

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

July 2, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker. Others attending: Town Administrator Sullivan and Selectmen Larkin, Nourse and Thompson.

Chairman Parker called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

PONDVIEW II: Town Administrator Sullivan and Selectmen Thompson, Nourse and Larkin met at the invitation of the Planning Board to discuss the grading in the Pondview II plan and adjacent area.

The Selectmen are concerned because the requirements of Section 12 of the Zoning Bylaw (Earth Removal) have not been completed in accordance with the Selectmen's letter of February 1985.

The Board is concerned that further gravel may be removed.

The Selectmen's main concern with the area in the Pondview I subdivision under the Selectmen's jurisdiction was safety. The banks were unstable and steep. According to Mrs. Thompson the slopes have been made safe to the Police Chief's satisfaction.

Mrs. Bancroft suggested that something be set up for maintenance between the two towns before the street is approved for construction.

Town Administrator Sullivan suggested that Medfield get together with Walpole and suggest that if Walpole will take care of Jorie Lane, Medfield will take care of the new street.

Mr. Brennan felt that it was the developer's responsibility to provide evidence that he has made agreements between the towns for upkeep and plowing of the roads, etc.

Mrs. Thompson reported that the area abutting the Warnock's has been fixed to the Warnock's satisfaction.

Mr. Sullivan asked if the original subdivision will have to be changed. Mr. Parker said that the developer will be reminded that he has to keep the 4-to-1 sloping along Stuart as well as the new street. The revised plan will go to Whitman & Howard for review. The Board's decision is due July 29th.

Mrs. Willis was instructed to call the Walpole Planning Board regarding the Pondview II plan.

SHIELDS PARKING VIOLATION: The Selectmen asked about the status of the Shield's parking violation on South Street. Mr. Larkin said that the matter has been turned over to Town Counsel to proceed.

MAIN STREET THREE-FAMILY HOUSE SITE PLAN: Mr. Parker reported that he talked with Town Counsel Fuller regarding the necessity of a variance for a driveway for more than six cars within 150 feet of an intersection, whether garaged or not.

Mr. Fuller said that it is the number of cars that is being controlled. It is a safety issue.

VOTED: To require Hartshorn Construction to apply to the Board of Appeals for a zoning variance to allow the proposed driveway to be within 150 feet of an intersecting way.

VOTED: To deny Site Plan Approval on the basis that the driveway does not comply with Section 8.3 of the Zoning Bylaw.

TOCCI-TOCCI SUBDIVISION: Mrs. Willis reported that Mr. MacKinnon and Dr. Carr had a conversation regarding Mr. MacKinnon's requirements for drainage of the subdivision. Mr. MacKinnon will send a letter to the Board regarding this conversation.

It was noted that the EIS was not dated nor signed by a registered professional engineer and did not meet the intent of the Bylaw. Only a partial list of plants in the vegetated wetland was included. The historical site on the property was not shown. The negative impact of the loss of natural resources was not discussed. All waterways in and adjacent to the site are not shown on the same plan.

Mr. Gagliani pointed out that the Conservation Commission minutes misrepresented his input into the hearing on June 5th.

DEERFIELD DRIVE EXTENSION: The Board briefly reviewed the Deerfield Drive Extension plan which is before the Board of Appeals. The Board will suggest that monuments be placed to locate the right-of-way easement to the common land in the rear of the cluster.

FORESTRY LAND-OWNED BY MUCCIACCIO: The Planning Board has received a notice of intent to convert and sell forestry land containing 14.1 acres of land off South Street.

VOTED: To send a letter to the Selectmen that the Planning Board does not feel that it is within the Town's interest to exercise its option to purchase the above-offered land for the sum of \$175,000.

LIAISONS WITH OTHER TOWN BOARDS:

Joseph R. Parker Jr.

Selectmen
Warrant Committee
School Committee
Board of Appeals

John K. Gagliani

Central Business District Cte,
Conservation Commission
MPIC
Historical Commission

Margaret E. Bancroft

Park & Recreation Commission
Board of Health
Board of Assessors

Joseph D. Codispoti

Housing Authority
Water & Sewerage Board
Sign Advisory Board

Sarsfield P. Brennan
Bicycle Path Committee

Highway Department
Hazardous Waste Committee

Page 3
July 2, 1986

In addition to the above, Mrs. Bancroft has been appointed by the State to the Bay Circuit Green Belt Committee; appointed by Trustees of State Hospital and Selectmen to Massachusetts State Hospital Committee and appointed to the Capital Budget Committee by the Selectmen. Mr. Brennan has been appointed by the Selectmen to the Joint Transportation Committee of which he is chairman and the Drainage Study Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully yours,

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

July 14, 1986

Members present: Brennan, Bancroft, Codispoti and Parker.

Others attending: People interested in public hearings.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

MINUTES:

VOTED: To accept the minutes of June 16 and 23, 1986.

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

Chairman Parker dismissed himself from the Village Farm Estates hearing as he is an abutter to the project.

Vice Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 8:15 p.m. Acting Secretary Codispoti read the public hearing notice as it appeared in the SUBURBAN WORLD.

Mrs. Bancroft stated that Mr. Parker had exempted himself from the hearing as a Planning Board member. Mrs. Bancroft then explained the procedure to be followed.

Mr. Robert Poxon, engineer for the subdivision, explained the plan. He said that the subdivision contained five lots, four of which were newly created. The parcel of land is within two zoning districts. Abutting South Street for a depth of 120 feet it is zoned RU; the remainder of the land is zoned RS. Three lots are proposed in the RS Zone, and two in the RU zoning district. A waiver is being requested regarding the 25-foot radius. Based on the size of the street and the subdivision, Mr. Poxon felt a 50-foot radius could create an area which could invite "U" turns. A 20-foot drainage easement is shown for drainage from Pound Street. The land generally slopes from North to South. The grading for the roadway is designed to contain all the surface water within the subdivision. The construction of a detention pond is proposed in the SE corner of the lot. This detention pond will be designed so that drainage which comes from Pound Street will be directed to flow into the pond. The outlet pipe is 18". Mr. Poxon said that it was almost completely clogged. A flow will be created through a pipe system so that there will be less chance of plugging. The utilities in the street will meet town specifications. There will be a fire hydrant at the end of the cul de sac for safety and to keep the water line functional. The drainage of the entire area, including most of Pound Street, was analyzed. The surface water from this site drains in the north-easterly and easterly direction to the rear of the site where there is presently a 20-foot wide drainage easement which is used to discharge surface water from Pound Street. This 18" pipe is located parallel to the rear property line and an 18" inlet has been left to drain this parcel along with the parcels of land northerly of the site. The 18" pipe, which as previously noted is practically plugged, and requires cleaning, is the inlet for draining some seven acres of land. This inlet will be cleared and a manhole will be constructed and a Detention Pond will be established with an 8" outlet pipe to control the runoff from the proposed development and the land north thereof. The drainage as it is discharged into the 18" pipe will drain through the Town of Medfield High School property. There presently are 18", 21" and 24" pipes in place, which eventually discharge into the ditch adjacent to Phillips Street where there are two culverts - one 30" RCP and one 30" CMP. The proposed detention basin will reduce the 10-year storm peak flow from 8.9 cfs. to 6.5 cfs. The site is basically an open field with very little vegetation as far as trees or bushes. It is mostly high grass.

The owner has performed test pits on site and these test pits are noted on the site plans which details the residential units to be constructed and based on measurements

taken on April 15, 1986. The ground water ranges from four feet to seven feet from the surface. Plotting the ground water elevation, it appears that the ground water drains from the north to the south and this is generally the direction of the existing topography sloping from the north to the south. Based on these observations, the houses will be maintained to the minimum of three feet-plus from the observed ground waters. Lessening the impacts to the ground water, we are proposing to tie the proposed four new residential units into the Town of Medfield sewerage system. There presently is an 8" existing gravity line within South Street and proposed are two additional manholes and an 8" gravity PVC line within the proposed street.

Mrs. Bancroft read the report from Whitman & Howard dated July 14th:

1. THE TYPICAL ROADWAY CROSS SECTION SECTIONS SHOWN ON SHEET 2 and 4 SHOULD BE REMOVED OR CORRECTED TO AGREE WITH THE CROSS SECTION SHOWN ON SHEET 3.

The drafting errors will be corrected.

2. WE RECOMMEND THAT THE STOP AND START STATIONS FOR THE LOCATION OF THE GRANITE CURBING BE SHOWN ON SHEET 3.

This problem will be addressed.

3. DISAGREE WITH THE ESTIMATE OF 10 TRIPS PER DAY FOR THE FOUR NEW HOMES. AASHTO ESTIMATES 10 TRIPS ENDS PER HOUSE FOR A TOTAL OF 40 TRIP ENDS PER DAY. AGREE THIS SUBDIVISION TRAFFIC SHOULD NOT CAUSE A NOTICEABLE IMPACT ON SOUTH STREET.

Will be reviewed again.

4. THE LOCUS SHOWN ON THE TOWN OF MEDFIELD ZONING MAP INCLUDED IN THE DRAINAGE CALCULATIONS IS IN THE WRONG LOCATION.

Will make the change.

5. THE HYDROGRAPHS DEVELOPED FOR THE DETENTION BASIN ARE UNDERESTIMATED. THE RATIONAL METHOD DETERMINED THE TEN-YEAR PEAK RATE -OF-FLOW AS 2.65 cfs FOR THE PROPOSED STREET DRAINAGE. THE PROPOSED HYDROGRAPH FOR THE SAME AREA USING THE COMPUTER HAS A PEAK FLOW OF ONLY 1.7 cfs.

There is a soils map in the presentation which shows that the site is located within type "A" soils - Hinkley, Merrimac and Windsor. They will give less of a runoff because of the slope and time concentration.

The Planning Board has requested that the drainage be calculated in accordance with the Planning Board Subdivision Rules & Regulations.

6. CONCERN REGARDING DETENTION BASIN.

The drainage will be piped directly into the manhole from the detention basin. The 50-year storm design is required for culverts. The street drainage is designed for the ten-year storm. The 100-year storm will be devastating to the area. There will be flooding in a ten-year storm. There will be an enormous amount of water running down the street. To require that this pond be designed for the 100-year storm, it would have to be much larger. The system can't get the water to drainage in a 100-year event. The pipes can't hold that much water.

Mrs. Bancroft read a letter from the Water & Sewerage Board stating that Village Farm Estates had not yet applied for a permit to extend the sewer.

July 14, 1986

Page 3.

Miss Lynn Rhoads expressed her concern as an abutter to the right of the property as there already is a problem with drainage. She said that her basement "is a total flood situation." If the land is filled next to her lot and a pond added she felt it would aggravate her situation as she has no drainage in her back yard.

Mr. Codispoti asked if a swale was going to be constructed around the entire property to catch the water and asked to what elevation will the property be filled.

Mr. Poxon said the maximum elevation is 175 feet which will then slope down to the street. The minimum elevation is 170 along the south side. Presently the area is created so that there is a swale around the property line.

Mr. Brennan asked if there was a sump there now.

Mr. Poxon said that there is a contour of 169 which creates a small ponding area.

Mrs. Bancroft said there appears to be somewhat of a water problem currently and asked if the drainage will help to take care of the water there now.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the plan requires removing any earth outside the property lines of the subdivision.

The answer was "no".

Mrs. Bancroft asked how they proposed to deal with the detention basin. What are the slopes and how deep will it be?

Mr. Poxon said the slopes will be three-to-one side slopes. The depth of the basin is $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet. It holds $1\frac{1}{2}$ feet of water in a ten-year storm.

Mrs. Bancroft asked how the bottom of the basin would be treated.

Mr. Poxon said it would be planted with canary grass.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that because the basin would be part of the Town's drainage system and the Town would need an easement.

Mr. Poxon said he has shown a triangle easement, plus a 20-foot easement on the plan.

Mr. Brennan asked what the silted pipe does now.

Mr. Poxon said it takes overland flow which doesn't go into the piping system.

Mr. DeSorgher said that there has been a pump coming out of a house in the area for ten years. Twice in the past ten years storms have washed away part of 109 and part of 27. It would be better if the town planned for the storm rather than running into problems two or three times a decade. Mr. DeSorgher asked who is responsible for keeping the 18" pipe clean.

Mrs. Bancroft said the town has the responsibility.

Mr. Tom Rezza, 73 South Street, said that a 100-year storm cannot be designed for.

Mr. Brennan stated that most drainage systems are designed for 50-year storms.

Mr. DeSorgher asked if the trees would be retained.

Mr. Poxon said the trees bordering the property will not be disturbed, nor will the stonewall.

Jane Rezzo, 73 South Street asked about the trees near the farm house.

Mr. Poxon said the barn will be taken down. Any trees that can be saved will be saved.

Mr. James Imbert, 64 South Street, asked if there was any ledge in the area and, if so, will there be blasting.

Mr. Joseph Parker said that "as a neighbor the scope of this plan seems to fit into the neighborhood. I would hope that when the stonewalls are broken through, you could use them on the roundings going into the new street. That would be a real amenity to the neighborhood. In the Subdivision Rules & Regulations we do not allow detention basins. I would hope that the Planning Board would listen carefully to expert engineering advice." Mr. Parker asked how much fill would be brought onto the site.

Mr. Poxon noted that volume computations have not been made on the amount of fill, but this computation could easily be made.

Mr. David Nilson said he would like to address the lady who asked about the trees. Two trees have been tagged for removal. The trees that will not be affected by the road will remain.

Mr. Poxon said that the Board could require that the trees be welled where it appeared they could be destroyed.

Miss Lynn Rhoads asked at what point near the stonewall that abuts her property will there be filling.

Mr. Poxon said that the filling would be approximately 30 feet from her property.

Miss Rhoads said, "Right now nothing grows there. I can't imagine how you can regrade it and it won't be worse on my property. It will flood my property. It is doing it now. There is no drainage."

Mr. Poxon said that an underdrain could be installed to direct water into the pond. The whole purpose of the Village Farm drainage design is to contain everything on site. We will look at Rhoads' property to see what could be done.

Mrs. Bancroft said that it would be helpful to the Board to have information about the contours on the adjacent land and she asked when the percolation tests were taken.

Mr. Poxon said they were taken in April through May.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if anyone would like to go on record in favor of the plan.

Mr. & Mrs. Rezza are in favor of the plan.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if anyone would like to go on record in opposition to the plan.

Mr. & Mrs. Rhoads and Lynn Rhoads were in opposition to the plan.

The hearing was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

JACKSON FABRICS - SITE PLAN APPROVAL HEARING:

Chairman Parker rejoined the meeting and called the hearing to order at 9:30 p.m.

Acting Secretary Codispoti read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Chairman Parker explained the procedure to be followed.

John Anderson, 281 Mylod Street, Walpole, engineer for the project introduced Mr. & Mrs. Lance Jackson, developers; John Perry, architect; David Carroll, attorney; Peter Smith, broker, and Mr. & Mrs. Nourse, current owners.

Mr. Anderson said that the site is at the intersection of North and Frairy Streets. One plan shows the original condition of the property and the other shows the development of the property. There is an existing house on the property. It is served by a driveway which loops out onto Frairy Street. There is a 2½-foot wall which will be maintained except where the driveway openings will be. There is an existing sanitary sewer line and water main. It is within a Business Zoning District. The residential zone is further to the west. On the north side of the property is the Chinese restaurant and other stores within the Business zone. There is no watershed protection or flood plain overlay. The use is for retail stores (5.4.4.1) and miscellaneous business offices (5.4.4.12). All of these are permitted by Special Permit authorized by the Planning Board under Section 14 of the Zoning Bylaw. The dimensional requirements for Business Zone have been met. The lot is 36,324 s.f. There is 129 feet along North Street and 176 along Frairy Street. The sidelines will meet zoning requirements. There will be three stories - two above ground and one partially below grade. The maximum floor area ratio meets town standards as does the minimum open space. Section 6.3.2 makes reference to walls or fences or anything which would be obstructing views at intersections. There is a nice granite wall around the property which is 2½ feet high. The driveways are one-way and are 20 feet in width. Section 8 of the Bylaw concerns parking. We have provided 48 parking spaces. The formula we have used is as follows:

Five offices times three spaces per office requires fifteen spaces. Retail space of 4,380 - 60% open to the public and 40% storage and stock area requires 22 parking spaces ($2628 \div 120$) and lastly ten employees with one space for each two employees - which is 5 spaces - totalling 42 spaces. 48 spaces to be provided. The Bylaw requires screening for lot lines which abut residential property. Mr. Anderson said that there are maple trees which go the whole length of the property. The Board may wish that more buffer be provided as the maples do not provide much of a buffer in the winter. That was brought to our attention in the Whitman & Howard report. There is a stockade fence along the north edge of the property. Handicap ramps and parking places are provided. The services will connect to Frairy Street.

Sewer would be tied in with a new connection and the water will be 1" copper tubing which will connect into the existing water line. It would require excavating half the width of the street.

Mr. John Perry, architect, Norwood said that Mr. Jackson had called him because we have done a lot of restoration. After inspecting the house, it was my recommendation to tear it down because Mr. Jackson's intended use is retail. When the building was constructed they did not take into consideration 1985 codes and structural requirements. To make the building do what Mr. Jackson wanted, it was my recommendation that he can't do it. The building must be replaced with a new structure. The building designed for the site is federalist style. The building will be clapboards. Mr. Jackson's business is fabrics. He deals with window dressings. The building will be 50 x 90'.

Mr. Parker read the comments from the Whitman & Howard Report:

1. 6.2.10 PROPOSED CONTOURS INTERRUPT EXISTING BUFFER ZONE. THERE IS NO PROPOSED LANDSCAPING TO REPLACE VEGETATION LOST. AN ONSITE INSPECTION ON 7/8/86 DETERMINED THAT ADDITIONAL SCREENING WILL BE NECESSARY TO COMPLY WITH THIS REGULATION.

Mr. Perry said that a landscaping plan has been started. He said that pink and white flowering shrubs were going to be planted in front of the building. There will be pyramidal arbovitae to cover the dumpster.

Mr. Parker stated that the Planning Board has only the authority to approve a site plan which meets the zoning. The Bylaw spells out what the planting will be for the buffer. If the applicant wishes to vary from that it is necessary to obtain a variance from the Board of Appeals. Our plan must be in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Anderson said he was not sure whether or not the Planning had any judgment on the buffers. If not, then it will be put on the plan as required.

Mr. Parker asked if it would be possible to accomplish the border without removing any of the existing trees.

Mr. Anderson noted that there is ten feet between the pavement and the property line.

2. 14.13.3.e SITE PLANS DO NOT INCLUDE HEIGHT OF EXISTING OR PROPOSED BUILDINGS.

Mr. Perry said that the building height will be 28 feet.

3. 14.13.3.h THE SITE PLANS DO NOT INCLUDE PLANTING DETAILS. SPECIES AND HEIGHT OF SPECIES ARE REQUIRED.

Mr. Parker said that Mr. Perry has indicated that you would submit a separate complete plan.

4. 14.13.2.i THE SITE PLANS DO NOT INCLUDE ANY LIGHTING INFORMATION.

Mr. Perry said that there will be lights in front of the building shining onto it and three pole-mounted sodium lights shining from the property line toward the new building.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board dislikes lights which give off a pink glow and prefers pole lights not lights on the building.

Mr. Parker said that the Board prefers low poles - 10 feet in height or so.

Mr. Perry stated that "we are talking a show-case type of building."

5. TABLE 8.1 AN ESTIMATE OF THE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES FOR THE OFFICES IS REQUIRED TO DETERMINE IF THE NUMBER OF SPACES PROVIDED IS ADEQUATE.

Mr. Anderson said that they do not know who will be leasing the offices. It is his anticipation that they will be professional type offices - three small offices and three larger offices.

Mr. Parker brought to the developer's attention that if their driveway is not 150 feet from the centerline of the intersection of North and Frairy Streets, a variance would have to be obtained from the Board of Appeals.

Mr. Anderson said that perhaps they could go with one entrance onto Frairy Street or put the driveway on the edge of the lot on North Street.

Mr. Parker brought up the question of the stone wall on North Street and Frairy Street. The Board would like to be assured that any work done would not change

the stonewall.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if any grading of consequence was planned for the site.

Mr. Anderson said that the existing house is set up on a mound on the Frairy Street side. There will be a minimal amount of grading. The site is relatively flat and there will not be peak cuts and fills.

Mr. Parker said that the basement level is 172 feet above mean sea level. The pond's 100-year flood level is 171. The water level this past spring was approximately 169, two feet below the 100-year flood.

Nancy Codispoti, 435 Main Street: The Historic Commission members present tonight wish to go on record as regretting the loss of this historic structure, the D.D. Curtis house, a structure so important to Medfield architecturally and relevant to the history of the town and the famous Straw Hat Factory that it is referenced in Tilden's History of Medfield and included in the Town's Bicentennial Commemorative Book Medfield Reflections. It is also included in the Historical Commission's popular pamphlet Historic Medfield - 300 Years, a Guide to the Architectural History of Medfield Center and many historic maps of our town.

The commission can only hope that out of this tragedy the residents of our town will become less naive where historic preservation is concerned and made more aware of the potential for losing our heritage and take action to protect other historic areas in town. Perhaps then the loss of the Manor Inn (now the Chinese Restaurant) and now the D.D. Curtis house will not signal the beginning of a "domino effect," i.e., the razing of our historic structures for commercial purposes.

Chairman Parker read two letters which were received from residents, namely, June Hinkley and John Gagliani.

Ms. Codispoti said that there appears to be a misconception that no developers were interested in keeping the building as it is. Two or three people have come forth, according to information I have received, and others were interested in rehabilitating the house.

Mr. Perry said that the purchaser has the right to do as the zoning allows. Mr. Jackson is willing to give the building to the Historical Commission for nothing, if the Commission so desired. If it is that important to the town, the building can be offered to the town today.

Ms. Codispoti said that the Commission is unable to accept offers like that.

Mr. Perry suggested that maybe the town could accept it. Towns can accept things. If it is that valuable historically, maybe the town should do something to salvage it.

Mr. DeSorgher asked which town board should pursue the offer - the Selectmen or the Planning Board.

Mr. Parker said that the Planning Board has site plan review and he felt that it would be up to the Selectmen to pursue the matter, however, since the applicant does not own the property, the present offer is conditional. There is no reason why interested parties shouldn't investigate possibilities.

Mr. Parker said that the Board has 90 days to act on this plan and it appears that the driveway is located closer than 150 feet from the intersection. Mr. Parker asked the applicant if he would consider altering his plan before the Board takes

action.

Mr. Parker said that the Board will continue the hearing.

Mr. Nourse said that he owns an adjoining piece of property which abuts the site and at the moment there is no access to the adjoining property. Perhaps when addressing the second driveway the developer address the right of egress and the right to pass and repass. Also, Mr. Nourse asked that the architect qualify his statement that Mr. Jackson will give the property away. I obtain interested in the real property.

Mr. Perry said that what is left, Mr. Jackson is willing to donate to the Town.

Mr. Parker said that the hearing will be continued to July 28th at 9:00 p.m.

F.D.C. PACKAGING:

The Board is in receipt of Board of Appeals decision No. 479 regarding the F.D.C. Packaging enlargement.

The Plan of Land in Medfield, drawn by Ernest W. Branch, Inc., dated February 14, 1986, and revised March 6, April 2 and April 17, 1986, shows 43 parking spaces for the building. The requirement is 41.

VOTED: To sign the plan to approve the parking.

DEERFIELD DRIVE EXTENSION - CLUSTER:

VOTED: To send the following letter to the Board of Appeals for the July 16th public hearing:

"The Planning Board would like to be recorded as supporting the general scheme of the proposed cluster plan, noting that the plan appears to fulfill the purpose of 'cluster' concept as stated in the Zoning Bylaw.

"However, the Board requests that the following three specific issues be addressed in the Town's interest:

- "1. The location of the 'cart path' right of way from Deerfield Drive to the open land (Lot 16A) should be identified by survey and marked by monuments on the ground to prevent future uncertainty over its location. Use of the right of way by privatelyowned motor vehicles should be prohibited.
- "2. The open land to be deeded to the town should be restored to a condition satisfactory to the Conservation Commission before the street is built or bonded.
- "3. The rock rubble edges of the plateau on Lots N3 and N4 should be filled and graded to a reasonable slope, at no point steeper than 2 to 1.

"Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations."

PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED - MAIN STREET:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield, drawn by Norwood Engineering

July 14, 1986

Page 9.

Company, dated July 11, 1986, showing two lots on Main Street.

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan.

The plan was signed.

PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED - NORTH STREET:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield, drawn by Cheney Engineering, dated May 16, 1986, showing nine lots. The lots are numbered A2, A3, B1, C1, D1, E4, E5, 3 and 11. Lots enumerated A2, E2, E4, E5, 3 and 11 are labeled "not separate building lots" on the plan.

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan.

The plan was signed.

PONDVIEW II:

Mr. Codispoti will represent the Medfield Planning Board at the Walpole Planning Board meeting to discuss town interaction with regard to the Pondview II subdivision.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Acting Secretary

100

100

100

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

July 28, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.
Others attending: Nick Bancroft and Rou Boudette, Steve Mainones, David Carroll,
Mr. & Mrs. Lance Jackson, John Rosata, Mr. Donald Neilsen,
Ruth Bridge and other regarding Village Farm Estates, Messrs.
Clayton and Alan Haigh.

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

VOTED: To accept the minutes of June 30 and July 2.

SWAIM PLAN:

(Mrs. Bancroft removed herself from the Board for this appointment.) Messrs. Bancroft and Boudette presented a plan of a portion of the Swaim property off Country Way for discussion. Mr. Boudette said that the lot would contain four lots on a 480-foot cul de sac. There is a question regarding the ownership of the Country Way stub shown on the 1963 subdivision plan of Gun Hill Park. The plan as drawn shows Mr. Swaim owning all of the Mount Nebo Street easement. It can be changed if it is determined that a portion of the easement is owned by other abutters. The vegetated wetlands border is shown. There is a large swamp which goes into Walpole. There is no Watershed Protection District or Flood Plain District in either Walpole or Medfield. Mine Brook is not on the property. The pavement will be 28 feet wide. A new catchbasin is proposed for Wood End Lane.

Mr. Parker asked what the slope would be on either side of the road. Mr. Boudette said that it was his intention to follow the present contour of the land. It may be necessary to ask for an 8% grade for a short distance. The 300-foot sight distance can be maintained. Mr. Boudette explained the proposed new drainage. A drainage easement is shown through Lot 3. Mr. Domey observed the tests. Ground water is ten feet down on the average. An 8" water main and a hydrant are being proposed. A planted island with low plantings has been designed for the cul de sac. Some re-grading of the lots will be required.

Mr. Codispoti asked about the development potential of the surrounding land.

Mr. Boudette said the site was bounded by swamp on three sides. The only possibility for developing in Medfield on Mr. Swaim's land is the four lots shown on the plan.

Mr. Bancroft asked the Board's advice on the Country Way stub as the ownership of the lot is not clear at this time.

Mr. Gagliani feels that the ownership of the road should be straightened out prior to acceptance of the preliminary or definitive subdivision plan.

Mr. Bancroft asked how the Board would like him to proceed.

Mr. Parker said that the Board prefers the submission of a preliminary plan to review followed by the definitive plan.

The Board will check with Town Counsel regarding the Country Way stub.

PONDVIEW II:

Joseph Codispoti's Report of meeting with Walpole Planning Board on July 17th:

"The Walpole Planning Board requested a representative from the Medfield Planning

July 28, 1986

Page 2.

Board to discuss the Pondview Estates II Subdivision which crosses between Medfield and Walpole. The owner/developer was represented by Bruce Kirkland of Norwood Engineering.

"The meeting focused on the need to define mutual delivery to the subdivision by Walpole and Medfield of such services as fire and police protection, snow plowing and street maintenance, school bus access and other such needs. A letter dated July 14 from Norwood Engineering to appropriate Town agencies in Walpole and Norwood was acknowledged and cited for its initiative helping lead the process to resolve this service issue.

"Mr. Kirkland argued that the letter should be viewed as the full extent of compliance needed by the developer and that it was the Towns' responsibilities to now resolve the issue without delaying approval. I noted that Planning Boards were responsible for land use including the needs of safety and that Medfield would not likely approve the subdivision plan until such assurance were agreed to in writing.

"With minor exception, I noted that the plan met all of our other requirements. I reminded the Walpole Board of the water drainage from Medfield into Walpole and that drainage eventually led into wetlands. The Walpole Board was well aware and gave assurances that all of the Town's requirements would be met.

"It was decided that the respective Boards of Selectmen needed to agree on the final disposition of mutual services and that the Town Administrators should have preliminary discussions on the matter and seek appropriate Board of Selectmen action. I also suggested that the resolution might also consider the similar condition on Jorie Lane now under development.

"Since the next meeting of the Walpole Board was not until July 29th and the next Planning Board meeting was not until August 8th, Mr. Kirkland filed for an extension until August 8th. I suggested to Mr. Kirkland that he be prepared to ask for an extension of the Medfield Board, as well, at our meeting of July 28th."

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Bruce Kirkland, representing the developer, requesting an extension to August 12th for the Medfield Planning Board to take action.

VOTED: To allow an extension to August 12th and to so notify Mr. Kirkland by certified mail.

RECONVENE THE CONTINUATION OF HEARING ON THE JACKSON PROPERTY:

Chairman Parker reconvened the hearing. Mr. Steven Mainones represented the Jacksons and explained the changes made in the plan. The driveway on North Street has been moved so that it meets the requirement that a street must be 150 feet from an intersecting street. One parking space has been lost, changing the number of spaces from 42 to 41. The driveway will be one-way, 15 feet in width. Mr. Brennan asked how the driving pattern will be controlled. Mr. Mainones said it would be controlled by signs.

Mr. Parker asked about the size trucks anticipated and the ability of those trucks to negotiate the area.

Mr. Mainones said that a trailer truck 43 feet in length could enter the site, but would have to use both sides of North Street to do so.

Mr. Jackson said that most of the deliveries for his business are UPS size trucks;

however, the other retail space has not been leased and he did not know about their trucking requirements.

Mr. Mainones said it would make a difference if the corner rounding could be made, however, this cannot be done without infringing on abutting property. If the rounding were allowed to be opened up, it would be beneficial for large trucks entering the site. The truck docks are three feet in height and have not been set up for semi trailers. There is an occasional "semi" but most of the trucks are UPS or cube van.

Mr. Parker asked if the existing wall would have to be changed.

Mr. Mainones said that one side would have to be changed to accommodate the driveway.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the 36" horse chestnut tree could be saved.

Mr. Jackson said that he would try to keep as much vegetation as possible, but did not know if the tree would be too close to the building.

Mr. Parker said that it is assumed that there will be three parking spaces per office "no matter what." He requested that the notation on the plan should show the parking requirements.

Mr. David Carroll noted that lighting has been added to the plan as requested. Mr. Mainones explained the lighting plan. The poles will be ten feet in height. The lights will be shaded and directed away from neighboring property. The fixtures will have 250-watt Halide lights. Mr. Parker requested that photometrics be shown on the plan.

Mr. Codispoti asked if the parking lot would be chained off when the building is not in use, or if the nearby church could use the parking lot on Sundays. Mr. Jackson said he plans to keep the parking area open.

Mr. Gagliani had a reservation regarding "any portion" of a driveway being within 150 feet of an intersecting street in accordance with Section 8.3.6.f.

Mr. Codispoti recollected that Mr. Nourse asked about access to his property to the rear of this lot at the original hearing.

Mr. David Carroll said that this is still in a discussion stage with Mr. Nourse.

The Stones said that the "traffic is tough on Frairy Street" and suggested that it be made a one-way street. Mr. Parker said that would be a matter for the Selectmen to consider. He asked if the visibility problem is caused by bushes within the town way. He said that there is a sight problem at the corner of Frairy and North Streets. Mr. Parker asked if the developer of the property had any thoughts about sight distance.

Mr. Mainones said that "There will not be speeding from this site. The people flying through must be from the other side of town."

Mr. Gagliani asked if the stonewall interferes with sight conditions. Mr. Mainones said that the stonewall is 2½ feet in height and will not hamper sight.

Mr. Gagliani suggested that no trailers be allowed. Mrs. Bancroft did not think it is necessary to over design for the exceptional case. Mr. Parker suggested that there be some sort of a statement that the driveway can handle the trucks for which it is designed.

July 28, 1986

Page 4.

The hearing was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

PINE STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

Mr. John Rosata presented a Plan of Land in Medfield, drawn by Mr. Jeffrey Caffrey and dated May 12, 1986, to the Board. It was determined that the setback line did not meet zoning requirements.

VOTED: To allow Mr. Rosata to withdraw the plan and have it revised to meet zoning requirements. To save Mr. Rosata time, Mr. Gagliani will check the corrected plan and two other members will come in to sign it.

The vote was recorded four in favor with one abstention.

(Mr. Parker excused himself from the Board as he is an abutter.)

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

Mr. Donald Nielsen met with the Board to discuss comments No. 5 and 6 of the Whitman & Howard Report.

Mr. Nielsen said that they had combined two methods to determine the drainage for the detention basin design. The method used did not determine the same rate of flow as the Rational Method which is required in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Mr. Nielsen explained that the pipe analysis used for the design was the Rational Method. The detention pond analysis time of concentration was done by the Soil Conservation Service Method.

The time of concentration is the real dilemma between the two methods. The Board requested that the drainage and time of concentration both be figured by the Rational Method.

Item #6 deals with the detention pond itself. Mr. Nielsen asked if the Board will allow the use of a detention basin. Mr. Nielsen said he would just as soon run the drainage directly into the pipe, but there is a slight limitation in it. The detention pond will be small and should be dressed up like a part of someone's back yard.

Mrs. Bancroft read Superintendent Feeney's note on the Village Farm Estates Drainage, as follows: "I reviewed the proposed drainage system with my foreman, Robert Kennedy, and we came to the conclusion that the detention area is a good idea, but may have to be made a bit larger because of the Public Works Department's future plans within the next couple years of tying in four catch basins which will drain a 600-foot area of South Street."

Mr. Nielsen said that this issue complicates the matter.

Mr. Brennan said he was concerned that Miss Rhoads' basement was part of the drainage basin and asked what effect the detention basin, as shown, would have on the Rhoads property.

Mr. Nielsen said that Miss Rhoads elevation is 170 and the bottom of the detention pond will be 165.

Mr. Brennan asked what will happen with the water in a 50-year storm.

Mr. Nielsen said it would flow across the Junior High School driveway to the

July 28, 1986

Page 5.

baseball field, where the low point is 165 feet.

The Board asked Mr. Neilsen to discuss the drainage from South Street with Mr. Feeney.

Mr. Brennan said he would like to have some reaction from our consultant on this matter. Mrs. Willis will call Mr. MacKinnon and ask his opinion regarding the size of the detention basin.

Mr. Nielsen will meet with the Board on August 11th on this matter.

The street name was discussed and the Fire and Police Chiefs said that Village Lane will be acceptable.

The Board is in receipt of a request for an extension for action on the Village Farm Estates plan to August 27th.

VOTED: To allow the extension to August 27th.

Messrs. Parker and Gagliani did not vote.

HUTSON PINES:

(Mr. Gagliani did not participate.) Mr. Alan Haigh met with the Board and presented a letter from Millis Engineering containing answers to the Board's questions.

1. The Board has agreed that it will allow a 30-foot radius at the transition to the cul de sac instead of the 50-foot radius required.
2. The Board thinks it would be best to have the drainage easement moved to the rear of lot 3, however, the Board will allow the drainage to stand as it is.
3. The engineer will put the street name on all the plans.
4. The revised plans have increased the runoff to the Hospital Road drainage system. The information regarding the additional drainage will be provided.
5. Calculations have been performed and a hydrograph generated that demonstrates there is sufficient capacity in the Medfield Technology Park detention basin. This information will be provided to Whitman & Howard.

Mr. Haigh requested that the Board approve the Hutson Pines Plan with conditions for items 4 and 5 of the above listing.

Chairman Parker told Mr. Haigh that the Board has been advised by Town Counsel not to approve subdivisions conditionally.

Mr. Haigh then requested an extension within which the Board must make its decision to August 27th.

VOTED: To allow an extension to August 27th for the Board to make its decision on Hutson Pines.

TOCCI-TOCCI SUBDIVISION:

The Board discussed the Tocci-Tocci Subdivision plan.

VOTED: To deny the Tocci-Tocci Definitive Subdivision Plan dated February 22nd,

revised April 21, 1986, because the developer's plan fails to comply with Section 5.2231 of the Land Subdivision Rules and Regulations and also fails to comply with Section II of the Zoning Bylaw.

The specific areas are as follows:

1. The applicant's plan does not comply with Section 5.2231 of the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Planning Board. The developer's drainage calculations show that the public drainage system into which storm water will be directed has inadequate reserve capacity.
2. Deficiencies in the Tocci-Tocci Plan are as follows:
 - a) 4.321 Drainage Calculations (separate statement)
 - b) Environmental Impact Statement (4.321). The EIS fails to "clearly show the relation of the proposed project to the total environment of the Town and its inhabitants" and to "determine the significance of each (environmental impact), "particularly with regard to the impact of the proposed drainage system on the area downstream of the site.
 - c) 4.322 Plan Form. The index sheet does not show street stationing as required.
 - d) 4.323 Plan Content.
 - g) Numbering of lots 10 and 11 is inconsistent within the sheets submitted.
 - 1) Size, materials and type of all existing storm drains within and adjacent to the subdivision are not shown on the plan - specifically, the drainage entering the site via two easements on the south east edge of lot 10 (sheet 4) and a storm drain known to exist on the adjacent lot to the west of Lot 7.
 - 0) Major site features, specifically woods lines and some existing stone walls, are now shown on the plan.
 - u) A plan for control of erosion and siltation has not been submitted.
 - e) 5.2231 Connection to Public System. The drainage calculations submitted by the applicant demonstrate that the existing public drainage system into which the applicant proposes to connect has not only inadequate reserve capacity, but inadequate capacity to handle existing storm runoff.
 - f) 4.321 g) Complete drainage calculations have not been prepared by the applicant.

BULLARD'S SITE PLAN:

No additional information has been received regarding drainage from the Bullard's site. The Board would like to know where excess drainage will go. The Board dis-

cussed the possibility of a sidewalk on Green Street.

THREE-FAMILY - MAIN STREET:

The Board is in receipt of a request from Norwood Engineering to withdraw the plan for the three-family on Main Street.

VOTED: Not to allow the plan to be withdrawn because the Board prior to the withdrawal request had voted to deny the plan.

The vote was recorded four in favor of the motion, with Mr. Gagliani abstaining as an abutter.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

()

()

()

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
August 11, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

BULLARD'S MALL:

Messrs. McCullough and Poxon met with the Board to answer questions which Whitman & Howard had raised. Mr. Poxon presented the Board with a letter from Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. dated August 11, 1986.

The questions and answers follow:

1. Whitman & Howard recommend that a 25-year storm frequency be used for leaching drainage structure designs.

ANS. System designed for a 10-year storm. It has been analyzed for a 25-year storm. (Calculations confirming this will be forwarded to the Board.) The system of galleys will still mitigate surface water runoff for a 25-year storm.

2. Whitman & Howard recommends that the Town observe the deep hole pits and percolation tests conducted for these designs.

ANS. Guerriere & Halnon, Inc., said they would be glad to rerun the tests if the Town wished them to do so.

3. Whitman & Howard requested that the Engineer document that "should the system fail for whatever reason that the run-off not flood any buildings and, in undeveloped areas, easements be required to assure that this will not occur for future development."

ANS. The Drainage System includes catch basins, drain manholes tight joint reinforced concrete pipe and a leaching galley drainage discharge system. The design will retain a 25-year storm. Based on the existing topographic conditions, the site slopes southeast and our proposed design incorporates that particular sloping.

Presently there is an industrial building for Corning Glass with a catch-basin west of the building situated about 15 inches below the first floor or slab grade. No basement was observed.

The driveway northwesterly of the Corning Glass Building slopes away from the Corning Glass building in a northwesterly direction along and towards their property line. There is a swale that appears to run parallel to the Corning Glass property line in a northeasterly direction.

Mr. Poxon said that under existing condition the Bullard's site drains onto the Corning Glass property. The drainage system that we have designed collects a 25-year storm with 100% retention of runoff onsite where presently there is runoff being discharged onto the Corning Glass property.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if one section of the galley were damaged would that affect the rest of the row.

Mr. Poxon said that it would decrease the actual storage capacity. He said there

August 14, 1986

Page 2.

is an opening between the walls and there is a 12" pipe which connects the two rows of galleys. Generally runoff would flow through the entire section. The galleys are designed for H-20 loading. They will be between 2½ and 3 feet below the finished grade.

Mr. McCullough showed the Board a picture of the lights which were proposed for the project. The poles will be 8 feet high and the plan shows the spread of the foot candles. He said the lights will be shielded from abutters.

Mr. Poxon said that everything had been moved forward two feet so that the ten-foot required buffer could be observed. This reduced the grass strip in the parking lot.

Mr. Parker asked about the trees which were in the buffer area.

It was noted that the requirement for the buffer is for evergreens five feet in width, six feet high planted three feet on center.

Mr. McCullough said they would plant either red or white pine in the buffer.

Mrs. Bancroft expressed a safety concern regarding the paved shoulder on Green Street as it would likely double for off-street parking. It was suggested that Mr. McCullough meet with Superintendent of Streets Feeney to discuss the sidewalk design on Green Street abutting the Bullard project.

Mr. McCullough said, "We would be happy to work with the Town on the planning stage. It is not incumbent upon my clients to work on the Town's way. We will coordinate with the Town Standards. Guerriere & Halnon would provide engineering details." Mr. McCullough asked if this would be part of the site plan review process.

Mrs. Bancroft said "I think the applicants have outdone themselves to satisfy the drainage."

The Board anticipates further information within two weeks.

ORCHARD PARK:

Messrs. Nickerson, Fickeisen, Kirkland and Attorney O'Neil represented the applicants.

Mr. Kirkland said that the subdivision consists of three separate pieces of land. The names of the owners of the three parcels are shown on the plan. This is a residential subdivision off High Street. Seven new lots are proposed and there are two existing homes on High Street. This is an RT Zoning District. The proposed road will have 28 feet of pavement, underground utilities, including an 8" water main coming up Granite Street, and sidewalk and grass strip. There will be a closed drainage system, discharging in wetland on lot abutting Granite Street. All homes will be serviced by septic systems. Preliminary soil testing has been done on the property. The length of the cul-de-sac is shown as 850 feet, however, it is in excess of the 500-foot allowed. This would require a waiver. Mr. Kirkland explained that it would be impossible to continue the road as there are wetlands in the area which would have to be filled.

Whitman & Howard's July 31, 1986, letter said that "Between 40' - 50' must be cut back along the frontage of lots 4 & 5 to meet existing grade at the required 4:1 slope."

August 11, 1986

Page 3.

Mr. Parker said he would like to have the safety issue of the sight distance addressed.

Mr. Nickerson said that there is a lot of ledge, however, it will be removed and the sight distance will meet Town requirements.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if there was water in High Street.

Mr. Nickerson said there is no water in High Street at this point, however, they will connect to water on Granite Street. Two hydrants will be installed.

Mr. Fickeisen said that the granting of a waiver for the length of the cul-de-sac, be necessary however, the length is not inconsistent with other cul-de-sacs. The length should not be a problem.

Mr. Brennan said he would like to have a comment from the police and fire chiefs on the length of the cul-de-sac.

Mrs. Bancroft suggested that there be a planted area in the center of the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Parker asked that the fire chief and Superintendent of Streets have input on the length of the cul-de-sac and the planting in the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Parker asked if there would be any blasting. Mr. Fickeisen said that there would be some blasting.

VIDEO STORE - 255 MAIN STREET:

Mr. John Gagne met with the Board to obtain permission to sell "take-out" pizza in addition to video rentals. Mr. Gagne said the space open to the public would not be changed. He said about 20% of the store would be devoted to pizza take-out.

Mrs. Bancroft said the store was in operation under Section 5.4.4.1 of the Zoning Bylaw and this would include retail sale of food.

Mr. Parker asked if Mr. Gagne would be selling drinks of any kind.

Mr. Gagne said he did not anticipate selling drinks. He said they could be obtained at the nearby gas station.

The Board agreed that "take-out" pizza would be allowed with the videos under the Zoning Bylaw.

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

Mr. Poxon said that the comments in Whitman & Howard's July 14, 1986, report have been addressed as follows:

1. The typical roadway cross sections shown on sheet 2 and 4 should be removed or corrected to agree with the cross section shown on Sheet 3.

The above corrections have been made.

2. Whitman & Howard recommend that the stop and start stations for the location of the granite curbing be shown on Sheet 3.

Mr. Poxon said that they intend to install slant granite curbing on the tangent sections of the proposed roadway as well as the radii, thus eliminating any bituminous curbing.

Mrs. Bancroft said that granite curbing is not required around the cul-de-sac. It is only required on the roundings.

Mr. Poxon said that if granite curbing is not required on the cul-de-sac, they would install granite curbing on the roundings and the rest would be bituminous concrete curbing.

3. Whitman & Howard disagreed with the number of trips per house as set forth in the Environmental Impact Study, however, ASHTO estimate of 40 trips per day still should not cause a noticeable impact on South Street.
4. The locus shown on the Town of Medfield Zoning Map included in the drainage calculations is in the wrong location.

Mr. Poxon said they did not understand this question. Mrs. Willis will ask Mr. MacKinnon about this.

5. Hydrographs developed for the detention basin design are underestimated. The Rational Method determined the 10-year peak rate-of-flow as 2.65 cfs for the proposed street drainage. The proposed hydrograph for the same area using the computer has a peak flow of only 1.7 cfs.

Mr. Poxon said that the soil map for the Town of Medfield classifies the soils of the site as belonging to the Hinckley-Merrimac-Windsor Association. The Soil Conservation Service classifies each of these soil as "A" soils. The runoff to the proposed detention pond was re-analyzed using adjusted times of concentration using the SCS charts. The peak flow to the pond was computed to be 5.3 cfs. The runoff to the pond was also analyzed using the rational method which computed a peak runoff of 4.5 cfs. Using the greater peak flow of 5.3 cfs, the detention pond was re-analyzed to have a peak outflow of 2.2 cfs and a depth of two feet, which indicated an increase of .6 cfs and .6 feet of depth from the initial analysis.

The detention basin is proposed to be sized large enough for the ten-year storm. Whitman & Howard wanted to know what would happen and where the water would go in a 100-year storm event. The water will flow over the roadway of the Junior High School and onto the athletic field. The field is equipped with three catch basins that are part of the town's drainage system and is adjacent to the Philip Street culvert. The field slopes gradually to the Philip Street culvert with elevations running from 165 to 160. There are no foundations or houses adjacent to the flow area within the ball fields.

The elevation has been increased along the stone wall to 170 feet. A berm will be created and these two changes will force the water away from the Rhoads property. It should be noted that the ground water at this time is at 162 feet. Miss Rhoads' cellar is at elevation 162.5.

Mr. Brennan asked that the drainage calculations for Village Farm Estates be stamped by a certified, registered engineer.

The following items were to be taken care of by the engineer:

1. Make changes on the plan for bituminous curbing.
2. Put waiver for minimum radius of curvature at the intersection. 25-foot radius allowed.
3. Have the drainage calculations stamped.

HUTSON PINES DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION PLAN:

Messrs. Alan and Clayton Haigh met with the Board to discuss their plan. The Board is in receipt of a report from Whitman & Howard dated August 7, 1986, stating that the applicant has shown that there is adequate reserve capacity in the existing drainage system on Hospital Road to handle the proposed drainage from the developed site. It was also stated that the calculations performed on the proposed detention basin have been determined to be of sufficient size to handle the proposed additional runoff.

VOTED: To approve the Hutson Pines Definitive Subdivision Plan dated March 24, 1986, revised to June 20, 1986, owned by Clayton and Alan Haigh, drawn by Millis Engineering, with drainage calculations updated to July 31, 1986, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the engineering calculations be signed, stamped and dated by a registered, professional engineer.
2. That the street name, "Clayton Street," be inscribed on the plan.
3. That the plan be subject to approval of other Town Boards as required.
4. That the Board has granted the following waivers which must be noted on the Plan:
 - a) Waiver to permit a cul-de-sac 530 feet in length.
 - b) Waiver to permit a 30-foot radius where the cul-de-sac intersects the street.

This decision will be sent by certified mail to the applicant, with a copy to the Town Clerk. All abutters will be notified by regular mail.

SHEPHERD LANE:

Mr. Terry Shields met with the Board to request that he be allowed to have two telephone poles installed on Shepherd Lane. He will then put underground electricity and telephone to the lot line abutting Mr. Scribner's property.

Mr. Scribner asked if he could put the bioluminous concrete on the road and then dig the trench for the power and telephone.

The Board will allow the two telephone poles on Shepherd Lane, however, they will require that the power and telephone trenches be dug, the lines laid and then covered before any surety can be released.

PONDVIEW II:

There is no street name for the cul-de-sac going into Walpole. That is to be decided by the Board. Ellis or Turner streets were suggested. Mrs. Willis will check with Walpole to determine if they have used either of the street names. It was noted that there is a memorandum from James R. Merriam, Town Administrator, called, "Reciprocal Agreement with Medfield" dated August 1, 1986, which reads as follows: "Please be advised that I have reached an agreement with Michael Sullivan, Town Administrator for the Town of Medfield, in which we will provide temporary services including snowplowing and street sweeping to all of Jorie Lane and Medfield will provide temporary services to the two lots known as Pondview Estates II."

VOTED: To approve Pondview Estates II Subdivision Plan dated May 8, 1986, revised July 1, 1986, drawn by Norwood Engineering Company, with the following conditions:

1. That the August 1, 1986 memorandum from James R. Merriam, Walpole Town Administrator, regarding provision for services between Walpole and Medfield Departments of Public Works be followed.
2. That the plan be subject to all approvals of other Town Boards as required.

The decision will be sent by certified mail to the applicant, filed with the Town Clerk and sent by regular mail to the abutters.

GEORGETOWN ESTATES COVENANT:

VOTED: To sign Georgetown Estates covenant covering the plan dated March 9, 1986, revised April 9, 1986, June 9, 1986 and July 1, 1986

MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE:

VOTED: To appoint Daniel L. Jones, Jr., to the Master Plan Implementation Committee for the term ending June 29, 1989.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
August 25, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti and Gagliani.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Acting Chairman Bancroft and the following business was transacted:

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

Mr. Poxon and Mr. Neilson were advised the Board that the name of the street for Village Farm Estates would be Village Road. They agreed that this was acceptable. The Weston & Sampson sewer design is acceptable. It shows 30" manhole covers and ties into existing sewer with drop in manhole. Mr. Poxon and Mr. Neilson were advised that all basement floors had to be 2 feet above ground. Mr. Pozon said that according to the plan all basement floors are currently 3 feet above ground. Mr. Poxon stated that there is no elevation shown on the plan for the foundation. He was asked to determine slab elevation and to show it on the plan.

VOTED: To approve subdivision for Village Farm Estates plan dated May 30, 1987, revised August 11, 1986, on the condition of other Town Boards approval as required and developer will note on plan:

- 1) It shall be noted on the plan that the basement floor elevations shall be set a minimum of two feet above maximum groundwater elevation.
- 2) Waiver to permit a 25-foot radius where Village Road intersects South Street.

This decision will be sent by certified mail to the applicant, with a copy to the Town Clerk. All persons in interest will be notified by regular mail.

BULLARD'S MALL:

Dale MacKinnon from Whitman & Howard called today, August 25, 1986, to advise that he still has problems with the drainage. He said that he would follow with a letter. Mr. McCullough and Mr. Poxon met with Ken Feeney and Bob Kennedy regarding the property line where it abuts Green Street for 2 or 3 blocks on the southerly side. It was agreed by the developer that they would use landscape timber on the property in relation to the street. Mr. McCullough noted that the tenant use of the building would be an eating establishment, dry cleaning and other shops. The size has been reduced by 532 feet in order to generate 4 more parking spaces, a total of 63. The eating establishment will seat 78 people with take out. The restaurant entrance will be on North Street. Mr. Codispoti brought up the point that the restaurant was now being shown in place of boutiques as had been presented at the hearing. Mr. McCullough felt that this did not make much of a difference since the size of the building had been reduced and more parking had been created. Mr. Brennan felt that, as a courtesy, the abutters and persons attending the hearing should be advised that a restaurant was now in the plans.

VOTED: That a letter be sent to sbutters and persons attending hearing advising that the size of the building had been reduced by 532 feet and parking had been increased by 4 spaces to accommodate a restaurant instead of a retail shop. Plans are available to be seen at the Planning Board office.

A revised site plan was submitted reflecting reduction by 532 feet and an increase of 4 parking spaces.

CRANMORE ROAD:

As an abutter Mr. Codispoti will not vote on any decision. Mr. Borelli, the contractor, want to build a concrete wall. We allow only fieldstone or brick. He wants to know if we will waive this. The Board would like to see something on plan. It was noted that the subdivision plan is perhaps 25 to 30 years old and as much detail was not required on plans at that time. Mr. Brennan requested that our subdivision rules be checked to see what the requirements were at that time. An appointment was to be made with Mr. Borelli to come in to a meeting regarding the wall.

JACKSON FABRICS:

VOTED: That site plan identified as "Site Plan of Land in Medfield, MA dated June 4, 1986, revised July 24, 1986" depicting property northwest North Street, opposite Meetinghouse Pond, be approved.

ORCHARD PARK ESTATES:

To be considered at next meeting regarding cut through on cul-de-sac. Also comments from Police, Fire and Supt. of Public Works.

APPOINTMENT TO MPIC:

Application of Newton Thompson to MPIC reviewed.

VOTED: To appoint Newton Thompson to MPIC.

SIGN BOARD APPOINTMENTS:

VOTED: To appoint Mr. Codispoti to Sign Board.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

September 8, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

MINUTES:

VOTED UNANIMOUSLY: July 14, July 28 and August 11.

VOTED: 3 in favor, Mr. Parker not voting: August 25, 1986

HUTSON PINES:

Mr. Haigh and his engineer met with the Board. He submitted Drainage calculations which were completed with engineer's stamp, signature and date. He also submitted plans showing two waivers (cul de sac, radius) street name and stamp and signature of engineer. The new revision date is 9/5/86.

One plan submitted on wrong kind of paper (not mylar or cloth), not numbered as a set, areas of drainage plan not shown in black ink. Index sheet was missing. The top course should be changed to 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ on street and cross section.

HICKORY DRIVE - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

Messrs. Ronald Tocci and George Giunta met with the Board and presented a plan showing a lot labelled "7A" Hickory Drive, which combines a portion of Lot 7 and 19 to make a lot. The remainder of lot 7, labelled "7B" will be a second lot.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: To sign the Plan of Land under Subdivision Control Not Required, dated September 3, 1986, drawn by George Giunta.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: To sign the Plan of Land in Medfield, dated August 30, 1986, by George Giunta, with lot 5B, and noting Lot 5A is not a building lot. This was off Hickory Drive.

PHEASANT ROAD SUBDIVISION:

Messrs. Tocci and Giunta discussed a new proposal which would not connect to Pheasant Road from Hickory. They asked if the Board would consider a five-lot subdivision off the cul de sac from Hickory Drive which would drain into the wetland (1 drain, rest overland flow). 500-foot cul de sac would allow four lots, a 600-foot cul de sac would obtain five lots. The area would be sewered through Lot 7A. The end of the drain would be at least 200 feet upland from the cart path. This would not include the Cohen land, but would include the Bryant land. The road and houses would be sited well away from the wetland.

Mr. Tocci will probably present a preliminary plan.

CRANMORE ROAD SUBDIVISION:

Several abutters were present as was Robert Borrelli, the developer. Mr. Codispoti exempted himself as a Board member because he is an abutter. Mr. Borrelli said that the 18- to 20-foot concrete wall would require 12" wide footing. The Board would prefer a lower wall with a sloped bank planted with trees, 3-to-1 slope would be allowed.

John Hegedus, abutter, owns bank on the same side as utilities and is concerned

September 8, 1986

Page 2.

about the steep slope proposed and the loss of his buffer.

Mrs. Bancroft suggested a combination wall and less steep slope.

According to Mrs. Bancroft since the Sub Rules in effect at the time of plan approval didn't control slopes or walls, the Planning Board can only advise.

Mr. Gagliani is concerned about erosion from the steep slopes.

Mr. Borrelli said he will put loam and "hydro seed" on remaining slopes.

Mr. Codispoti asked about stone wall for aesthetics.

Mr. Borrelli said he will consider an 8-foot wall with a stucco face. He said that all but two lots have already been sold. He is having a problem finding a disposal site for the stone rubble.

Mr. Tannler, 38 Hillcrest Road, is concerned about drainage coming onto his property from Lot 51 since the natural drainage gully has been filled.

Mr. Borrelli said he would grade in back of the house, will go to sides and then to street (not to back property).

Mr. Tannler asked if water pressure will be adequate. Mr. Borrelli said the hydrants are in and the water pressure is O.K.

Mr. Borrelli said that water and sewer are in, Edison is coming and telephone and cable are in. Mr. Borelli agreed to have a wall designed making a plan which would be acceptable for the Planning Board. Abutters would be notified of the meeting.

WAMPATUCK SUBDIVISION:

Ralph Copeland, representing Anthony Delapa, said that Mr. Delapa will build the stub connecting Gun Hill Park and Wampatuck if the land is available. He feels that tax title will take six moare months. Mr. Copeland would like to submit a modification and asked what the filing fee would be.

Mr. Parker said that Town Counsel recommends proceeding with both cases: as if it is a new plan and also a modification.

Mr. Copeland said that the town now owns land subject to the "right of redemption" and suggested that the town should lay out the street as a public way. He asked the Board to check with the Selectmen to see if land would be available for street purposes once town forecloses the "right of redemption."

Mr. Copeland will check to see if his client is willing to pay for design as well as construction.

It was suggested that the filing fee would be legal costs plus engineering costs.

BULLARD'S SITE PLAN:

No more data has been received from Whitman & Howard. A letter was read from Madelyn Grant.

Mr. Parker asked if the issue of odors from the restaurant were addressed.

September 8, 1986
Page 3.

VOTED: To advise applicant of requirement for compliance with Section 5.3.2 of the Zoning Bylaw, through letter to Mr. McCullough, responding to concern voiced by several abutters.

JACKSON FABRICS:

VOTED: To approve the Site Plan. (This second vote was taken because insufficient number of members were present to vote on the plan at August 25th meeting.)

ORCHARD PARK:

Mrs. Bancroft reported that the fire chief thought the dead end street was all right. He was glad to see water being brought to the site.

Mr. Feeney has approved the cul de sac. There was discussion as to whether to tie into the adjacent land. The Board will view the site before deciding.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

7

7

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

September 15, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

Others attending: John Rosata and residents interested in Scenic Roads hearing; William Miller, Carolyn Devine and Jack Sullivan re condominium complex on North Meadows Road; Stafano Avitable; Clayton and Alan Haigh; Harry Pritoni and other abutters interested in Bullards Market expansion.

SCENIC ROADS HEARING - PINE STREET:

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 8:15 p.m. Mr. Codispoti read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Mr. Rosata showed a plan of the lot on which he would like to build at 88 Pine Street. He said that the existing Pine Street in this area has about ten or fifteen feet on either side of the paved way. He said the stonewall is broken down and that the two trees to be removed were not good specimens. The removal of a portion of the stonewall and the trees are necessary for the placement of the driveway to the property.

Mr. Malcolm Gibson, Tree Warden, was in attendance and said that the two trees were 8" in diameter, they are red oaks, but they are poor specimens.

Mr. Rosata said that the stonewall is not in good condition and he would like to use the stones for a rounding of the driveway.

Mrs. Stokes asked where the house will be located on the lot.

Mr. & Mrs. Smick said that the trees and stonewall are not in good shape, and they would not object to the removal of the two 8" trees and the opening of the stonewall for a driveway.

VOTED: To grant approval to Mr. Rosata to remove trees as specified in the public hearing notice and to allow the removal of that portion of the stonewall necessary to construct a driveway on the condition that the location of the driveway be approved by the Superintendent of Public Works.

SCENIC ROAD TREE REMOVAL HEARING:

Tree Warden Malcolm Gibson has requested a Scenic Road Hearing to remove the following trees:

CAUSEWAY STREET: opp. pole #16 Maple; opp. pole #31 Maple; opp. pole #45-46 Elm; opp. pole #55 Cherry; opp. pole #65 Oak; pole #75 end Oak.

ORCHARD STREET: pole #16-17 Oak

FOUNDRY STREET: pole #12 Oak

PINE STREET: pole #69-70 Oak

NOON HILL ROAD: No pole numbers. 5 marked trees consisting of Oaks and Pine.

The hearing will be scheduled for October 20, 1986.

FOX PROPERTIES - PRELIMINARY PLAN MULTIFAMILY - NORTH MEADOWS ROAD:

Mr. William Millett, professional land surveyor, explained the project to those present. Ms. Carolyn Devine and Jack Sullivan were also present from Fox Properties.

Mr. Millett said that 32 units are proposed, with a maximum of three stories and a maximum height of 45 feet. All of the units will be two-bedroom units. 64 parking spaces are required. According to Mr. Millett 67 parking spaces are shown on the plan, including ten garages. The lot is bounded by the cemetery on two sides, business zone on the third side, and the fourth side abuts North Meadows Road. Two entrances are proposed, both to be two-way.

Mr. Millett said that the area of the lot which the Assessors have shown is incorrect. He said that 199,764 square feet is the correct figure. The assessors map shows 4.57 acres \pm , which 199,069.2. The number of units remains the same at either square footage.

Vine Brook is shown on the plan. An existing 30-foot wide drainage easement to funnel drainage from North Meadows Road is in place as is an existing 20-foot wide sewer easement. A question was raised regarding the paving over portions of the easements. A 20-foot wide drainage easement runs along a large portion of the front of the lot.

Mr. Millett said that he has attempted to keep any development at least 25 feet from the stream. A Conservation Commission hearing will be requested by the applicant. The floodplain contour for the Vine Brook area is 143 feet. Four main buildings are shown with hay bales completely around the perimeter. The fire chief would like to see a hydrant in front of the building and one behind the building.

Mr. Parker asked if the stream on the left is an open stream.

Mr. Millett said it is. He had hoped to pipe it but the company's environmental engineer reviewed the area and thought it would be detrimental to pipe the brook.

The State has installed six catchbasins which will flow into the existing 30-foot wide drainage easement.

Mr. Parker asked if there is water in the easement constantly. Mr. Millett said it was a seasonal stream.

Mr. Parker asked how close would the building be to the easement. Mr. Millett said that the building would be right up to the easement.

Mr. Gagliani said that there is an easement along the front of the lot.

Mrs. Bancroft said that it is contoured as a swale and asked if the applicant plans to put culverts in. Mr. Millett said that the water in the swale will seep into the ground and culverts would not be necessary.

Mrs. Bancroft asked what the elevation difference would be. Mr. Millett said that the lowest point that would be filled would be from elevation 151 to 155.

Mr. Gagliani asked if the applicant was proposing to fill in the whole swale. Mr. Millett said that he was planning to fill most of the swale but that it would not be a problem.

Mr. Codispoti asked about the condition of the ground.

Mr. Millett said that they found water at six feet in the back of the lot and there was some ledge. A lot of gravel was placed on the lot when the road was built.

Mr. Gagliani noted that the buildings will be a maximum height of 45 feet and asked what the style of the buildings would be. Mr. Millett said they would probably be colonials as that seemed to be a popular style in Medfield.

Mr. Parker asked if any drainage studies had been done on the lot. As none have been done Mr. Parker asked if the applicant feels confident that he will be able to design a satisfactory drainage system.

Mr. Millett said that the lot looks flat. He said, "If worse comes to worse, we will have to design a system that won't make it worse."

Mr. Codispoti asked about the makeup of the buildings. Ms. Devine said that there will be 14 2-bedroom units on two floors with garages and full family rooms; 12 2-bedroom ranches like a split level with a sunken living room; six on the top floor with cathedral ceilings.

Mrs. Bancroft asked what the basis was to come up with 32 units.

Mr. Millett said that the Assessors' Maps were incorrect and the lot is a total of 199,764 square feet.

Mr. Parker said that this site plan will be the first under the new Bylaw passed at Town Meeting allowing more than one building on a lot. The way the Bylaw is worded the Board has discretion over how you are dividing the buildings on the site. Mr. Parker felt that the way the parking is designed it is very objectionable. He asked the applicant to think about the impact on the site with that much exposure of the parking to the street. It should be possible to break up the parking and have less visibility.

Mr. Codispoti asked if any recreational area was planned.

Ms. Devine said that two-bedroom condominiums did not attract people with children and therefore no recreation area was designed.

Mr. Parker asked what kind of lighting was proposed. Mr. Millett said that they plan to use an Acorn light, which is 100 watt each. He said they were "tall on a pedestal." He pointed out the location of the lights.

Mr. Parker asked that the photometrics be shown.

Mr. Millett said that they would provide the Board with a specification sheet on the lights.

Mr. Parker said that lights from the complex should not glare onto North Meadows Road.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board will discuss the work adjacent to the road with the Highway Superintendent.

Mr. Gagliani suggested that the large buildings shown on the plan be broken down into smaller buildings. Mrs. Bancroft asked that the mass be distributed better.

Mr. Millett said that the roof lines would break up the mass.

Mr. Parker brought the required buffer between RU and RS to the applicant's attention. He noted that even though there is a natural buffer, it is necessary

to follow the Zoning Bylaw and plant the buffer in accordance with Section 6.2.10.

Mr. Brennan asked when the Board will see an architect's rendition of the complex.

Mr. Millett said one would be available at the public hearing.

Mr. Parker said that the plan would be sent to Whitman & Howard for review and the Board will send their comments to Mr. Millett.

WEST STREET - STEFANO AVITABLE:

Mr. Avitable met with the Board and requested that the sign on the lot across the street from his house be removed and that the buffer as required in the Zoning Bylaw, Section 6.2.9 be planted.

VOTED: To send a memorandum to the Zoning Enforcing Officer asking that the above complaints be referred to him for action.

BULLARD'S MINICOMPLEX:

Mr. Harry Pritoni of Green Street met with the Board to express his and his neighbors' opposition to the possibility of a "fast food" restaurant in the proposed Bullard's minicomplex. He stated the following objections:

1. Fast food establishments attract many commercial vehicles. Some of which will then travel Green and Brook Streets, which are not designed to support same. The neighbors do not want commercial vehicles in a residential neighborhood.
2. High volume of people served in short time will increase traffic on Brook and Green Streets which are already heavily used by Corning employees, commuters avoiding traffic lights and residents in developments farther up Green Street.
3. Fast food restaurants attract idle youth and become "hangouts." Vandalism may occur to adjacent properties. Litter in the parking lot could create eyesore and blow into adjacent yards.
4. Increased traffic may create a safety hazard entering North Street and could cause backups on Green Street.
5. The restaurant may be open-early in the morning and late in the evening. The neighbors do not want the noise associated with this activity in a residential area. The neighbors do not wish to have beer or wine served.
6. The neighbors are concerned that property values will decline as a result of having a fast food restaurant near by.

In order to have sufficient parking for a restaurant, the complex has been reduced by 524 square feet.

Mr. Parker said he was concerned about the procedure followed; however, the Board reviews the site plan to be sure that it meets zoning. In a "B" Zoning District restaurants are allowed. The Board's concern would be proper parking. Past experience has shown us that our parking requirements are quite accurate.

September 15, 1986

Page 5.

Mr. Goldberg said that the surrounding towns require one parking space for every four seats, but Medfield requires one space for each three seats.

Mr. Thomas Sweeney said he was concerned with refuse in the area.

Mr. Thomas Lingel felt that the architect's design was good, but he was disappointed that the developer was going to spoil the complex with a fast food restaurant.

Mr. Robert Kinsman expressed concern regarding the drainage.

Mr. Pritoni thanked the Board for listening and said he would make an appointment to meet with the Selectmen about this matter.

HUTSON PINES:

Messrs. Alan and Clayton Haigh and Jeff Dymick presented their mylars to the Board for signing and their covenant for approval.

VOTED: 4 in favor with Mr. Gagliani abstaining to accept the covenant.

VOTED: 4 in favor with Mr. Gagliani abstaining to sign Hutson Pines Definitive Subdivision Plan, owned by Clayton & Alan Haigh, drawn by Millis Engineering Associates, dated March 24, 1986 and revised to September 5, 1986.

The plan was signed.

BUDGET MEETING:

The Board has received an invitation from the Selectmen to meet to discuss the 1988 Budget on September 23, 1986, at 7:30 p.m.

CRANMORE ROAD:

The Board has been invited to meet with the Selectmen at 8:30, Tuesday, September 16th, to discuss the construction of Cranmore Road.

PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED - COLONIAL PARK ESTATES:

The Board reviewed Plan of Land in Medfield, Massachusetts, dated September 9, 1986, drawn by Norwood Engineers showing two lots between Liberty Road and Oriole Road.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: To sign the above-described plan.

The plan was signed.

ORCHARD PARK PRELIMINARY PLAN:

The Board reviewed the Orchard Park Plan dated July 16, 1987, and the Whitman & Howard comments thereon and

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: To approve the Orchard Park Preliminary Plan, dated July 16, 1986, drawn by Norwood Engineering with the following recommended changes:

1. The roadway in Orchard Park shall extend to the back

September 15, 1986
Page 6.

lot line to conform with Section 3.432 of the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Medfield Planning Board. A temporary cul de sac will be required.

2. The roadway shall be realigned at the intersection with Route 27 making it closer to normal by slightly reducing the radius.

CASTLE HILL ESTATES II:

Deerfield Extension Cluster Plan has been received and a public hearing has been scheduled for October 20, 1986.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
September 22, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.
Others attending: C. Richard McCullough and others re Bullard's Market.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

BULLARD'S MARKET SITE PLAN:

Chairman Parker stated that the applicant's engineer had completed the additional testing requested by Whitman & Howard for drainage. Whitman & Howard has reviewed and approved the drainage calculations.

Mr. Richard McCullough, representing the applicant, said he was present to be sure that the Board had received Whitman & Howard's comments on the most recent drainage tests. He further said he would be happy to answer questions pertaining to the architecture of the building.

Mr. Parker noticed that the drainage calculations were not stamped but the letter forwarding these calculations was stamped by a registered, professional engineer.

Mr. Parker asked if the Board members had any questions.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that the parking requirements be reviewed.

Mr. McCullough said that the first floor of Unit 1 is the proposed restaurant. 78 seats are proposed with four lineal feet of counter space and eight employees, making a total of 32 parking spaces for Unit 1, first floor. The second floor of Unit 1 requires 4 parking spaces. Unit 2 will have 480 s.f. open to the public and 5 parking spaces are shown. Unit 3 shows 120 s.f. open to the public and requires 3 parking spaces. Unit 4 will house Bullard's Market and the bottle redemption center and 19 parking spaces are shown, with total parking at 63 spaces. These spaces are shown on the plan and include two handicap spaces. There will be an architectural screen six feet high to shield the dumpster and to protect the neighbors.

Mrs. Bancroft asked how often the dumpster would be serviced.

Mr. McCullough said there would be a contract for servicing the dumpster, which would be based on need.

Mr. Parker asked if there will be a complete planting screen for the buffer.

Mr. McCullough said the "Plant Schedule" as shown on Sheet 1 of 3 will be followed.

Mr. McCullough said he had met with Mr. Feeney regarding the grade distance between Green Street and the blacktopped area of the site and Mr. McCullough has agreed to build the property up 8" at the back of the sidewalk at the layout line. Mr. McCullough said he would do this with landscape timber. This would allow the Public Works Department to build a sidewalk in the future with a 6" vertical berm and would allow a 2" pitch for drainage. He said that all the information required is on the three sheets revised to August 25, 1986.

September 22, 1986

Page 2.

Chairman Parker read letters from Walter Frank and Mr. & Mrs. Goldman objecting to the project.

Mr. Pritoni presented the Board with a list of residents who are "strongly opposed to a fast food type restaurant at Bullard's Market complex." He then asked about Section 14.13.3 of the Zoning Bylaw regarding "facilities for the prevention of air pollution." He also mentioned Section 5.3.2 which pertains to usage of a building. He questioned noise allowed in the neighborhood.

Chairman Parker said that this would be an enforcement matter. There is nothing in our Site Plan Special Permit requirements that gives us direction as to what to require.

Mr. McCullough said that Papa Ginos has a sophisticated system for disposing of odors. He said that the restaurant would not be serving breakfast. He said it would open at 11:00 a.m., but he was not sure of the closing time.

Chairman Parker said that a traffic study is not required. Since the Town Meeting voted specifically to rezone this area for business. It was decided at that time that business uses were appropriate to the area.

Mr. Brennan said he has reviewed the traffic circulation. The driveway as designed will be safer than the way it is situated today.

Mr. McCullough said that the lighting plan shows 1.8-foot candle power, with a 20-foot spread. The lights will be on a timer and will be shielded from abutters.

Mr. Pritoni asked if the galley system would be cleaned annually. Chairman Parker said that the Town has no such requirement.

Mr. Pritoni said the abutters were concerned about the possibility of declining property values as a result of the new minicomplex. The Zoning Bylaw does not require the Planning Board to address the issue of property values adjacent to a site plan.

Mr. Gagliani asked what the difference would be between a fast-food restaurant and a "regular" restaurant. Mr. McCullough said that the number of seats vs. counter space is the indicator. The restaurant proposed has four feet of counter space and 78 seats. This could not be called a fast food restaurant.

Chairman Parker asked for a motion for the Site Plan.

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: To grant a Special Permit under Section 14.13 of Medfield's Zoning Bylaws for Site Plan of Land for Bullards Market at the corner of North and Green Streets, consisting of three sheets as follows:

- a) Sheet 1 of 3 - Site Plan and Landscaping, dated June 9, 1986, and revised to August 25, 1986, drawn by C. Richard McCullough, Inc., Medfield.
- b) Sheet 2 of 3 - Site Plan of Land, dated June 9, 1986, revised to August 11, 1986 and August 25, 1986, drawn by Guerriere & Halnon, Franklin.

- c) Sheet 3 of 3 - Schematic Floor Plan, dated June 9, 1986,
revised to August 25, 1986, drawn by C. Richard McCullough,
Medfield.

The above approval is subject to an agreement dated August 22, 1986, with the Superintendent of Public Works as to the treatment of the edge of the property along Green Street.

This approval is subject to the approval of other Town Boards as required.

VOTED: To waive the drainage regulations as shown in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations to permit a galley drainage system as shown on Sheet 2 of 3 of the Site Plan, revised to August 25, 1986.

SLOPING EASEMENTS:

The Board would like input from Town Counsel Fuller regarding the best mechanism for having sloping easements on plans. One method could be the requirement of sloping easements on the plans.

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

OTED: To accept covenant and sign plan as the 20-day appeal period has elapsed.
(Mr. Parker did not participate.)

PONDVIEW II:

VOTED: To accept the covenant and sign plan as the 20-day appeal period has elapsed.

REVISION OF LAND SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS:

The remainder of the meeting was spent reviewing changes to be proposed in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Superintendent Feeney and Roy Boudette were present so that the Board could hear their input.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

(1)

(2)

(3)

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
September 29, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

Others attending: Kenneth Feeney and Roy Boudette to work on Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Messrs. Stephen G. Mirick and Richard J. Libardoni of A.J. Lane & Company and Richard R. Hunt, Architect for A.J. Lane & Company.

Chairman Parker called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. and the following business was transacted.

LAND SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS:

Messrs. Kenneth Feeney and Roy Boudette met with the Board on the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations. The Board will meet on October 14, 1986, to continue the review of the Rules & Regulations.

Among the items discussed was the addition of a requirement to have underground electrical wires installed in PVC #20. It was suggested that this requirement should include electrical service to the house.

This item should be added to the construction check list.

MEDFIELD INDUSTRIAL PARK:

Mr. Stephen Mirick, Director of Commercial Construction, Richard J. Libardoni, Commercial Project Manager, and Richard R. Hunt, Registered Architect, met with the Board to discuss the leasing of the North Meadows Road buildings to The Stitchery.

Mr. Mirick said that The Stitchery is a mail order house, which will be using two of the buildings on the site immediately with the possibility of using the third building for warehousing only. He said that rack-type storage, computer orders, VCT operator and telephone orders would be housed in the two buildings. It is anticipated that Unit C will house 20 to 24 people; Unit B, 50 to 60; and the office are 50 to 60 people. If and when Unit A is taken over it will be strictly for warehousing. These buildings will be under a three-year lease. A mezzanine containing 12,000 square feet will be added to Building B and there will be connectors to all three buildings, estimated to be 1,800 square feet each, making a total square footage of the three buildings of 117,600 square feet, or 235 parking spaces.

Chairman Parker noted that any additions of 500 square feet or more to the ground floor area of construction required site plan approval and asked Board members if they thought this would come under Section 5.3.8. Mr. Parker felt that enclosing the connecting area might be considered as additional ground floor area.

Mr. Mirick said that 126 parking spaces are in place and he felt that 30 additional spaces could be utilized because of the change in the loading docks to accommodate this use.

Mr. Parker asked how many parking spaces would be utilized when all three buildings are completed.

Mr. Mirick said it was a two-shift operation and that 120 to 130 spaces should be more than adequate.

September 29, 1986

Page 2.

Mrs. Bancroft suggested that if the parking requirements could not be met and the developer could prove that they were not necessary, he could go to the Board of Appeals for relief from the parking requirements.

As this is a change of use from manufacturing to warehousing, the Planning Board must review and approve the parking and nay change in drainage.

Mr. Mirick said that they would re-engineer the parking and attempt to work within the area already approved for paving and meet with the Board on October 6th with an updated parking plan. If the Board deems it necessary, Whitman & Howard will review the plan.

PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED - HIGH STREET:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan under Subdivision Control Not Required entitled "Plan of Land in Medfield, MA" owned by Robert F. Terhune, dated March 21, 1986, drawn by Schofield Bros., Framingham, showing two lots.

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan.

Members Bancroft, Gagliani and Parker voted to sign the plan and so signed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
October 6, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Gagliani and Parker.

Others attending: Town Counsel, Charles Fuller; Messrs. Edward Beard and David MacCready; Barbara Gardner; Messrs. Stephen Mirick and Richard Libardoni of A.J. Lane Company.

The meeting was called to order at 8:25 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

WAMPATUCK ESTATES:

Town Counsel Fuller met with the Board to discuss Ralph Copeland's September 18th letter regarding the conditions under which Mr. Delapa would be willing to design and build the roadway required to connect Wampatuck Estates to Gun Hill Park.

Town Counsel Fuller advised the Board that they did not have the authority to commit the Town to easements, to right of ways or to construct retaining walls.

Chairman Parker said that the Board is looking for a mechanism to proceed with the subdivision which has already been approved.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the Board has the legal right to hold an escrow fund for the road. Town Counsel said that is the purpose of the security deposit.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the Board has the right to require a developer to show the design of a street which he does not own. Town Counsel Fuller said it was so common that there have not been any Court cases on this matter.

Chairman Parker said that if we had a set of plans which met our requirements, we would sign the plan. The Board is interested in a mechanism to get us to the next step.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board does not want artificial obstacles to stand in the way of development.

Chairman Parker suggested that the Board set surety for this connection and hold the surety until the work is completed.

VOTED: To send a letter to Mr. Copeland stating that the Board is pleased that Mr. Delapa is willing to design the roadway connecting Wampatuck Estates to Gun Hill Park, that the Board would like to have Mr. Delapa meet with them to discuss design options and advising that the Planning Board has no authority to commit the Town to easements, to right of ways or to construct retaining walls.

SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS:

The Board requested that Town Counsel Fuller review covenants and agreements in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations.

A memorandum will be sent to Mr. Fuller with this request.

GREATER HEIGHTS:

Messrs. Beard and MacCready met with the Board to discuss any changes in parking which may be required as a third floor is being added in two of the buildings.

Mr. Beard said that when the original plan was approved one third of the building was proposed for retail use and two thirds for office. Mr. Beard said that he would like the building to be 100% office use, which would reduce the parking requirements.

Mr. Beard said that the development of a third floor would bring the total gross square footage of the building to just under 50,000 square feet.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if any medical offices were proposed for the building. She suggested that the plan should reflect what we know and an educated guess could be made for the rest.

Mr. Beard said that two medical doctors will have one quarter of Building No. 1, which would require 10 parking spaces. There will be two law offices on the second floor with two people in each office. Sixty parking spaces have been shown on the plan for each office.

Mr. Gagliani asked about plowing the area with islands in the parking area.

Mr. MacCready said it would be difficult but that it was preferable to break up the parking area.

Chairman Parker asked Mr. Beard to send the Board a letter with his best estimate of tenants who definitely be housed in the buildings and provide a realistic projection of the rest.

Mr. Gagliani asked if there would be deed restrictions on the condominiums so that purchasers would be aware that they cannot be used for retail sales.

Mr. Beard said he did not wish to put deed restrictions on the units. If a change in use were requested, the parking would have to be reviewed.

Mr. Beard said he would send the Board a letter regarding parking in accordance with his proposed change of use.

BARBARA GARDNER:

Ms. Barbara Gardner, candidate for State Representative, met with the Board to discuss matters important to Planning Boards.

SITE PLAN - A.J. LANE COMPANY:

Messrs. Mirick and Libardoni met with the Board to discuss changes in parking due to a change in use from manufacturing to wholesale and the addition of a 12,000 square feet mezzanine and two 1900 square feet connectors.

It appears that 164 parking spaces are required for the first two phases.

October 6, 1986

Page 3.

Mr. Mirick said that 213 spaces are shown on the plan and that for the completion of all three phases 535 parking spaces are required. Mr. Mirick will have a new parking plan drawn up for Planning Board approval.

MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE:

VOTED: To appoint David G. Strimaitus, 84 Bridge Street, to the MPIC for the term ending June 28, 1989.

VOTED: To send a letter to Robert Strong thanking him for the thought and effort which he put into his terms on the MPIC.

HIGH STREET:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield, drawn by Norwood Engineering and dated September 29, 1986. This plan was presented by Peter Fickeisen and shows Parcels A, b and C and Lots 1, 2 and 3. Notes are on the plan regarding unbuildable lots.

VOTED: To sign the plan as above described.

GEORGETOWN ESTATES:

Construction cards have been received with a verbal request from George Basile to have sure set on a portion of the subdivision.

VOTED: To require that the entire subdivision be bonded at one time.

CRANMORE ROAD:

Construction cards have been received and Robert Borrelli has requested surety to be set on Cranmore Road.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

U

U

U

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
October 14, 1986

Members Present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.
Others attending: Roy Boudette.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS:

Mr. Boudette met with the Board to work with them on the changes proposed in the Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Some of the items discussed were the elimination of parallel bar grates, changes in the fee schedule; the requirement of trees to be planted in subdivisions and their placement; changes in Forms and Plates. The Board would like to have the public hearing as soon as possible.

GREATER HEIGHTS CHANGE OF USE:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from R. Edward Beard regarding the change of use in his Greater Heights building. The use will be for offices and includes the addition of a third floor to Phases 2 and 3 of the Greater Heights building.

VOTED: To accept the parking plan as described in Mr. Beard's October 10, 1986 letter, (a copy of which is attached). It is the Board's understanding that even though the revised use requirements are less than as shown on the approved site plan, the actual number of parking spaces to be constructed will be the same as on the approved site plan (881).

Mr. Brennan abstained from voting as he was not present when this matter was first discussed.

BULLARD'S BOTTLE AND CAN REDEMPTION CENTER:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Messrs. Joel Goodman and Harold Pritoni, Jr. asking the Board's opinion of where the bottle and can redemption center fit into Medfield's Zoning Bylaw.

VOTED: To answer the letter by stating that this would fall under Section 2.1.73 "Use, Accessory" the way this appears to be handled at Bullard's at this time.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

11

12

13

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
October 20, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti and Parker.
Others attending: Tree Warden, Malcolm Gibson; Messrs. Michael Marholin,
Ralph C. Good, Jr., Roy Boudette; Messrs. Pyne and Barrett.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

MINUTES:

To accept the minutes of September 8, 1986.

SIDE LOT LINE DETERMINATION - VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

Building inspector O'Toole requested the Board to make a determination as to front, side and rear lot lines on Lot 4 on Village Road. The Board approved the plan as presented.

SCENIC WAY HEARING:

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 8:00 p.m. Mr. Codispoti read the advertisement which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS. Mr. Parker asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak regarding the removal of the trees as listed in the newspaper advertisement.

Tree Warden Malcolm Gibson said he would like to see the trees as listed removed as they are trees that are dead or dying.

There were no further questions or discussion and the hearing was closed at 8:20 p.m.

VOTED: To give permission to have the trees as listed in the Suburban Press removed.

VOTED: To have a decision written for signing at the Board's October 27, 1986 meeting.

SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS PUBLIC HEARING:

VOTED: To hold public hearing on Subdivision Rules & Regulations Changes and to send notices of same to active subdividers in Medfield.

STREETS FOR TOWN ACCEPTANCE:

VOTED: To advise subdividers that streets for Town acceptance in April, 1987 should be in the Selectmen's Office by the first Tuesday in December.

CASTLE HILL II CLUSTER SUBDIVISION HEARING:

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 8:30 p.m. and explained the procedure to be followed: Namely, the subdivider will be asked to explain his project; Board members will be called upon to ask questions; the general public may then ask questions. The Board has 60 days from the receipt of the subdivision plan within which to render a decision. (The application was received on September 8, 1986, according to the Town Clerk's records.)

Mr. Codispoti read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Mr. Roy Boudette, of Cheney Engineering, explained the subdivision to those present. The cluster subdivision plan will add 190 feet to the subdivision and add three new lots. He explained that a Special Permit had been granted by the Board of Appeals to allow the cluster. The frontages and setbacks have been reduced and are based on the Board of Appeals decision. All lots conform to the area requirement. The reason for the line through the plan is that one was registered and one is not. The area outlines in green under the cluster concept is intended to be conveyed to the Town of Medfield. A small lot containing 4,000 square feet will also go to the Town of Medfield. There is an existing wood road and we are providing a right of way 20 feet wide for access to the public land. This will be for foot or horse traffic except for town vehicles. The bridle path will be also a right of way for people who ride in this area. All the people on North Street have rights in the wood road through Lot 21 so that they can get to the back land.

As far as drainage is concerned, at the westerly end of Deerfield Drive when we went to the Boarf for Deerfield Drive, a detention basin was put on North Street. This will not be increasing the runoff into the detention basin. This plan shows contributory areas. Back areas will drain to a basin at the end of the existing cul de sac. The drainage would then go through a series of pipes and manholes to a natural drainage area. All lots will be sewered and have public water.

One requirement of the Board of Appeals decision was that some extensive re-grading be done under the initial section of Deerfield Drive. One of the restrictions was because of the steep banks and we had to do regrading that is shown on the plan.

The drainage is all designed for a 10-year storm so that during a 100-year storm we will not be adding any runoff to the pond. The reason for the second manhole is so that this will happen. Water will flow into the seasonal pond. We have been before the Conservation Commission. We offered them three alternatives for running drainage through here. The alternative they chose was to leave it natural. Based on the 10-year storm the only increase in volume is two cubic feet of runoff.

The road will be 28 feet wide, the same as the road that currently exists. The existing cul de sac which is partially completed will be put back into a natural condition.

Mr. Boudette asked for a waiver from Section 7.3.2 to allow bituminous concrete instead of granite curbs in an area which has a radius of 400 feet.

Mr. Boudette presented a letter from Dr. Carr to the Board giving Dr. Carr's interpretation of a natural water course. Mr. Boudette said that water flows more to the Raduano's because of the extensive work which has been done on the Raduano property.

Mr. Parker: How many feet between the outfall of the drainage structure and the natural water course in distance?

Mr. Boudette: About 120 feet. There is only 40 feet to the edge of the vegetated wetlands.

Mrs. Bancroft asked about the Conservation Commission's reply.

Mr. Boudette said that the Conservation Commission requested that they do nothing.

Mrs. Bancroft read Dr. Carr's letter to the meeting.

Mr. Parker said that his big concern is where the water goes. The concern is southerly flow of the water of what is now filled land. What has the drainage done? Has it been regraded?

Mr. Boudette said he could not answer the question. He said that last summer when we had 7" of rain he went out to look at the pond. In July there was some traces of trapped water. There was a little water flowing out of the pond at that time. The elevation there is 205 feet.

Mr. Parker: What effect do you think this changed drainage is going to have on these new lots that have been created?

Mr. Boudette: Virtually none.

Mr. Parker: Will it adversely affect any other property?

Mr. Boudette: The 100-year storm is one large amount of water. The whole rest of the town will be flooded in a 100-year storm. There is nothing downstream until you get to the pond south of the Tregakis' house.

Mrs. Bancroft: What is the impact of a 10-year storm?

Mr. Boudette: Two cubic feet per second for one acre of drainage.

Mr. Brennan: What is the percentage of increase in the flow?

Mr. Boudette: Probably 5% if it is that high. The plan shows a 2.6% grade up to the center of the cul de sac. It is designed so that water will stay in gutters. If we carry the 2.6% grade up we get sheeting. The grade has to be flattened to make the gutter work. It should be added that the setback width on Lots N3 and 20 are not shown. The line is there but the dimension is not.

Mr. Parker: Will you tell us again about the waiver which you are requesting.

Mr. Boudette: The cul de sac will total 1,100 feet in length and a waiver will be required.

Mrs. Bancroft: I have a couple of questions. Do the sewer laterals go to the lot lines? Any house in a cluster has to be on a public sewer.

Mr. Boudette: Easements will be there and laterals will be provided to each lot. All to be sewerred and watered.

Mr. Parker: In reviewing the Zoning Board Appeal decision, there is some involvement by Mr. Feeney. Mr. Feeney is here. Have you had a chance to review the Zoning Board Appeal decision?

Mr. Feeney: The Zoning Board Appeal asked for the land to be conveyed to the Town and the cart path to be restored to its natural state. Their opinion now is that it was a stump burial site and they want the stumps removed. It is part of the opinion

October 20, 1986

Page 4.

that these stumps be removed and the land restored. Who is going to do it, I don't know. I wrote a letter and haven't had a response. They are very adamant about the land being restored to its natural state. Mr. Feeney asked that a more detailed plan of the utilities to the property lines be submitted. Let us make sure that the easements are there and that the utilities are run to the property lines.

That is in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Boudette: The day we walked this with Mr. Feeney, the Board of Appeals and Ellis Allen, the feeling I got was that they just wanted the whole thing covered and made it to look presentable and also to be able to drive a vehicle over it.

Mr. Feeney: At that time it was the public works trying to expedite the project. Since then the Board of Appeals asked that the stumps be removed.

Mr. Parker: They want the work done before the street is bonded or built.

Mr. Parker: One other thing. Does this plan contain the placement of the monuments?

Mr. Boudette: What they are talking about is that the right of way be properly monumented. The easement encompasses the road that is there now.

Mrs. Bancroft: Is there some provision to put a gate to prevent unauthorized vehicles from using the right of way?

Mr. Parker: Would a curb cut be desirable or not?

Mr. Feeney: Most of our vehicles are four-wheel drive. It is six of one and one-half dozen of another.

Mr. Parker: Do you think it is advisable to have a curb cut?

Mr. Feeney: Our vehicles can go over a curb.

Mr. Parker: It would be less inviting as a driveway.

Mr. Feeney: Will the right of way serve as a driveway to any of the houses?

Mr. Boudette: I would say no.

Mrs. Bancroft: If that is meant for public use, how will the road be shown?

Mr. Boudette: The only people to use it will be people on horseback or people in the neighborhood. People on horseback are going to ride along the old Castle Hill Road. The only way to designate the path would be with a sign and let the people police it themselves. The cart path will not be paved. It is to be a natural wood road.

Mrs. Bancroft: Question on the other easement. It doesn't go anywhere. Does that give the general public the right to use the land?

Mr. Marholin: We have retained easement over the cart path. It is available for public use.

October 20, 1986

Page 5.

Mr. Parker: That follows the traditional trail that was used over the years. Do you have any plans for lot 5?

Mr. Boudette: Initially under the cluster concept we left this piece of land to provide parking for the public. The general consensus is that the Board of Appeals does not wish this for parking.

Mr. Harney: What is the relationship to this Board and to the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding the dump site?

Mr. Parker: That question is to Mr. Feeney. As far as the dump site is concerned, the Planning Board does not have any enforcement power. Mr. Feeney has been directed to inspect it.

Mr. Harney: Does that mean that you will require the work to be done which has been designated by the Board of Appeals?

Mr. Parker: "The road cannot be built or bonded. We can't control Mr. Marholin and what he does. The Planning Board relies that the conditions have not been met to their satisfaction. Whether we would take some action, we would not bond the road prior to a letter from Mr. Feeney stating that all the conditions of the Board of Appeals have been met.

Mr. Harney: Why are there doubts as to who the party is who is responsible? It would seem to me that the one who made the situation is responsible for correcting it.

Mr. Feeney: One of the developers crashed the area up. Brought the stumps in from the Town of Dover. I sent him a letter. The person sitting here tonight is the developer who went to the Board of Appeals and according to their decision it will have to be restored to its natural state. Right now it is a gray area. However, the current owner is responsible for the removal of the stumps, but I can't say who will clear it up.

Mr. Parker: The Planning Board's approval is always subject to other Town Boards. There are outstanding portions of the decision of the Board of Appeals that have not been met.

Mr. Marholin: There are several ways to clear up the stump problem. Sometime ago we reached agreement among ourselves for a perfectly adequate way to take care of the problem. Regrading, loaming and seeding. It would be safe. We had the problem solves. Specific members of the Board of Appeals were aggravated. What we should all be interested in is finishing the area up. While the shouting match is going on we seem to be at an impasse. We can't return the stumps to Dover.

Mrs. Bancroft: Why can't you take the stumps back to Dover? What is the problem with removing them?

Mr. Feeney: It is tht Board of Appeals decision to return them to a natural state.

The subdivision plan was received be the Town Clerk on September 8th and the Planning Board must render their decision by November 6th.

October 20, 1986

Page 6.

Mr. Boudette reiterated that a waiver would be required to extend the cul de sac and a waiver would be required to build the street at at a 387 feet curvature without granite curbing.

The hearing was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES:

Mr. Gary Baxter of Millis Engineering along with George Pyne met with the Board to discuss the LedgeWood Acres proposed subdivision of 54 lots off Emerson Road and Pine Street. It is proposed to sewer the site with gravity flow sewer and to supply water using a pumping booster station as the elevations are too high for the current water pressure. They plan to tie into the existing drainage in Tamarack and Emerson. There are no wetlands on the site.

The roads will have a 6% grade for a section of the road which has previously been at 9%. A 20-foot cut will be required at the Emerson Extension. There are other cuts which will be as high as 31 feet.

Mr. Parker: Do you have any thoughts before the weather gets too cold to go out and look at the area.

Mr. Pyne said that the general area was flagged.

Mr. Parker said he was concerned with the number of cul de sacs.

Mr. Pyne said if he could receive a waiver for a 9% road in areas he could lessen the cuts. He said, however, that he is ready to "go by the book."

The Board suggested to Mr. Pyne that he submit a preliminary plan followed by a definitive.

Mr. Pyne said he would like to go forward with a definitive plan and that he would file it on October 21st.

The Board would like to set up a site inspection within the next few weeks.

DEERFIELD DRIVE - RETURN OF SURETY:

The Board will ask Dale MacKinnon if the planting is completed at the top of the slopes at this time.

GEORGETOWN ESTATE:

The Board is in receipt of an inspection report from Whitman & Howard on Copperwood Road and Bishop Lane.

VOTED: To set surety at \$90,000 without bituminous concrete binder and \$65,000 if the binder is in place.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary Pro-tem

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
October 27, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Gagliani and Parker.
Others attending: Roy Boudette and Alan and Clayton Haigh.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted.

CONNORS PROPERTY:

Roy Boudette met with the Board to discuss a cluster subdivision plan for a 25-acre parcel of land off Main Street at the Dover line. The informal plan showed no houses on Main Street, a road with two 18-foot wide lanes with a planting strip in the center and an 18-foot wide road servicing one of the clusters. He said that either an on-site system for the entire subdivision would be designed or a connection to public sewer would be made. The area would be serviced by Town water.

Mr. Boudette asked the Board if they would approve an 18-foot wide street as shown on the plan. Mr. Brennan said he thought that would open the door to other subdividers requesting narrower roads.

Mr. Boudette said the reason he proposed the cluster plan was to preserve the natural beauty of the area. He said his client, Paul Borrelli, would prefer a standard subdivision but it was Mr. Boudette's idea to design a cluster which would allow the area to be kept in as natural state as possible.

Mr. Boudette asked the Board how he should proceed.

The Board suggested that Mr. Boudette draw up a preliminary or conceptual plan and present it to the Board of Appeals and the Planning Board would review the plan and send their comments to the Board of Appeals.

HAIGH - JANES AVENUE:

Mr. Alan Haigh said he would like to move his glass shop to the site behind the Town Hall which was vacated by Hillcrest Motors. He showed the Board a letter from his engineer which certifies that he could have parking spaces on this lot which would meet Medfield's Zoning Bylaw.

The Board recommended that he come up with a use for five spaces; namely, area open to the public 10' x 20' (2 spaces) and would allow six employees, including the Haighs.

Mr. Haigh asked if half of the garage could be utilized for parking. He was advised that he would have to check this with the Fire Chief as the combining of the two may not be permitted.

Mrs. Bancroft said that an approved parking plan would not be required under Section 8.1 because Mr. Haigh is talking about five parking spaces.

Section 8.6.1 was not reviewed with Mr. Haigh.

ALLISON - 17 HICKORY ROAD:

The Board is of the opinion that because the final cost of bituminous concrete has not been laid the water collects on the road instead of going into the drainage system.

October 27, 1986

Page 2.

VOTED: To send a letter to Mr. Ronald Tocci (Jr.) requesting that he make provisions to fix this drainage problem before winter so that there will not be an icing condition on the street.

A copy of the letter will be sent to Mrs. Allison.

WAMPATUCK SUBDIVISION:

The Board is in receipt of a letter dated October 23, 1986, requesting that the Board design the connection of Wampatuck Subdivision to Gun Hill Park.

Town Council says that the Board accepts plans on land not owned by applicants on a regular basis.

Mr. Fuller asked the Board what their objective was regarding the condition. If the Board's objective is that because of good planning the road must go through, then it should remain a condition.

The Board feels that it is up to Mr. Delapa to design the roadway.

DEERFIELD DRIVE:

The Board is in receipt of a report from Whitman & Howard regarding the work to be completed on Deerfield Drive.

VOTED: To return bankbook in the amount of \$205,000 in exchange for surety in the amount of \$93,000.

DEERFIELD DRIVE EXTENSION:

An answer regarding the acceptance of the Deerfield Drive II Subdivision is due on November 6th. The Board would like to see where the drainage from the subdivision will go.

VOTED: To reject the plan at the Board's next meeting if questions have not been answered regarding the watercourse or an extension request has not been received.

GEORGETOWN ESTATES:

The Board is in receipt of Benjamin Franklin Savings Bank Book No. 03-005771-0 in the amount of \$65,000 and assignment of account,

VOTED: To accept the above-described bankbook and sign release of lots 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 Copperwood Road and 6 Bishop Lane.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES:

The Board will walk the LedgeWOOD Acres land on November 15th at 9:00 a.m. (rain date November 16th). The Selectmen, Water Board and Michael Sullivan will be invited to attend.

TREES:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Ellis Allem regarding hardy trees to be planted adjacent to streets in subdivisions.

October 27, 1986

Page 3.

VOTED: To send Mr. Allen a letter thanking him for the letter.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

1

2

3

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
November 3, 1986

Present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti and Gagliani.
Others attending: Roy Boudette, Ralph Copeland and Divid Nilson.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Vice Chairman Bancroft and the following business was transacted.

MINUTES:

VOTED: To accept the minutes of September 15, 1986.

CASTLE HILL ESTATES II:

Messrs. Boudette and Copeland met with the Board to discuss drainage from the proposed subdivision at the end of Deerfield Drive Extension to a natural water course.

Mr. Boudette said that, based on the elevations in the area, the drainage will flow both ways at the same time (towards Raduanos and Allens) from the pond. He said that eventually a natural water course will be made by the drainage.

Mr. Boudette was asked why the drainage from the new subdivision was not channeled into the drainage pipes within Deerfield Drive and into the detention basin at the bottom of the street. He said that although it would cost less he did not wish to do so as it would possibly add water to the Donnelly's pond.

Mr. Boudette said that two cubic feet per second would be added to the area in a ten-year storm and eight cubic feet per second would be added in a 100-year storm. It was stated that an average northeaster would add less than two cubic feet per second. The drainage would be piped from the new section of Deerfield Drive to the pond. The pipe would have a stone filter fence at the end to keep silt out.

VOTED: To approve Subdivision Plan of Castle Hill Estates No. II, dated August 28, 1986, drawn by Cheney Engineering with the following conditions:

1. Subject to the requirements of Board of Appeals Decision No. 482.
2. Subject to the requirements of all Town Boards.

VOTED: To allow the following waivers.

1. Waiver from Section 7.32 of the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations to allow bituminous concrete curbing on the north side of Deerfield Drive where the radius is less than 400 feet.
2. Waiver from Section 3.431 to allow a cul de sac approximately 1,100 feet in length.

WAMPATUCK SUBDIVISION:

Mr. Ralph Copeland, representing Mr. Anthony Delapa, met with the Board to discuss the meaning of the Board's phrase "satisfactory design plan."

Mr. Copeland said that if the Board thinks the connection is important he would like the Town to obtain sloping rights. He said Mr. Delapa would be willing to build the connection. Mr. Copeland suggested that the Board submit an article to Town Meeting to obtain the sloping rights.

VOTED: To answer Mr. Copeland's October 23rd letter, stating that until the right of redemption in the Trailside Stub has been foreclosed, the Board understands that the ownership of the land is in limbo and, therefore, the Planning Board has no right to initiate any sort of action. The Board would like to see a design of this stub which shows a combination of low retaining walls and slopes, where required. The streets should be designed to meet Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations.

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

The Board is in receipt of Whitman & Howard's report on work to be completed on Village Farm Estates in accordance with the items signed off on the Construction Cards. Whitman & Howard suggested that no lots be released until the detention pond is dug.

Mr. David Nilson met with the Board to discuss the time schedule to be followed in completing the work in his subdivision. He said he would have the detention pond dug on Wednesday, November 12th. He will have his construction cards updated and will meet with the Board at 8:00 p.m., November 17th to discuss surety.

FOX PROPERTIES - NORTH MEADOWS ROAD:

VOTED: To send the following letter to Fox Properties regarding their Preliminary Site Plan:

"The Planning Board and their engineering consultants have reviewed your site plan. A copy of our engineer's comments were given to you on October 22nd.

"Whitman & Howard's comments should be taken into consideration during preparation of your Definitive plan.

"Additionally, the Planning Board suggests that pedestrian connection be provided from the residential complex to the adjacent mall.

"The Board also suggests that the mass of buildings be redistributed so as to provide a scale to the project which is more compatible with nearby residential and commercial development. We would like to bring to your attention Section 14.13.1 of the Zoning Bylaw which reads as follows: 'For multifamily site plans, the size, number and placement of structures on the site shall be appropriate to the site and compatible with its surroundings.'

"The Board also requests that the parking areas be landscaped to screen them from the public view along North Meadows Road.

"These comments constitute the Board's final action on your Preliminary Site Plan, and entitle you to proceed with a Definitive Plan."

A.J. LANE - NORTH MEADOWS INDUSTRIAL PARK:

VOTED: To accept revised parking plan for Buildings B and C as drawn by Richard R. Hunt, Architect, West Greenwich, Rhode Island, showing parking for Buildings B and C. The parking spaces shown must be standard size. The Board has voted to accept the above-described plan for Buildings B and C, with the condition that Conservation Commission approval be obtained.

November 3, 1986

Page 3.

The vote was recorded three in favor, with Mr. Brennan abstaining as he was not present when this was originally discussed.

TREE WARDEN GIBSON:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from the tree warden stating that a 32" Norway Maple Tree which was owned by the Town was removed from in front of the Bridge property on South Street prior to having a public hearing. He has suggested that restitution for this should be 16 two-inch trees of a variety to be chosen by the tree warden and planted in locations designated by him. The trees should be watered and maintained in good health for a one-year period from the date of planting. He has requested that all building permits should be held until all trees are planted.

VOTED: To send a letter to Tree Warden Gibson stating that his letter would be forwarded to the Building Inspector and thanking him for his diligence in this matter.

BUDGET MEETING:

The Planning Board will meet with the Selectmen on November 22nd at 11:45 a.m. to discuss their budget.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
November 10, 1986

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.
Others attending: Messrs. Larkin, Fritzsche and McCullough; Paul Nyren and Ronald Kerr.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

MINUTES: VOTED: To accept the minutes of October 6 and 14, 1986.

PUBLIC HEARING ON CHANGES IN SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS:

Chairman Parker called the public hearing to order at 8:15 p.m. and said Massachusetts law requires the Board to hold a public hearing to revise the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Mr. Parker thanked Superintendent of Streets Feeney and Roy Boudette for their assistance on this project. He also thanked Mrs. Bancroft who has worked on the changes for many, many hours and who has led the project to completion. Mr. Parker said that the entire Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations layout has been re-organized and other changes are on the handout.

Mr. Parker asked for questions from interested citizens on the proposed changes.

Mr. Larkin: Concerning Section 3.3.1 Construction Standards for Streets, you refer to DPW standards. What bothers me is that the Commonwealth DPW standards asks for different widths. A subdivision doesn't need DPW standards.

Mr. Parker: Section 3.3.1 is for the construction Standards of Streets, not the design. The width of the layout is covered in another section of our Subdivision Rules.

Mr. Brennan: There is nothing in the DPW Standards which specify the width of the street. It is construction as opposed to design. There is a whole line of street widths in the DPW Design Manual.

Mr. Larkin: The only reason I brought this up is that when we talked to the DPW they were strict on the width. This, you say, has no bearing on the matter before us.

Mr. McCullough: How do we differentiate DPW standards from those that we now are using? How will it be different from what we are doing now?

Mr. Brennan: Section 3.3.1. 2 of the Blue Book shows construction standards. It has to do with the thickness of the layers of the pavement.

Mrs. Bancroft: It will allow the Town to automatically be updated with material specifications.

Mr. McCullough: Have those standards changed?

Mr. Parker: We are now requiring the 28-foot pavement only in residential areas. This will be consistent from on for all roadways. Sidewalks will be on one side only.

Mrs. Bancroft: We will have the DPW manuals in the Planning Board Office for reference purposes.

Mr. McCullough: Why did you change the vertical size of profiles?

Mrs. Bancroft: Both Whitman & Howard and Roy Boudette suggested that this be done.

Mr. McCullough: Does the Board agree with this? One to four is quite an exaggeration and could cause confusion. When you have a public hearing it will shock people.

Mrs. Bancroft: One of the arguments; when you get into tight situations, is that the scale is too small for our engineering consultants to review. We understand it is common practice to require one to four instead of one to eight.

Mr. McCullough: You made some comments about the street. What about the right of way?

Mr. Parker: Only the paved areas have been changed. We had conversations with Mr. Feeney. The conclusion was that larger pavement areas require more plowing. The less pavement, the better.

Mr. McCullough: Tell us about the tree planting requirements.

Mr. Parker read Section 5.2.11 on Tree Planting.

Mr. Larkin: You are insisting that the contractor plant trees on public land? I think it is a good idea. I think we need trees planted. It is too bad we can't get people to work with the town now to see if they would plant trees. I am talking about the westerly side of North Meadows Road.

Mrs. Bancroft: These specifications - the placing and the types of trees were suggested by Ellis Allen.

Mr. Gagliani: The town has always had a tree planting program. It is a great investment for the town and the neighborhoods. There are a lot of subdivisions that are in wooded areas where tree planting would not be a major issue. There are some subdivisions where in 10 years a tree line would look absolutely beautiful.

Mr. Parker read a letter from Dan Nye regarding continuation of sidewalks.

Mrs. Bancroft said that she had discussed the matter with Town Counsel Fuller and it was his opinion that 400 feet is probably as far as we could go.

Mr. Parker: Do you have a recommendation as far as distance? It was recommended that developers be required to connect to existing sidewalks if within 1,000 feet of the new subdivision.

Mr. Larkin: I can understand the builder's point of view. 1,000 feet might be too much for a four-house subdivision. The program would be a benefit for the citizens.

Mr. McCullough: The removal of the 34-foot roadway is a good idea.

Mr. Larkin: The less pavement, the more water will get back into the earth.

Mrs. Bancroft: There is no reference to retention and detention basins in our Subdivision Rules. We have decided to continue without our old requirement; that is, the catchbasin/manhole system. We will be able to waive our requirements, but detention and retention basins will not be in our regulations.

Mr. Fritzsche: Where does the water go?

Mrs. Bancroft: To the nearest water course.

Mr. Fritzsche: The water will not be controlled. Detention basins serve to slow down the release of water in a heavy rainstorm. Will the drainage go into the stream full force or is there another way to slow it down?

Mr. Parker: We have asked Whitman & Howard about the long-term effects of retention basins. There is no history. It is a little premature to put that type of drainage in our Subdivision Rules. We think this type of system has served us well.

Mr. Fritzsche: The detention basins which have been constructed - is it reasonable for us to think that they came through the Conservation Commission review? It is really a conservation issue.

Mr. Parker: In refusing a detention basin recently, we were able to negotiate with the developer to fix a long-term drainage problem in the town. By not allowing the basin, a drainage pipe was installed by a developer in accordance with the master plan. It is a good idea to continue what we are doing in the Subdivision Rules at this time.

Mr. McCullough: It would be helpful to include the time within which the Planning Board must act. There is a different time period for subdivisions and special permits. It is a gray area for the applicants. Planning Boards seem to stretch the process out and I think it is incumbent on the Board to make decisions on plans as soon as possible.

Mr. Brennan: It is the Board's responsibility that the Town's welfare be upheld and proper consideration be given to each submission.

Mr. Parker: Perhaps we should make reference to the law in the Subdivision Rules.

It was suggested that reference be made to Section 4.1 and Section 4.2 to the State Law.

Mr. McCullough: I think the tree idea is good. I think that they should be planted closer than 40 feet.

Mrs. Bancroft: A new requirement is that the developer show where high ground water is on the plan relative to the street. We thought there might be problems with the streets as the high water was never shown and streets are now being built in low areas.

Mr. Parker: We have reviewed our fees. One of the things that we hope will be effective re changes on the plans is the increased resubmission fee. In charging a higher fee for resubmission, we hope the engineers will be asked to submit the plan correctly the first time. Obviously this will have some effect. What we are seeing now is land that is more difficult to develop.

Mr. Fritzsche: In the review process, was any thought given to looking at the requirements for reconstruction of existing streets? The requirements for underground electricity and telephone lines where it is important for the town to do likewise, would it be worthwhile

to have this more specific? Can this be waived by the Planning Board?

Mrs. Bancroft: We are still as committed to having underground utilities as ever. We would like to have all streets with underground utilities. There is a special law regarding relocation of utilities. Subdivision laws don't apply. This is under the Selectmen. When we were discussing the sidewalk continuation today, Mike Sullivan asked the Board to consider giving a height limitation on retaining walls to avoid the town being responsible for high walls in the townway in the future.

Mr. Brennan: Maintenance in terms of graffiti and vandalism is a concern.

Mr. Parker: What is the life of a wall?

Mr. Brennan: Usually 50 years of life to a structure.

Mr. Parker: Our subdivision rules call for fieldstone walls only.

Mrs. Bancroft: Are there reasons to consider a height limitation?

Mr. McCullough: What height are you talking about?

Mr. Brennan: Four feet for a wall in a subdivision.

Mr. McCullough: Regarding the sidewalk issue, if the town wants to implement this, the developer could give the town so much per foot for the town or another contractor to build the sidewalk. If you are building on your property, it is part of doing business. Building on someone else's property is a problem.

Mr. Parker: After changes suggested are incorporated, we will file the document with the Town Clerk, Registry of Deeds and Land Court.

Mr. Parker thanked everyone for coming.

The hearing was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING:

SCHOOL STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield, Massachusetts, owned by Paul Nyren and Ronald Kerr, dated November 10, 1986, drawn by Millis Engineering Associates, showing Lots A and B on School Street.

VOTED: To sign the above described plan.

The plan was signed.

PRITONI LETTER:

The Board is in receipt of a letter dated October 27, 1986, from Mr. Pritoni. The Board will take this under advisement. Mrs. Bancroft will check this matter with Town Counsel Fuller. This will be on next week's agenda.

SIGN ADVISORY BOARD:

Mr. Codispoti, the Board's representative on the Sign Advisory Board, said he had talked with Helen Weinert, Chairman of the Sign Advisory Board. She requested that the Sign Advisory Board be made smaller. She said that complaints have been referred to the Building Inspector for action. There was

November 10, 1986

Page 5.

no pressing need for the Board to meet at this time.

CASTLE HILL ESTATES I:

The Board is in receipt of a letter dated November 6, 1986, from Michael Marholin requesting an explanation of the surety held on Deerfield Drive.

VOTED: To send Mr. Marholin a letter showing work to be done and explaining that the item must be signed off in order to obtain credit.

The Board is in receipt of Mr. Marholin's letter of November 7, 1986, containing deposit slips. The Board will wait until the assignment is received before releasing surety.

INVOICES:

VOTED: To pay American Planning Association	\$70.
Suburban World	121.28
Zip Print	29.92

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

11

12

13

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

November 17, 1986

Present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

Others attending: David Nilsen re Village Farm Estates; Spruce Way neighbors.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

Mr. Nilsen met with the Board to discuss progress on the roads and drainage for Village Farm Estates. The Board noted that compaction on the construction card had not been signed off. Mr. Nilsen said that a ten-ton tandem roller had been used for compaction of the street. Mr. Nilsen said that the detention basin should be constructed within ten days.

Mr. Nilsen asked if he could obtain a release of Lot #4. He said that the foundation had been dug. Mr. Parker said that it was Planning Board policy on a subdivision of the size of Village Farm Estates to have all lots released at the same time.

Mr. Nilsen will meet with the Board on December 1, 1986, at which time he believes the detention basin will be complete and he will ask that surety be set.

SPRUCE WAY RESIDENTS - BLASTING:

A group of eight residents of Spruce Way met with the Board to air complaints that according to them had fallen on "deaf ears" before the Selectmen, Zoning Board and Planning Board. Their concern was that Mr. Marholin has received permission to extend Deerfield Drive and additional blasting would be required.

Mr. Sylvia suggested that in the future the Planning Board could include as part of its Subdivision Rules that a geologic survey should be a part of a subdivision submission.

Mr. Harney asked if the Board would hold the surety on Deerfield Drive until the neighbors were satisfied that damage to their property was rectified. The Board said that they hold surety for the completion of the roads and drainage and could not hold funds for insurance that damage from the blasting would be fixed.

FISCAL 1988 BUDGET:

The Board will submit a \$11,500 budget, \$10,000 for consulting services, and \$1,500 for other expenses. This budget is more realistic than using "0" budgeting as for the past several years the Planning Board has had to have a sizeable transfer of funds.

Mr. Brennan suggested that when the Ledgewood Subdivision is underway that the Town should have a Clerk of the Works on site. He will obtain additional information on this matter for the Board.

Another article that the Board would like to have considered is a technical drainage study which would include engineering updates on current drainage practices as they might be applied to Medfield.

CONDUIT FOR ELECTRIC WIRES:

In accordance with request of the Wiring Inspector the Planning Board recommends

November 17, 1986

Page 2.

that the Selectmen add to the Town Bylaws the provision that electric wires shall be put into conduit from the edge of the street to the house. The Planning Board is requiring same in the street.

SIDEWALK EXTENSION:

VOTED: To send a letter to Daniel Nye thanking him for his input into the Subdivision Rules & Regulations, and requesting that when this matter is discussed that he will be invited to the meeting.

WATER TOWER:

It was noted that there should be a meeting soon of the Planning Board, Water & Sewerage Board, Mike Sullivan and Ken Feeney regarding water tower in the North/Pine Street area.

MINUTES: VOTED: To accept the minutes of September 29th and October 20, 1986.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING - LEDGEWOOD ACRES:

Board Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.
Others attending: George Pyne, Gary Baxter, Gerald Lindsey, Stephen Beyer and others interested in the LedgeWood Acres public hearing.

The hearing was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and Secretary Gagliani read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS. Mr. Parker introduced the Board members.

Mr. Parker said that the authority for this hearing is found in Chapter 41 of the General Laws and the Planning Board Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Copies of the documents are at Town Hall and are available for review there.

Mr. Parker said that the procedure to be followed will be first we will ask the applicant to present his plan. After he has finished his presentation, letters from other Town Boards which the Planning Board has received will be read. The next item will be the reading of the Planning Board's engineering report. We will read the three-page report item by item and ask the applicant to respond to the items and Planning Board members to ask questions on the topics. After we have gone through Whitman & Howard's letter, we will ask for information from other Town Boards who have representatives here tonight. Then we will ask for questions from abutters and residents. I will ask you to give your name and address so that we can keep an accurate record of people speaking. The Planning Board decision is due on December 19, 1986. This decision date can be extended by request of the applicant. If you are interested in further meetings of the Planning Board, Mrs. Willis will be able to tell you what is on the agenda. Then the Planning Board makes its decision it will be registered with the Town Clerk and direct abutters will receive a copy. There is a 20-day appeal period. The appeal would be to the General Court.

Mr. George Pyne, the applicant, asked that Millis Engineering start the presentation.

Mr. Gary Baxter gave the Board copies of Millis Engineering's response to the Whitman & Howard Report. Also given to the Board were copies of LedgeWood Acres meetings with the Water & Sewer Board, Board of Health, and the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Gary Baxter said that they are designing a subdivision on a 62-acre parcel off Pine Street in Medfield. The plan shows 54 house lots. The roads according to the plan submitted are at the grades required by the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations. He said that they were going to request waivers for the grades on certain roads. He said that the maximum grade allowed is 6% and that has caused deep in the parcel. Some of the cuts are 30 feet or more. In order to reduce the cuts Mr. Baxter showed the Board some plans which would change the proposed grades and the plan which was shown also changes the length of the vertical curves. Two entrances to the site were proposed, one on Emerson from Tamarack and the other Emerson to Pine. A plan reducing cuts has been submitted to the Board just a minute ago and we have extended Bronte to the lot line and have connected Doyle to Emerson. Mr. Baxter said that waivers are being requested for the side slopes on Emerson, where there is a 40-foot right of way. The site will be sewered. At this time we think it will be connected to the sewer at Green and Summer Streets, but that has not been definitely determined as yet. They have met with the Water & Sewer Board regarding water. They had originally proposed a large booster station, however, the Water Board would like us to put in individual booster

pumps. They are looking for a possible location for a standpipe. It could be located at the top of the hill between Thirber and Doyle, the highest point on the site. This will be reviewed with Walter Amory, the Water Board's consultant. For drainage the site is exited in three spots. We go down Pine Street and tie into an existing brook. Then we come down an easement and runoff into a brook towards the Dover line. The third exit is down Bronte Way which drainage will be sheeted towards Rocky Woods (this is actually Kennedy property).

Mr. Parker then read letters from Water & Sewer Board and Board of Health. There is also a letter from the Fire Chief to the Water Department requesting 12" water pipes.

Mr. Baxter said that the size if the mains will be taken up with Walter Amory. Mr. Baxter explained that there will be a suction hydrant and a domestic hydrant. It would be possible to take water from one hydrant to another.

Mr. Parker said that that would be handled by the Water & Sewer Board.

Mr. Parker next read Whitman & Howard's report and the items were answered one by one, as follows:

1. 3-6 The proposed subdivision has massive cuts up to 24 feet deep. No information has been provided about soils and ledge. There is no apparent area that can receive this amount of soil material. Therefore, an earth removal permit may be required from the Board of Selectmen.
1. The proposed subdivision was designed according to the rules and regulations. We have all seen that the best way to develop a piece of property with very steep natural grades is best accomplished with grades in excess of six percent. We have requested that waivers be granted as attached. If an Earth Removal Permit is required, we will obtain one.

Mr. Parker asked if calculations had been made as to how many yards would have to be removed?

Mr. Pyne said that they wouldn't know until the sloping has been done.

Mrs. Bancroft asked what the deepest cuts were.

Mr. Baxter said that the deepest cuts would be 22 feet if the requested waivers were granted.

2. 5-28 Many of the natural features of the area will be lost because of the proposed cuts and fills.
2. The cuts and fills do disturb the natural features and we have requested waivers to alleviate this.
3. 3-54 The proposed drainage outfall at Bronte Way does not show a connection with a natural water course. A topographic plan is required and an easement from the Rocky Woods Reservation to allow the runoff to cross their land. Items of concern would be erosion and sedimentation control of the work area.
3. The proposed drainage outfall does not show a connection to a natural

watercourse. The post development flow in this area is less than the pre development. We do now have a point source that can be altered to a sheet flow if the Board desires.

Mr. Boxter said that the water going toward Rocky Woods would be diminished because some of the flow would be diverted. The flow from Thurber Way would be heading down Pine Street. The cul de sac is about 182 feet from the end of the property. The water course is on Rocky Woods Reservation. The flow would be widened out so that there would not be any erosion problem. There would be riprap at the end of the pipe.

Mr. Gagliani asked about the rate of flow.

Mr. Baxter said it would be down by the riprap where the rate of flow will be reduced. The rate of flow in this area would be increased but in total water going over there would be reduced.

Mr. Gagliani asked if calculations had been made as to how much flow would be coming out.

Mrs. Bancroft said that there is only one point where the subdivision would abut Rocky Woods. A resident of the town owns the land, not Rocky Woods.

Mr. Lindsey: All the record plans show Rocky Woods as the abutter. It is easy to document. We have backup plans.

Mr. Gagliani asked if an easement has been acquired by Rocky Woods.

Mr. Lindsey: Basically on advice of our legal counsel the flow has been decreased. We are changing the characteristics to the better as there is no definite point where the water would be coming into the property.

Mr. Gagliani asked how big the fan was.

Mr. Lindsey said the fan would be just as large as the Town asks. In the Board's Rules & Regulations you require that subdivision should tie into a natural water course. Faced with the fact that the Town does not wish to maintain detention basins, how are we going to do this without detention basins.

Mr. Parker said that our engineers have reviewed this and you have to be within 400 feet of a natural water course or into a Town drainage system.

Mr. Lindsey said it was his understanding that George Basile was allowed to use detention basins in his industrial subdivision. It is accepted engineering practice.

Mr. Kennedy said that he thought the proposed area for drainage is on land owned by he and his wife.

Mr. Lindsey said that he would be glad to sit down with the Kennedy's and discuss the ownership.

Mr. Parker said that Planning Board will not take effective action until the ownership question is straightened out.

4. 4-321J The Environmental Impact Statement is incomplete and unacceptable. Particular questions of concern, because of the proposed massive cuts, are noise, groundwater, and design considerations of natural

vegetation and contours. Alternatives should be proposed to decrease the massive cuts. The anticipated amount of ledge removal is not indicated.

Other engineering concerns are Public Facilities (1) Water supply, flow, pressure and distribution, (2) Sanitary sewerage connection, distribution and facilities, (4) Disposition of storm water, (5) Traffic facilities.

4. We take exception to this statement, all pertinent information was provided. If they are implying the blasting could have a deleterious effect then they fail to recognize the authority of the Fire Chief in this area. The proposed new grades may alleviate the fears expressed so well in this remark.

Mr. Baxter said that comments have been made about blasting and cuts. We are here tonight making a request for waivers to alleviate the amount of cuts.

Mr. Parker said that what our engineer is responding to is that the EIS doesn't address what the Subdivision Rules asked them to address. Your Environmental Impact Statement has drawn conclusions that are your opinions but are not backed up with factual information. How much disturbing are you going to do to the land?

Mr. Baxter: The amount of land being disturbed is shown on the grading sheets.

Mr. Parker said that you don't talk about the severity or lack of severity.

Mr. Codispoti said that for the size of the property being developed and the marginality of the land, that the EIS was clearly inadequate. Mr. Codispoti read the items to be covered in the EIS.

Mr. Gagliani said that the developer has to give us some information on what he wishes to do. We need to know the difference between your original proposal and the new proposal that you are suggesting. Mr. Gagliani said he would like to see how the cuts are changed and how that will affect the road. Your responsibility is to show us that the subdivision will be to the Town's benefit as well as your own.

Mr. Baxter said that they will come up with further information on this point.

Mr. Pyne said he wanted to talk about impact. He wants to clarify a couple of things. We didn't tell you how much material we are going to take out. You have to take every site - site by site by site. Nobody wants to foul it up less than I do. We want waivers so that we don't have to take out so much. I can't tell you how much is going to be done. As far as housing is concerned, every house has two cars. That will be an additional 100 cars. I know that can be handled. As far as people are concerned, people who are buying \$400,000 to \$500,000 houses have children in school or college. It won't be a big impact. The biggest thing is the deep cuts unless we have waivers.

Mr. Parker said that there are basic design problems. The specifics have to come after the design of the subdivision. For everybody's information the maximum slope we allow in town is 4 to 1. There is a darker line on either side of the road depicting that cut. What he is showing is the 4 to 1 sloping. The Planning Board has allowed steeper slopes.

5. A portion of the existing Pine Street gravel road does not follow the right of way as indicated on the plans. Therefore, the proposed drain pipes should be located within the right of way, or easements obtained for those areas outside the right of way.

The Town of Medfield is still the owner of the existing Pine Street. No easements are necessary.

Mr. Lindsey said that the Norfolk County has a taking and a design for new Pine Street. We were trying to put the drain pipes in the public right of way.

6. Pine Street is approximately 20 feet wide and unpaved for at least $\frac{1}{2}$ mile before the project. This road has areas that do not provide adequate sight distance. We believe this road should be upgraded to subdivision standards.

What your consultant recommends on upgrading Pine Street has merit. However, the Board must look at all the considerations brought before them, not the least of which is the desires of the residents of this area. Furthermore, inadequacy of adjacent public ways is not legal grounds for denial.

Mr. Parker asked if any measurements had been made of where Emerson comes out onto Pine Street.

Mr. Baxter said that their hands are tied because they don't own the land on both sides of the adjacent streets.

Mr. Parker said that the Planning Board could not approve a road with an unsafe entry. It is a matter which needs to be addressed so that we can begin to judge whether it is a safe place to enter.

7. Profile and topographic plans of Emerson, Tamarack, and Pine Street should be provided to verify the intersection sight distance.

Our hands are tied by the location of the road openings, we cannot be expected to rebuild all the adjacent streets.

8. 3.1 Has the applicant included with his application a certificate that arrangements have been made with the Medfield Water and Sewerage Board for supplying water? More information is needed regarding the extension of the Pine Street and Emerson Road sewer system.
8. The Medfield Water and Sewerage Board does not issue a certificate to this effect. They have assured us of the availability of water. We have done testing in the area to determine adequacy and these findings are being reviewed by the Town's consultant. See our memo to your Board dated today.

Mr. Baxter said that Medfield Water & Sewer Board does not issue such a certificate at this time. We should submit plans and iron out how water and sewer can be brought to the site. We have done testing regarding the adequacy of these. It will be discussed with Walter Amory.

Mr. Parker said that the Planning Board has a letter from Water & Sewer stating that you must submit to them.

A question was asked about water pressure. Mr. Baxter said that water pressure would be 15# at the top of the hill and about 50# at the low spot on Emerson. In the event of a fire, the Fire Department should have a plan on how to attack a

fire in this area. One truck would be assigned to come to Emerson. Their job would be to tie into the suction hydrant. Another truck could go up to the fire.

9. 3.431 Taking the halfway point of the Doyle-Thurber loop, a 1850 ft. dead end road is proposed.

This is being addressed conceptually tonight for your approval.

Mr. Baxter said a new road had been shown. This will change the number of lots to 52.

10. 3.51 There is no information provided on how the deep cuts will affect the subsurface water.

Refer to comment #1.

Mr. Lindsey said that some testing had been done and they hit ledge anywhere from 7 feet below ground to three feet above the top of the ground. We haven't done test borings like the Town does. If the Board wishes we could do borings.

11. 4.321G The drainage calculations are incomplete because they do not provide the drainage areas that were used for the calculations. A red pencil drawing should be submitted showing the drainage areas for each catch basin. The lengths of each pipe should also be shown on the plans and in the calculations. We did not complete the drainage review for these reasons.

The drainage calculations are not incomplete. The areas were specifically called out in the table and topographic maps were supplied. The lack of a red lined set of drawings is no excuse for not having reviewed them. Furthermore, the lengths of all pipes are clearly evident on the plan and profiles. These entire comments puzzles us.

Mr. Parker asked if he could be shown where the drainage areas are located.

Mr. Baxter showed a plan of the drainage areas.

Mr. Lindsey said if you look at the grading sheet, it is evident the way it is graded we have stations on all the catchbasins. Any trained person could read this. We have supplied this information with a topographic map. In addition we have a copy to give you tonight. The Conservation Commission will also be looking at such matters in their hearing. We will have additional information for the engineers. The one minor thing that might come up if the Board would like us to locate the roads, it would be good to know if you would give us a waiver for 9% grades. It would be helpful to your engineers for reviewing the two sets of calculations.

M. Gagliani said that this is a definitive plan and that the Board prefers to see a preliminary. Then we could work out the problems before the definitive is submitted.

Mr. Baxter said that they had submitted a plan with 6% cuts. The Board members requested this change.

Mr. Lindsey said that the change in the roadways will make a change in the calculations. We could have requested this originally with a 9% grade.

Mr. Parker said that the Subdivision Control law allows for submitting a preliminary plan which is a discussion plan. The preliminary plan is discussed and worked out and these kinds of changes can be made and then you could come in with a plan which would be acceptable. We haven't had a chance to discuss this but we are doing our best to go through the right procedure. The drainage calculations are important but incomplete.

12. 4.323E Existing and proposed house numbers are not shown.

12. Street numbers are being added.

13. 4.323F The widths of streets bounding the proposed subdivision are not given.

13. Widths of adjoining streets are being added.
(a graphic scale is provided)

14. 4.323L The size and location of existing storm drains are not shown.
The proposed connection of the drainage to the Emerson Drive existing drainage system requires an analysis of the existing drains to determine if they have adequate capacity.

14. The location and invert of the existing drain manhole is provided.
Mr. Ken Feeney informed us that he would review this connection and make recommendations for possible pipe changes. If we are suppose to do this study, please clarify.

Mrs. Bancroft said that Superintendent Feeney said he would not be able to be here tonight but would like it known that he made no commitments. It is important that you provide this information as to the adequacy of the downstream drainage to the Board.

Mr. Pyne said that he would be happy to provide the information requested.

Mr. Parker said for general information the Selectmen have the authority to approve a connection of this type. It is up to the developer to show that there is existing space.

15. 4.323D Existing homes near access roads should be shown on plans.

15. Section 4.323D refers to Zoning District Boundaries, which are shown.
If you would like to see the houses on adjacent parcels please inform us of this.

16. 4.323T Details for the retaining walls are not given. Alternatives to the proposed retaining wall at the Emerson Road extension at Tamarack Road should be discussed.

16. The proposed retaining walls are in excess of 8 feet in height and require the Building Inspector's design review. They were designed by a Registered Structural Engineer and permits will be pulled for them if required.

Mr. Baxter said that at the first part of Emerson where we are coming off Tamarack, we have a 40-foot wide right of way. When we put in a road, we will have to put retaining walls on each side of the street. What we are proposing tonight is a gradual change which will change the height of the walls. We were to have 12-foot high walls. With a change in grades the walls will be 8 to 10 feet high.

Mr. Lindsey said that the design of the walls is a "boiler plate" type thing. A detail of this would be provided to our consultant.

Mr. Pyne is required to have a certified structural engineer design these walls.

Mr. Parker said that all the Town allows is a masonry stone wall. You will be seeking a waiver on this. The type of footing that would be structural.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if a construction easement on private property would be required, and what does the plan do to it in the layout.

Mr. Baxter said all the requirements could be met within the 40-foot way.

Mr. Lindsey said that as bad as it sounds, we would be in better shape if we hit ledge at this point.

Mr. Parker asked if the road would have 28 feet of pavement.

Mr. Baxter said that what you propose tonight is the best we could do with the limit of curves. We are looking for a waiver to allow 9.9% slopes.

17. 4.323U No provisions for the control of erosion and siltation are given.

17. This is provided for on the topographic sheets and is evident to any observer of the plans.

18. 5.213 The vertical curve lengths for the proposed streets all fail to provide the required 300 feet minimum sight distance.

18. The streets were designed using a traffic engineering design speed of 35 mph and an eye height of 3.5 feet.

Mr. Lindsey said that a 300-foot sight distance allows a design speed of 35 miles per hour. We were trying to minimize the vertical curves. What we did was use design speed of 35 miles per hour by using a standard height of 3.5 feet. There was a reason we were going to ask for a waiver.

Mr. Parker said that it is a safety issue. You could lower the speed.

19. 6.11 A detail should be provided for vertical grate protection for all open-ended pipes.

19. A detail will be provided.

20. The proposed drainage outfalls to the brooks on Pine Street should have an analysis to check the downstream impacts.

20. This is provided to you, the Board of Health and the Conservation Commission tonight.

21. No Rip-Rap details are shown for outfall pipes.

21. A detail will be provided.

Mr. Parker noted that in Section 5.2.1.1 it requires that access be provided for adjoining property which has not been subdivided. There is some adjoining property which has not been subdivided. It is developable. How do you propose to address this issue?

Mr. Baxter said that the cul de sac could come out to the property boundary.

Mr. Parker said that we would require that the street be built to the edge of the applicant's property and that all services be installed to the edge of the property so that in the future if someone wished to continue development this would be consistent with previous subdivisions in the town.

Mr. Parker asked if the developer saw any reason to redesign the streets.

Mr. Lindsey said that they would like to sit down with the Kennedys to determine how they could get maximum use. Any member of the Board have any questions of the applicant?

Mrs. Bancroft said she would like to make one observation. This is a highly difficult area to develop. There are steep grades up and steep grades down. We have seen a plan. He tells us that the modification would require waivers to reduce the extent of the cuts. The most logical alternative is to design a street system where the streets are designed to follow the contours that already exist rather than asking that the street go straight through the hill. I have a basic problem with the whole concept of designing a street system as if it were on flat land. I would like to see a plan that uses the contours. Instead of a street that is flat, locating a street system that will not destroy the land using the contours would do far less damage.

Mr. Robert Kinsman: I would like to ask a couple of questions. How many pounds of explosives will you use in this development?

Mr. Baxter: That would be according to the amount of ledge.

Mr. Kinsman: What will happen to the wild life in the area? What about the wetlands?

Mr. Baxter: There are no wetlands on the site. The hay bales and erosion control is to keep the area as is during construction.

Mr. Kinsman: You are asking for a waiver above 6%. We have school buses going into the area. We don't want big school buses to go onto Pine Street because of the danger. You have Emerson going onto Pine Street with no turnaround.

Mr. Baxter: We have taken care of that with this addition piece of road. A bus could come up Emerson and make a loop.

Mr. Parker: If you are asking for a change in the plan, it would be appropriate for it to be reviewed by our engineers. The public hearing would have to be continued. My personal opinion of this particular application is that the changes required are so extensive as to require a new subdivision plan. I am one of four votes. My vote would be not to accept waivers and changes. To deny the plan. The Planning Board in subdivision plans will make minor changes. If minor changes, they can be made between the hearing and approval. Something of this magnitude needs a new hearing and a new plan.

Robert Stokes, 93 Pine Street: I am on a well. On the hill the water bubbles up out of the ground. What assurances can we have that this will not ruin the well.

Mr. Baxter: For drainage of surface water, a large portion of the water drains down to the beginning of the stream. We propose to take all water from the streets and discharging on the opposite side of Pine Street. Once we put the road in we will carry down Emerson and then down Pine Street. Emerson will be below existing grade. The land will be sloping near Emerson. 1/3 of the lot will be sloping toward Emerson.

Mrs. Conlon, 15 Tamarack Road: We have a bad water problem. Water goes down into the ground and then comes up again. I can't take any more water.

Bill Blair, Tamarack Road: I would like to address a question to the Planning Board. Are you fully cognizant of the problem we have there? We have a mountain. All the water goes down and then comes up.

Mr. Parker: It is true when he puts in a road that will cause new problems.

Mr. Blair: The street now floods on Emerson.

Mr. Parker: He cannot increase the runoff onto your property. He has to make it less or keep it the same.

Mr. Blair: Hundreds of gallons come out of the ground.

Ray Dellaselva, 2 Cedar Lane: This property needs a sanitary sewer system and the closest tie-in is approximately 3/4 of a mile. Who is bearing the cost of the line?

Mr. Baxter: The developer.

Mr. Lindsey: The entire area is Contract #7. We will be proposing to install the main collector line which ties into a main on Summer and Green Streets. It will come up Green and we will go down Emerson to the intersection at the intersection of Green and Summer. There will be a line that will go to Tamarack, down Pine Street and Tamarack and Pine Street to the extent of Contract #7. We are currently working out a design for that with Weston and Sampson. Mr. Pyne said that he would be making the financial arrangements.

Mr. Dellaselva: This is not going to take grant money from the State?

Barbara Murphy, 120 Pine Street: How will this affect my front yard? Will I have a swimming pool?

Mr. Lindsey: I would like to make a suggestion to the Board. I will be here with a pad of paper. If they would give us their name and address and telephone number, we would like to meet on the site.

Mr. Suojanen, 59 Pine Street: I live on Pine Street, which is a narrow street. There are small children in the neighborhood. There are large earth-moving vehicles totally disregarding any speed limits weighing 40,000 pounds. People usually drive on my front lawn to miss the trucks. With this development they will move 100,000 yards of earth. This is a lot of earth to be moved. Children play in the street everywhere. I am concerned not only with earth removal trucks but the workers who speed up and down the street. There is terrible danger to the citizens. There will be a liability to the town and the developer if something unfortunate happens.

Mr. Parker: The Planning Board agrees with you.

Douglas Ouhanian, 24 Emerson Road: I see there is a 40-foot right of way. Does that require a variance in itself?

Mr. Parker: It was O.K. for its time. Presently we require a 50-foot right of way. 40 feet is a problem.

Mr. Ouhanian: It appears that it is a 28-foot roadway and there is a sidewalk with a fence on the wall.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, 97 Pine Street: The stream which you are talking about is on the property of my neighbor's. One of the neighbors did not get notification of this meeting. Since they weren't notified that should be explored with them. There are 78 of us who would like to be put on Mr. Pyne's list. This is a concern by the Selectmen because they just challenged the State regarding Spruce Way. We are set on the same piece of ledge. We need assurance that we will be protected.

Mr. Pyne: What we do before we do anything at all is we take a survey of all houses in the neighborhood. Someone goes through your house and takes pictures to verify cracks. That is how we protect ourselves and you also.

Mr. Dunlea, 42 Flint Locke Lane: If you take pictures and if there is then structural damage what will you do for me?

Mr. Pyne: My blaster will take care of this. He is required to carry \$5,000,000. of insurance.

Mr. Dunlea: Do you go just to abutters?

Mr. Pyne: We go down streets. We don't give you certified pictures of your houses. You would have to sign the pictures.

Mr. Parker: The fire chief is responsible for carrying out the state law.

Mr. Froman, Carol Ann Drive: Two questions on blasting. Do I have to use legal means in order to get my house back to the way it was before the blasting was started.

Mr. Pyne: No way. If a rock went through your window or roof, it would be fixed up right away.

Mr. Froman: We are 300 feet from the street. What kind of a plan does the blaster develop? How do you know he has a plan to do the work?

Mr. Lindsey: If the Board wants to stipulate when we get to the approval stage a plan be worked up with the Fire Chief. He can tell us we can only use 500# a day. He could tell us how he wants to do this.

Mr. Froman: Is the Fire Chief qualified for that?

Mr. Pyne: I hope we don't have a problem. We don't want problems. We want to be free of problems. I don't want to increase his liability as it increases his insurance rates and mine. You have to have faith. There is insurance and the blaster has to be bonded.

Lorraine Paul, 135 Pine Street: Relative to the other places where you blasted, what has your experience been with blasting? To what degree do you have to blast?

Mr. Pyne: We have done blasting 16 feet deep in some places. Some 20 and 25. There are \$500,000 houses about 300 or 400 feet away and we haven't had a problem.

Charles Ferrulo, Carol Ann Drive: Quoted from the paper regarding Fire Chief's authority. Mr. Ferrulo said that there is nothing the fire chief can do in regard to blasting re breaking out windows, etc. The cuts must be 31 feet - but the underground utilities make it 39 feet. I have a question on water pressure. Some people have water pressure problems now. If you have individual booster stations, what will that have to do with this?

Mr. Baxter: The peak flow for that site might lose about 1# of pressure on Tamarack. That is a small amount of water relative to the mains.

Mrs. Galante, 117 Green Street: How long would you blast? Could the blasting make hairline cracks bigger?

Mr. Pyne: I can't tell you that it won't happen. I know this town has had trouble with blasting. You drill enough holes. Let us assume that we started May 1st, it would be over the course of a year for the roads. Some builders do it in sections. We will do the whole development before we do anything else. The first six months should complete the road.

Sue Fine, 19 Tamarack: I would like to know why the developer didn't tell us about the other eight feet. Why did we have to depend on Mr. Ferrulo to tell us that?

Mr. Baxter: We are talking about cuts from existing grade to proposed grade. You are talking about eight feet below for water and other utilities.

Christopher Smick: The developer mentioned there are no easy sites left. Nobody has mentioned the fact that part of the area was listed as "severe limitation for home sites." These conditions might preclude this for house sites. Engineering and site work costs which were prohibitive prevented the development of the land. It has become economically feasible to develop marginal land. The burden of controlling the development of land will be on the town. I think it is important that Rules & Regulations provide for proper development of the land. There is no argument for waivers on the ground of hardships. It depends on the town to maintain services. There is no question but that this would be altered in addition to the deep cuts. 20% of the slopes would have a surface of severe rock. The EIS statement never mentioned the Soil Conservation Maps. I think that this proposal calls for the town to request partnership with him for the sewers. It seems to me that all these changes and variances are required to develop it, perhaps it shouldn't be developed. The reason why I think this proposal is important to the people who are planning to develop difficult land if waivers are given.

Mr. Pyne: What book are you reading the soil information from, sir? I think you are looking at the Soil Map for septic systems or wells. It was perhaps before sewer system and water. You might not like this, but you all have your places. I am trying to develop the land so that someone else can have theirs. That first plan meets the rules. We can make it fit.

Mr. Parker: The original plan was not within the rules. That is a matter that we will decide.

Mr. Pyne: We are here to develop the land. It is expensive to do. My point is that it is a piece of land and if it designed properly it can be built.

Lois Harwood, Tamarack Road: How would you protect the houses near the 40-foot cut if any blasting were needed on Emerson Road?

Mr. Pyne: Small charges is the way we go. We take time and do it right.

Mrs. Harwood: You mentioned that there would be a booster station on lot 1. Are you still considering a booster station? Where would that be located?

Mr. Baxter: That is no longer the plan after meeting with the Water & Sewerage Board.

Bruce Berry, Tamarack Road: What about the reprecussion on homes in other areas? It was a competent blaster who did the work going all day.

Mr. Payne, 7 Tamarack Road: Medfield is growing a such a rate. Are you doing anything towards the expansion of the water system?

Mr. Parker: That is an important planning function. I can't give you more information than that.

Mr. Baxter: There is sufficient capacity in the town wells.

Mr. Parker: Your question is more to the future. I think Water & sewer are involved in looking for aquifers.

John Harney, 7 Maplewood Road: I would hope that the Board would dismiss this plan. If you do decide to go ahead and allow this project, I would advise you to require a damages bond which would not be returned until all the people have been reimbursed for damages.

Cornwall, Emerson Road: I am concerned with what happens on Emerson Road. He is going to provide houses for new people. Emerson Road will have to take the brunt of all the traffic. We also have small children playing in our streets. I am concerned with the safety and amount of traffic. We would like the Planning Board to take that into consideration.

Mr. Parker said that our Subdivision Rules require that the owner of record be supplied with that information. In looking over the various documents, it is unclear who the owner is. It is important that this be supplied.

Mr. ? The water going onto my land cannot be increased. engineering wise has this been addressed?

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Feeney strongly recommended against detention basins. It will flow off. There will be increased water. If it needs any improvements, Mr. Pyne would address that.

Mr. Parker: It is up to the Planning Board to approve that the drainage could be proper there. It must be proven to the Town that additional drainage will fit into the public system. The other is the surface system. There has to be a stream. We don't allow wverland flow for more than 400 feet.

Mr. Steve Basset: What I see right now is very little drainage brought down to Emerson Road. I would like them to prove that changing the water and adding riprapping won't cause a problem. Will the town take the drainage over?

Mr. Baxter: We will be looking at that.

Mr. Parker: We are embarking on a new drainage study in town. After this has been completed the Town will have better information. Now we are lacking in that department.

Mrs. Kennedy asked if there is any sewer in Emerson Road now.

(No.)

Mr. George Ferincik: I would like to speak in opposition. I have been impressed particularly with the arrogance that the project will be developed legally whether or not anyone sees it fit for the neighborhood.

Mr. Froman: How long does the developer have to answer the issues?

Mr. Parker: We have 60 days to make a decision. The hearing tonight is part of the process we have to go through. The most important thing we have to decide first is if we want to continue the hearing and allow the developer to come in and show us a revised plan. If the Board votes not to continue the public hearing the Board will be making a decision before December 19th. It seems to me the changes requested here would require a new subdivision submittal. You would get notified. We would do this again. Legally we can accept a request for an extension. We could accept new information. We would be obligated to continue the hearing. We would set a new date for continuation of the hearing. I believe I have the support of the Board in speaking for them.

Mr. Fitzpatrick: If the sewer goes past your property, is there a requirement that you have to tie in?

Mr. Parker: If you have an operation onsite system - no. You can continue that until you have a failure.

Mr. Pyne: Someone asked a question about the sewer. We have to put the T's in for connections. I would like to apologize for seeming arrogant, but there are things that protect me.

Mrs. Paul: Questions about the elevated sidewalk. What kind of fence? How tall?

Phil Bonnano, 65 Pine Street: Where would all the material go?

Mr. Parker: Mr. Pyne would have to go to the Selectmen for an earth removal permit. It would have to be trucked out of town.

Mr. Bonanno: What length of time are we looking at for beginning of construction?

Mr. Pyne: The road network may be a year. The construction of all the houses would be over a three-year period.

Mr. Parker: Do we have a motion to continue the hearing?

November 24, 1986

Page 15

Mr. Pyne: It would save me a little bit of expense if we extended it so that we could have time to come in with a different plan.

Mr. Parker: Your plan needs radical changes. The trouble with extensions is that they get complex. The public has a right to come to a hearing. I am not sure that we are close to that. You would have to come back and show us a plan.

Mr. Pyne: If you would grant an extension I would be glad to pay the cost of sending out letters.

Mr. Gagliani suggested that perhaps an option Mr. Pyne would like to withdraw his application.

Mr. Pyne agreed to do so. He will withdraw and resubmit.

The hearing was adjourned at 11:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

1

THE FIRST PART OF THE

SECOND PART OF THE

THIRD PART OF THE

FOURTH PART OF THE

FIFTH PART OF THE

SIXTH PART OF THE
SEVENTH PART OF THE
EIGHTH PART OF THE

NINTH PART OF THE

TENTH PART OF THE

December 1, 1986

Page 1

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

Others attending: Nancy Wolcott, Syd Vaughan, George Pyne, Gary Baxter, William Warwick and others re Ledgewood Acres.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 P.M. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

WOLCOTT SUBDIVISION: Mrs. Wolcott met with the Board to present a definitive plan of seven new lots off Pound Street. One lot will be the Laura Smith house on Main Street, which lot will be in excess of 40,000 sq.ft. Two waivers are being requested for the road; namely, a waiver to allow the road width to be 45 feet and a waiver to allow a 606-foot long cul de sac.

Mr. Vaughan said that it would not be necessary to have an easement of five feet as the new Subdivision Rules & Regulations have changed the location of underground utilities.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if lots 6 and 7 on the plan met the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations.

A narrower entrance was suggested as a safety measure.

Mrs. Wolcott said that the sewer would be extended. She said that the main house had been reconstructed in 1815 by the Sanders family and she has named the subdivision street "Sanders Way".

Mr. Vaughan said that the Environmental Impact Statement is being done by Dr. Carr and will be in this office by December 15th.

A subdivision hearing will be set for January 5, 1987.

LAND SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS:

VOTED: To approve the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Planning Board of the Town of Medfield as revised December 1, 1986.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES SUBDIVISION: Mr. George Pyne said he had planned to withdraw his application, but after further consideration he would like to have an extension of time within which the Planning Board must act. He said he would like to work with the Board and have the plan approved to everyone's satisfaction. If the Board can't agree, then it denies and we will be back to square one.

Mr. Parker recommended that the plan be withdrawn because of the substantial changes which would have to be made so that the plan would be acceptable to the Planning Board. Mr. Parker said his concerns were safety, blasting and drainage.

Mr. Pyne said that there are no wetlands and no endangered species. There are plenty of open lands that abut the lot which he plans to develop.

Mr. Baxter noted that if the Board would allow waivers for the road grade, the cuts would not be so steep. The reserve capacity in the town's drainage will be studied.

Mr. Parker said that the subdivision would have to have stubs to the undeveloped abutting land. Mr. Baxter said they would sit down and talk with the Kennedys regarding drainage easement and also where they would like to have the stubs located.

December 1, 1986

Page 2

Mrs. Bancroft said her objection to the plan was that it has so little regard for existing contours. She is concerned with the geography.

Mr. Pyne said there would have to be two ways into the subdivision; one from Tamarack Road and the other from Pine Street.

Mr. Baxter showed the Board a plan demonstrating three grades for the streets; one showing the allowed 65 grade, one 9.9% and the third in the middle. The steeper grade allowed by the Board the less cutting would be required.

Mr. Brennan said that the Board and the developer's plan are not even close to an acceptable solution.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that the plan be withdrawn and that the developer come in with a discussion plan showing less steep grades and less cuts.

Mr. Parker asked Mr. Pyne to send a letter to the Board if he decided to withdraw or if he wished an extension.

DRAPER ROAD - DOVER: Mr. William Warwick met with the Board and asked that the Board sign a Plan Under Subdivision Control Not Required for portions of six lots which are in Medfield. The plan is called "Warwick Acres, Dover, Mass." owner and developer is William W. Warwick, the engineer is Leon B. Turner, Jr., Cimmarron Drive, Seabrook N.H., dated September 27, 1985 and revised to 10/28/86. The Planning Board signed under Approval Not Required.

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan.

The plan was signed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

December 8, 1986

Page 1

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:45 P.M. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

MEETING WITH TOWN COUNSEL:

The Board invited Town Counsel to meet with them to discuss the Board's authority regarding the acceptance of an extension of time within which to make its decision and the denial of a subdivision.

Town Counsel Fuller said the Board could extend the time within to act or deny a plan. If the Board were to deny the plan, explicit reasons would have to be set forth in such denial. When corrections were made to the plan, the subdivision could be built.

Town Counsel Fuller cited a case where the court overturned the Planning Board decision to deny a plan.

TOCCI - HICKORY DRIVE:

Messrs. Ronald Tocci and George Giunta met with the Board to discuss the possibility of constructing a one-house subdivision with waivers which would make the road appear to be a driveway.

The Planning Board agreed that a subdivision is required to build a house on the "street" between Lots 9 and 5 on Hickory Drive.

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

Mr. David Nilson met with the Board and reported that the detention basin is operational and the additional manhole has been installed.

Mr. Gagliani asked about the standing water in the detention basin. The Board's concern is that there is so much water in the basin that it is working like a retention area.

Mr. Parker said that when the basin is completed that the bottom of the detention basin will be at the end of the pipe.

Mr. Nilson said that the finished grade is 3" lower than the bottom of the pipe. Mr. Nilson said he would like to install a temporary 6-foot high chain link fence around the basin until it has been completed.

VOTED: To set surety on Village Road at \$30,000 for a two-year period.

CASTLE ESTATES II:

VOTED: To approve the Castle Estates II covenant and to sign the mylar as the 20-day appeal period had expired.

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Joseph C. Donnelly, Jr., of North Street regarding the bounds on the lots purchased from Mr. Marholin. Superintendent Feeney will be asked to check the bound placement.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES:

The Board has received a letter from the Board of Health disapproving the LedgeWOOD Acres subdivision because of the drainage.

December 8, 1986

Page 2

The Board is in receipt of a letter from George Pyne dated December 4, 1986, requesting at least a three-month extension of time within which the Planning Board must take action.

Messrs. Smick, Froman, O'Halloran, Crouse and Harney gave the Board their opinions on the matter.

VOTED: To extend the time within which a decision on the Ledgewood Acres Definitive Subdivision Plan must be made to March 24, 1987

This extension will be sent to Mr. Pyne by certified mail and will be filed with the Town Clerk.

CRANMORE ROAD - BOND ESTIMATE:

Before surety is set on Cranmore Road, the Board will invite Mr. Borrelli and the abutters to Cranmore to the December 15th Planning Board meeting to discuss the walls and sloping.

SHEPHERD'S WAY:

Mrs. Bancroft will check with Town Counsel if the Board may require an easement over a way which has been built to Town specifications but which will not be turned over to the Town.

MICHAEL E. LUEDERS:

The Board is in receipt of a request for a Special Permit for Site Plan Approval from Michael E. Lueders, 27 Brook Street. Mr. Lueders Site Plan is insufficient and the Board

VOTED: To return Mr. Lueders check and plan and to send him a copy of the Site Plan Approval requirements.

ROCKY ACRES SUBDIVISION:

The Board is in receipt of a subdivision plan for Rocky Acres. As the 7-month period since the preliminary has been submitted, the Board will inform Mr. DiGiacomo that there have been changes in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations which must be shown as part of the Definitive Plan.

VOTED: To send a letter to the subdivider regarding the change in the Subdivision Rules & Regulations.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

December 15, 1986

Page 1

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker. Others attending: David Nilson; Robert Borelli and John and Elaine Hegedus.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 P.M. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

The Board is in receipt of two bankbooks totalling \$30,000 for the release of lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 on Village Road.

VOTED: To release lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 Village Road from the covenant.

The releases were signed and given to Mr. Nilson.

LAND SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS:

VOTED: To send letters of thanks to Roy Boudette and Kenneth Feeney for their assistance working with the Board on the revision of the Land Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

INFORMATION FOR RELEASE TO GENERAL PUBLIC:

Chairman Parker said he had talked with Town Counsel Fuller regarding release of information to the general public and the Board is obligated to provide copies of any paper in its possession at a reasonable cost to anyone who requests it. All information in the office is available for perusal with the exception of information regarding personnel.

PRIVATE WAYS:

Mrs. Bancroft reported she had talked with Town Counsel Fuller and he said that the Town cannot require right-of-way easements over private ways. It is necessary to maintain the sewer easement through the way.

MINUTES OF TRANSPORTATION HEARING:

Mr. Brennan provided the Board with copies of information regarding Impact Fees.

CRANMORE ROAD:

Mr. Codispoti, as an abutter, excused himself from the Board on this matter. Mr. Robert Borrelli has requested that surety be set on Cranmore Road so that the lots may be released. Prior to release of lots, the Board requires that plans for the wall and sloping be drawn by a registered professional engineer and approved by Whitman & Howard, the Planning Board and Mr. & Mrs. Hegedus.

Mr. Borrelli said that the wall is to be a cement stucco wall, the highest point of which will be 7½ feet. The Hegedus land would have to be sloped 15 to 20 feet from the face of the wall. The wall will be one-foot wide.

Mr. Hegedus asked if the wall would be on Town property as he did not wish to have the expense of the upkeep nor the responsibility for accidents that may occur as a result of the wall. It was his understanding from the original meeting that the wall would not be on his property. Mr. Brennan said that the wall would have to be on the Hegedus property as it could not intrude into the 40-foot right of way.

Mr. Borrelli said he would install a three-foot high chainlink fence over the gravel ledge into the gravel fill to prevent possible accidents. The bankings will be hydroseeded.

Mr. Parker asked what vegetation could fit in and replace a chainlink fence. Mr. Parker wondered if there would be enough soil over the ledge for plantings.

Mrs. Hegedus suggested that a fence be erected with plantings to hide it.

Mr. Hegedus said that Mr. Borrelli has been working on his land without his permission. He requested to see a profile of the wall.

Mr. Parker informed Mr. Borrelli that in order to set surety the plan of the wall must be signed by a registered professional engineer. It should be a final plan showing where the walls are to be located, their height, where the chainlink fence will be installed and where plantings will be set. The sloping and construction easements should also be shown on the plan.

PONDVIEW ESTATES:

Mrs. Willis has been asked to check the status of the Pondview Estates bond with Town Counsel Fuller.

SHEPHERD LANE:

VOTED: To return surety in the amount of \$34,000 to Terrence Shields upon receipt of surety in the amount of \$300 and cards signed showing that electricity and telephone lines have been installed underground.

CASTLE ESTATES II:

Attorney Copeland called and requested that Lots 22 and N-5 be released from the covenant so that they could be deeded to the Town by Michael Marholin.

VOTED: To release lots 22 and N-5 on Castle Hill Estates Subdivision Plan dated August 28, 1986

The vote was recorded four in favor with Mr. Gagliani abstaining.

The release was signed and will be turned over to Town Counsel to complete the deeding of the lots from Michael Marholin to the Town.

MAIN STREET - PLANS UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield prepared for William J. Kelly, drawn by Guerriere & Halnon, Franklin, dated October 29, 1986, showing one lot 4505±s.f.

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan.

FEES: The Board is in receipt of a memorandum from the Selectmen regarding additional fees which may be charged through the Subdivision Rules & Regulations. The Board will take this matter under advisement.

INVOICES: VOTED: To pay invoices totalling \$983.69.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.
Others attending: Nancy Wolcott, Sidney Vaughan and Jonathan Wye and abutters re Wolcott Subdivision; and Huna Rosenfeld, David MacCready and George Khoury.

PUBLIC HEARING ON WOLCOTT SUBDIVISION: Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 8:10 P.M. Secretary Gagliani read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS. Certified cards were received from all direct abutters.

Chairman Parker explained how the meeting was to be conducted and called on Nancy Wolcott, owner of record and applicant for Wolcott Subdiviön.

Nancy Wolcott said that four or five years ago the lots fronting on Pound Street were sold and at that time sloping easements and drainage rights were maintained. The plan before the Board shows the subdivision of six house lots from the main house. There will be 40,923 s.f. with the house and each of the six lots is a conforming 20,000 s.f. lot. She said that they plan to build six colonials.

Mr. Vaughan said that although the street layout is five feet narrower than allowed by the Planning Board, the paved way is 28 feet in width and all utilities, sidewalks, etc., will be installed in accordance with the cross-section. The drainage will be connected to the Pound Street drainage. Subdrains will be installed to disburse the initial rainfall.

Mr. Parker and the Board reviewed Whitman & Howard's report dated December 11, 1986, as follows:

1. The applicant's name and address are not provided. (The applicant will provide.)
2. The proposed contours should be superimposed over the existing contours to aid in the review process. (The applicant will provide.)
3. The proposed low area on Lot 7 may pond runoff onto the O'Connell property. Additional contour information for the abutting property should be provided to show that this will not happen, or measures made to prevent it.

(The 181-foot contour line will go across the property lines. That contour loops about 10 feet into the property. Provisions will be made so that the drainage will go into an underground system.)

Mr. Gagliani and Mr. Parker asked if an easement should be shown for the town to have rights for drainage purposes?

Mr. Vaughan said when he obtains the contours of the O'Connell's lot that he will get the location of the house.

4. According to the drainage calculations the existing 15" pipe from DMH-E to DMH-F on Pound Street will handle for full-flow conditions a maximum of 5.4 c.f.s. The runoff from Pound Street contributes 4.4 c.f.s under design conditions. The additional flow from the proposed subdivision drainage will exceed the capacity of the 15" pipe.

(The chart was misread. This will be redone. The capacity is exceeded by 29 hundredths. These calculations will be redone and put in writing for review by Dale MacKinnon and Kenneth Feeney.)

Mr. Parker asked if there could be an alternative design. Mr. Gagliani asked how far down stream the drainage calculate runs.

5. According to the drainage calculations the 12" R.C.P. carrying the 2.29 c.f.s. from the proposed site is only capable of handling 2.0 c.f.s. The minimum slope to carry 2.29 c.f.s. for a 12-inch pipe is 0.4% However, we recommend a minimum slope for a 12" pipe of 0.5%

Mr. Vaughan said that they are trying to limit the inflow to 2.0 so as not to put too much water into the pipe below. After the peak flow, it would gradually go down the pipe.

Mr. Parker asked if a larger pipe in Pound Street would make any difference.

Mr. Vaughan said that the pipe is able to carry $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as much as is there. There is about a foot drop in the manhole. There is turbulence there from water going in two directions.

Mr. Parker asked for additional information on the downhill effects.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that the removal of the existing catchbasin on Pound Street be shown on the plan and that a catchbasin on the uphill side of Pound Street also be shown.

6. The environmental impact statement has not been received at this time and will be included in a later review. (Has been sent and will request report from W & H on same.)
7. 4.2.3.0 proposed monuments are now shown on the plans. (They will be shown.)
8. 4.2.3.P If there is an existing house on Lot 1, it should be shown on the plans. (Will be shown.)
9. The owner of lot 9 is not given. (Will be shown.)

Mr. Parker read the Planning Board decision dated February 28, 1983, allowing a 45-foot wide layout with a five-foot utility easement.

Mr. Gagliani's understanding was that the 45-foot layout was just for the first part of the road. It was also his understanding that there was no guarantee that that would continue into the subdivision.

Mr. Vaughan said that the 5-foot easement shows over lot 2; however, because of the change in the Subdivision Rules, this easement is not needed because the cross section shows the utilities further out than previously.

Mrs. Bancroft questioned the planting of trees too close to the paved way.

Mr. Vaughan said he would put the 5-foot easement on the plan so that the full 50-foot layout could be utilized.

Mr. Parker asked if a waiver is being requested for the length of the street.

Mr. Vaughan is requesting a waiver for road length.

12. Ken Feeney has asked that catchbasins not be located along the radius of the curve because of problems with snow removal.

Mr. Vaughan said that the radius will be 25 feet and that the basins would be placed in accordance with Mr. Feeney's requirements. Mr. Vaughan said that he would be willing to show the radius at whatever the Board wishes.

Mr. Parker said that the Board recommends a 30-foot radius where Sanders Way abuts Pound Street.

Mr. Vaughan said that there would be cuts and fills in the road. The filling would be the least amount possible. The fill in the streets will be practically all gravel as required by the Superintendent of Streets.

Dr. Carr, commenting on the EIS, said that the new road will intercept drainage and carry it out on the low side of the street. The drainage has not been altered and a lot of water will be taken out of the system. The low area can be taken care of by the subdrain which is proposed. The street drain solves the problem on both sides of the street. The rest has to do with capacity of drainage in Pound Street. Whitman & Howard pointed out that this problem exists. The water level in the manhole is just over the top of the pipe. The pipe will flow full. When you raise the water level inside the manhole for a short period of time, the added pressure increases and the velocity increases the amount of water which can be taken care of by the pipe. That is why we said the pipe is adequate in Pound Street.

Mr. Codispoti asked where the drainage goes from Pound Street.

Mr. Vaughan said that it flows within Pound Street drainage for about 300 feet to an 18" pipe to an open brook where a new subdivision is being built at the present time.

Mr. Brennan said that the contouring shows that the road is building a dike and creating a pond on the property. That needs to be addressed in a drainage plan. The drainage calculations should work and should work and should be stamped by a registered professional engineer.

Mr. Parker said that the issue of flooding adjacent to the O'Connell property should be solved. The Board will need additional input on the matter.

Mrs. Bancroft asked what the depth of the ground water was.

Dr. Carr said that they did not do any work regarding ground water because the houses will be tied into the sanitary sewer. There is no wetland as shown under the Corps of Engineers definition nor the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Gagliani asked how deep the drainage system is. Mr. Vaughan said he would be coming in the four-foot depth with a subdrain. The invert of the 12" would also be four feet deep.

Mr. Vaughan said that the purpose of the subdrains is to take care of the wet area. During periods of heavy rainfall this absorbs the water by percolation and it is carried away.

Dr. Carr said that if a subdrain is installed, it will lower the water table and increase the storage capacity. That is one of the advantages to a subdrain system.

Mr. Gagliani asked if it was anticipated that any ledge be removed or any blasting done.

Mr. Vaughan did not think it would be required for the street or drainage. He said he would like to put in six test holes to obtain an accurate reading regarding the water table. If there were inconsistencies from hole to hole we would have to do more. This is sometimes limited to March or April.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that granite is shown all around the cul de sac and that it is not required. The granite can be installed, but is not required.

Mr. Gagliani asked why the plan shows the road with a 45-foot layout instead of the 50-foot layout.

Mr. Vaughan said that the lots will not fit on both sides of the street with a 50-foot layout.

Mr. Gagliani asked why we should give easements instead of what the Subdivision Rules & Regulations say.

Mrs. Bancroft asked about the effect of bringing in fill. Normally, the Selectmen have control over Earth Removal projects. We would have to be sure that trucks are not coming in all hours of the night and day and that caution is exercised.

Mr. Gagliani asked if the existing houses on Pound Street meet the requirements for corner lots.

Dr. Legge, Pound Street, said he has been pumping for years and when the storm drains were installed in Pound Street the problem was alleviated somewhat. The water table is up to the surface of the cellar floor right now. When he purchased the land on Pound Street, the selectmen allowed me to tie into the storm drain in the street. Dr. Legge said he is concerned that there is ledge in the area as there was an out-cropping of ledge on his property. Dr. Legge also said that Mrs. Callachan pumps continuously.

Mr. O'Toole asked if the figures for drainage included the drainage from the Housing for the Elderly.

Mr. Vaughan said that it was included.

Mr. Parker asked what the observation of the street drainage has been.

Mr. O'Toole said he thought it was adequate the way it is now.

Edith O'Toole said that the real problem is not the surface water, but the ground water.

Mr. Codispoti asked about the depth of Mrs. O'Toole's cellar.

She said it was probably 5½ feet below grade. She said that the problem is not the surface water, but the water from underneath.

Richard Rogers said he lived next door to Edith and he ran into water at 4½ feet.

Mr. Parker noted that Mr. Rogers' lot would not be affected by the proposed grading.

Louise Mulock said that her land is the lowest in the area and they have a great deal of surface water when it rains heavily. She asked to see the complete contour plan, which would include her property.

Mr. Vaughan said that the new street will intercept a great deal of the water which now comes onto the Mulock property. The only water that will not be going into the street drain is in a low triangular area.

Mr. Mulock said that the "town gave us a discount on our taxes" because of standing water. (He received a 20% topography adjustment.) Mr. Mulock said he was concerned with the water.

Mr. Parker said that we need contours showing the effects of the drainage on Mr. Mulock's property.

Mr. Vaughan said that "we can't do much about his property." He also said that they will contour the property if required to do so.

Mr. Mulock said he did not understand about the sloping easement.

Mr. Gagliani asked that the sloping easements be shown on the plan.

Mr. Vaughan said that the owner retained an easement over the property when the lots were sold and the restrictions show on two deeds, the five-foot easement is shown on lot No. 2.

Mr. Parker said that the steepest slope allowed without a waiver is four-to-one. The easement will allow the developer to go on the Mulock and Rogers property to do the required sloping.

Mrs. Bancroft said that if there was a compelling reason the Board could allow a steeper slope.

Irene O'Toole said that the houses in this area have water in their cellars except her house because they were aware of the problem and stayed above the groundwater there. Precautions should be taken so that the new houses do not have water in their cellars.

Mr. Rogers asked to have the curb cut explained.

Mr. Parker said that a 50-foot radius is required; however, it is inappropriate to have such a wide opening. Mr. Parker said that the site distance is adequate.

The hearing will be continued on February 9th at 8:00 P.M.

✓ TANNERY FARMS SUBDIVISION PROPOSAL:

Messrs. Rosenfeld, Khoury and MacCready met with the Board to discuss a pre-preliminary plan for the subdivision of Tannery Farms. 85,670 s.f. of land will be with the large house and the other lots would be 20,000 s.f. or more.

Mr. Parker asked what the sight distance would be where the proposed street would come out onto Main Street.

Mr. Rosenfeld said that the sight distance would meet requirements, but they would like a waiver for the length of the cul de sac. The area will be provided with town water and sewer.

The Board will check the plan to be sure that the street is at least 30 feet from the abutting house.

Mr. Parker asked how much land would have to be disturbed for this street and the placement of the homes.

Mr. Rosenfeld said that there would be cutting and filling to approximately ten feet from the rear lot line.

Mr. Gagliani asked if they would be removing gravel from the site.

Mr. MacCready said that there is a hill which they would like to take down.

Mr. Rosenfeld said that they have eight acres and would be willing to deed three acres of that to the cemetery in exchange for having the land rezoned for multi-family units. They could build five buildings, and convert Tannery Farm. Mr. Rosenfeld said it could be beautiful and there are no abutters and it is on Main Street. Mr. Rosenfeld said that they were looking for the Board's personal opinions on this.

The Board suggested that Mr. Rosenfeld go to the Cemetery Commissioners with his proposal.

PRICE OF ZONING MAPS: The Zoning Maps will be sold at \$5.00 each.

Respectfully submitted,

John Gagliani
Secretary

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti and Gagliani. Others attending: Richard Merrikin, engineer representing Rocky Acres, and abutters and other interested citizens; Paul Leuders; Robert Borrelli and Mr. & Mrs. Hegedus.

ROCKY ACRES SUBDIVISION PLAN: Acting Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 8:05 P.M. John Gagliani read the public hearing notice.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the hearing is being held in accordance with Chapter 41 of the General Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Town of Medfield. She explained the procedure to be followed. First the applicant or his engineer will present the plan. The Planning Board members will ask questions. Other town boards present may ask questions. The meeting would then be open for questions for others present.

Mr. Richard F. Merrikin of R.F. Merrikin & Associates, representing Rocky Acres: The subdivision is an 8-acre parcel at the end of Vine Brook Road, which is a public way located off Route 109. Mr. Merrikin pointed out the area on the map and said that it has been subdivided in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw and the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Town of Medfield. It contains ten house lots, each one with a minimum of 20,000 sq. ft. The roadway is shown in yellow. It consists of Vine Brook extension and a cul de sac which will end in a dead end. The property currently is undeveloped. It is a vacant peice of property and is characterized by an upland area in the middle of the property. The wetland on the property is outlined in green. It is easily identifiable at both ends of the property. It is a swampy area. What we have done is take advantage of the upland available, follow the Rules & Regulations and have suitable building sites. The road is an extension of Vine Brook. The new road is a 50-foot wide road. The pavement width is the same. The transition from 40-foot to a 50-foot road is not difficult. Mr. Merrikin asked for a waiver to allow a radius of 350 feet instead of 400 feet in accordance with the Subdivision Rules & Regulations. The road is a 50-foot layout with one sidewalk and grass strip on the left and the grass strip on the right. Bituminous pavement on the straight strip and rounded on the curve as required. All of the lots conform to the Zoning Bylaw. One question was the drainage. Medfield presents a problem designing subdivisions becuae the town highway department doesn't like detention basins that they have to maintain. It is usually a requirement to slow down water over paving areas. We have fairly significant areas which may be drained into an 18" pipe down Vine Brook to Cheney Pond Road and out to a stream. In the rear there is a large wetland which connects in lower Vine Brook and goes down. We have attempted to make the drainage work so that there would be no problem in any particular area. We also have Vine Brook Road which has a drainage area. What we did was place the catchbasin toward the end of the cul de sac, making less water flow into this area. The wetland area is higher than the houses here. It goes into an open-end pipe. We saw potential problems. What we have done is reduce the amount of water which runs directly here. We have increased the runoff down in this area. It will be dissipated in the wetland area itself. The increase in flow will be absorbed in the wet area. It is flooded a good portion of the year. By collecting into catch-basins directly into the pipe it will discharge rather quickly into the system. The drainage system here works very well. We have a question with your engineering report and we will give them figures to address the issue. When we did our plan we took into effedt that all the houses were there in terms of the amount of runoff. We have done perc tests throughout the area and find that the area is O.K. for septic systems. We will go to the Board of Health. I have a copy of a letter of waivers we are requesting. I believe that is everything that we will need.

Mrs. Bancroft: The Planning Board has an engineering report from their technical consultant. We will go item by item and ask for your response.

1. 4.2.3p No indication of depth to normal high ground water within the street layout has been given.

Mr. Merrikin: In the EIS report was a full list of test pits. Some in the area of the roadway. The ground water in the area where Roadway A and Vine Brook test hole 11 - ground water tests at 6½ feet below the 231 elevation (225). The roadway is 228. The water is about three feet below the surface. Drainage: one of the problems draining from the road to the swamp is because it is difficult to get drain lines with suitable depth. We could put in an underdrain which is much lower and it would drain positively. The elevation to the swampy area near the road is 228 and 224. The contour for the vegetated wetlands is at 226. Pre-development would be no more than 226. We haven't computed it. The watershed is shown at 218. The high water mark is quite a bit below that elevation.

2. 4.2.3r Show tree line or note as wooded vegetation. It is a completely wooded site. There is no tree line.

3. 4.2.3t Norfolk County Conservation Commission District map entitled "Soil Limitations for Septic Tank Sewage Disposal" in the Town of Medfield has not been shown. (This will be supplied. That might be of interest on the wet sites as well as the dry sites.)

Mr. Gagliani asked if there is clay underneath.

Mr. Merrikin said that it is a perched system. We didn't find any clay. The perched system keeps the ground up. Also the muck in the wetland area keeps the water up. The ground water will follow the slope. It could come out in this area as a result.

4. 4.2.3w Add the statement required of this regulation to the plans. (They will do.)
5. 5.2.2 The applicant is requesting a waiver to reduce the minimum center line radius from 400 feet to 350 feet. (The Board will consider this request.)
6. 5.2.1.3 The radius at the street intersection can be reduced from 50 feet to 40 feet.

Mr. Merrikin said that the roundings can be changed. Mrs. Bancroft said the Board prefers to see them smaller.

7. 5.2.1.4b The radius of the paving surface on the cul de sac can be reduced from 50 feet to 45 feet.

Mr. Merrikin said that less pavement on the cul de sac would be all right with him. He would make the change. Mrs. Bancroft said that bituminous only is required not granite.

8. 5.2.1.4c A temporary cul de sac is required at the end of Vine Brook Road.

5.2.1.c: Mr. Merrikin said that they are asking for a waiver from Section 5.2.1c because at the end the land goes up 15 to 20 feet on one side. On the other side it would fall into wetlands.

Mr. Gagliani asked how long the cul de sac is proposed to be.

Mr. Merrikin said it is 354 feet. It is about 500 feet from Cheney Pond Road. The other one is 415 feet. We talked about it in the preliminary plan. Access is being provided to the Kennedy land.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if they intended to construct the road over the way to the property line. It does not appear to meet the property line.

Mr. Merrikin said he had shown the road as far as he could as on one side the road is at grade, but at the other side it is about 20 feet higher. In order to bring the road to the lot line, he would have to have an easement from Mr. Kennedy to work on his land.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board has had a lot of problems in the past because it leaves a piece of land in limbo. The Board will have to look at this seriously.

9. 5.2.1.4d The typical cross section does not conform with Plate 3. We recommend that the typical cross section of Plate 3 be modified so that the sidewalk and drainage are shown on the same side of the road as shown on the plan view of Sheet 3 of 9.

Mr. Merrikin said he would make the changes.

10. 5.2.1.5 Vine Brook Road is required to have granite curbing because it has less than a 400-foot center line radius.

Mr. Merrikin asked for a waiver to allow bituminous where the center line radius is 350.

11. 5.2.1.6 We suggest that this regulation be placed on sheets 2, 3 and 4 because the driveway opening at the catchbasin is one of the most abused items by the house builders. Having it on the plans may bring it to their attention.

Mr. Merrikin will do this.

12. 5.2.11 Tree plantings are required.

Mr. Merrikin said it is not a problem. The plan shows significant cuts and the trees will be cleared on both sides of the road.

13. 5.2.3.2 Calculations should be presented that demonstrate that the existing drainage system on Vine Brook Road can handle the proposed additional flow.

Mr. Merrikin said he will prepare calculations for the engineer.

14. 5.2.6.4 Cable television lines should be shown on the typical cross section.

This will be shown.

15. Correct the invert shown as 221.65 to 211.65 in the riprap detail sheet 3 of 9.

This is an error and will be changed.

16. The proposed drainage system will increase the flow to the large wetlands to the North of the site. We ask that the board check with the Street Superintendent to see if there is any known flooding problems along the perimeter of this wetland area. If there are none, then the proposed drainage design is acceptable.

Mr. Merrikin said he would check with Mr. Feeney regarding flooding in the area. If there is none, the street is acceptable. Mr. Feeney is against detention basins on small lots with septic systems.

17. This project should be reviewed by the Conservation Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals for Wetlands and Water Protection District issues.

Mr. Merrikin said that they plan to go before the Conservation Commission and the Appeals Board as the watershed line encompasses a small portion of the road.

18. With the possibility of a further extension of Vine Brook Road, it is necessary to have adequate sight distance east and west on Vine Brook Road from the A Road intersection. We request that profile sketches be made to show 300-foot sight distance from a point to 15 feet back from the intersection. Also, additional vegetation restriction easements should be placed on lots 1 and 7 to maintain these lines of sight.

We will check the sloping. It should be 4 to 1. It may be 2 to 1.

Mr. Codispoti asked if Mr. Merrikin could walk the Board through the low points on the property which currently exist.

Mr. Merrikin said that on the left is a good size hill. If you walk along the path you are going where the road is going. The land rises to a high point to the right. This is about 20 feet higher than the edge of the wetland. Continue up lower elevation near wetland elevation. A flat path runs down the property.

Mr. Codispoti asked if the terrain is ledgy.

Mr. Merrikin said that they have taken 20 test holes. They have run into good size rocks, but no ledge.

Mr. Codispoti asked if it required blasting.

Mr. Merrikin said it does not.

Mr. Merrikin said that the driveway crossings are not within the pervue of the Planning Board. Lot lines will be changed slightly to fit in septic systems.

Mr. Gagliani asked what the distance between the wetland and the backline is? He asked if a house would be able to be placed on the lot and meet the rear lot requirement.

Mr. Merrikin said it could happen.

Mr. Codispoti asked if the EIS shows contamination of the wetlands due to salt.

Mr. Merrikin said he couldn't remember if it was addressed. If this were deemed a sensitive area for salt, it would be designated as a limited volume area. I don't think this particular location would be because it is in the headwaters of the stream and the road is going into the drainage system. We will go into the wetlands another 400 or 500 feet. If it were significant, the Town could designate it as a "no salt" area. The plan shows six test pits to be observed.

Mr. Gagliani asked when you are regrading the lots, how much gravel will be taken out?

Mr. Merrikin: I haven't done a quantity analysis. Most of what is coming out of here will be coming off the site. Maybe 6000 yards will be taken off. This is a Board of Appeals issue.

Mr. Gagliani questioned what would happen to the gravel to be removed.

Mr. Merrikin said it is not a marketable type of gravel. It is not good gravel material.

Mrs. Bancroft said that there is a zoning restriction that not more than 75% of a lot shall be located within a wetland. Also, on a somewhat related issue, we have a requirement in the zoning that usable frontage has to be provided to a lot. It is a gray area to us and it is our requirement.

Mr. Merrikin: It is a question with watershed protection. There is limited review requirements and standards for filling that don't apply. They create a special case for a situation where you do have to go across wetlands. I think we have a right to these crossings.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the problem this creates planning-wise is that the street is meant to provide access to the lot. In this case it is a common driveway.

Mr. Merrikin said that there are two separate driveways shown. There will be two crossings. If you would prefer we could make three.

Mrs. Bancroft said that any action that the Planning Board takes on this plan would be subject to Board of Appeals action.

Mr. Gagliani asked for a review of the size of the drainage pipe.

Mr. Merrikin said that there is an 18" pipe that exists. We will put two catch-basins in with two 12" pipes to an 18" pipe. There will be no direct drainage into the area serviced by the 18" pipe.

Mr. Gagliani asked if in the future Mr. Kennedy's land is ever developed, what will happen with that land for drainage?

Mr. Merrikin said that he has the wetlands to drain into.

Mrs. Bancroft asked to see the profile plan as she would like to get a better sense of the depth of the cut.

Mr. Merrikin said that Vine Brook has a left-side cut of about 12 feet. The centerline cut is about five feet, just beyond the end of Vine Brook now. The street is elevation 231.6 on the left side. It is a 15 foot cut. Road A had to meet certain curve requirements so we were pretty well resolved to this. Middle portion has a cut of 14 feet.

Mrs. Bancroft said that sometimes we have allowed a combination of a wall and a slope.

Mr. Merrikin said he would have to talk with the applicant about that. We will have to design house and lot to see what is needed. We would have to go to 4 to 1 slope.

Mrs. Bancroft said that we have no input from other town boards.

Mr. Richard Heavey, 31 Cheney Pond Road: I live on the corner. Is there going to be another Planning Board meeting on this matter.

Mrs. Bancroft said that it is my sense that there are enough changes to be made in the plan that it will be a good idea to continue this hearing until a later time.

Mr. Heavey asked if the abutters would have access to final plans.

Mrs. Bancroft said that any plan submitted to the office is public information. This is a definitive subdivision plan but it is subject to review.

Mr. Heavey said that with respect to the drainage problem as it exists now, I have a drainage problem. The catchbasin at the corner of Vine Brook and Cheney Pond Roads overflows. You will be getting more water flow from the continued road. The gentleman said it is a significant wetland and it is a high wetland. I am concerned with additional water and the runoff. What I am suggesting is the area which presently exists doesn't have adequate runoff. I don't think it is advisable. If you ever have any time, I will take you up where the project is proposed. I don't like the term "siting a house and septic system" on a lot. Setting three houses with septic tanks near a very significant watershed would not be beneficial from a wetlands or conservation commission view. Other neighbors wished to be here tonight. They don't want the development.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Planning Board engineers give a particularly good look at drainage issues. We will tell you tonight when the continuation is scheduled.

Mr. Codispoti asked Mr. Heavey to explain the condition of the water problem on his property.

Mr. Heavey: I am on Cheney Pond Road. Water comes under the stone wall.

Mr. Merrikin said that he didn't do a topo for land off the site as it is very high. Those lots pitch down to Cheney Pond Road.

Mr. Ronald Gates, 30 Cheney Pond: I am concerned with the drainage situation. Our cellar floor is the lowest in the area. In the rainy time of year those basins don't handle water now. When they don't I get water in my basement. I get really concerned with dumping more water in there which can't be handled now. Supposedly there is a pipe that cuts directly from where it comes through the back of Mr. Heavey's property straight across the road and through my side yard. I can see the top of the pipe in my side yard. My two concerns are drainage and I think we are crowding in too much.

Mr. Merrikin questioned the problem with the capacity of the pipe.

Helen Lynch, 41 Hatters Hill Road: We are getting very heavy water encroaching on our property. About two years ago the town dumped earth at the end of the street that would go into Vine Brook which has a small river. If you get the drainage from there, we will be completely inundated with water. There used to be water in the spring and then dry up. Now more than half of the trees are in water. It would be helpful if the road could drain across the end of the street.

David Meader said that the area is a wildlife haven. He asked Mr. Kennedy when was the last time he saw a deer.

Mr. Kennedy said he saw one right in front of Doc Sullivan's house. Roger Hardy says he sees them coming out of my back yard.

Mr. Meader: I am totally against this subdivision and any future subdivision in the town. They are changing the culture of the town. Forcing wild life out. The town should work toward no future subdivisions.

Mary Lynch, 41 Hatters Hill Road: You mentioned that there is not a ledge formation. Would there be any blasting?

Mr. Merrikin: I see no need for blasting.

Mary Lynch: We always wondered why the town blocked up the flow of water.

Mrs. Willis will find the answer to the question and relay it to Mrs. Lynch.

Jim Sullivan: I am on the other side of the development. I am on a well unlike most people in Medfield. I am concerned about developing very marginal pieces of property where there is predominant wetlands and ultimately the septic system will seep into the wells in the Town of Medfield and individual wells and developing a parcel like this is setting a bad precedent. If we run out of water we could probably tie into the MDC.

Neal Curran, 13 Hatters Hill Road: Is there going to be a sidewalk on one or both sides of the road?

Mr. Merrikin: On one side.

Mrs. Bancroft: That is because there would be less maintenance. That is why two sidewalks are no longer required.

Richard Hopewell, 37 Hatters Hill Road: Currently you don't envision blasting in the area. If blasting is required, when will that be known? Who authorizes that and who meters the blasting in the area?

Mr. Merrikin: There is a whole set of rules. When they blast usually there is notification. As far as the road goes, we see no need for blasting. If there was need you would be notified.

Mr. Hopewell: Can it be definately decided that there will be no blasting?

Mr. Merrikin: We dug ten feet in with small back hoes. My feeling is that there is probably not ledge.

Mr. Heavey : On the property on the righthand side of your chart, the land continues

to rise. As far as the natural drainage of the septic system, won't they tend toward the wetlands?

Mr. Merrikin: There is a requirement that a septic system has to be 75 feet from the wetlands. It will be 75 feet for the effluent to flow through before it gets to the wetlands. The function of the ground is to cleanse the septic system. It is cleansed through the soil. This is nature's filter system. The wetlands serve a useful function. That would be one of the functions of the wetland area. The other thing is that the material in the area is such that there will be a fair amount of cleansing going on. The septic system will be reviewed by the Board of Health.

Mr. Hopewell: ~~Parts of the town~~ have been hooked up to the sewer system. I know our area of town is below what is required under current limitations. Will there be sewer coming to our area?

Linda Kimball, Cheney Pond Road: Are there any kind of regulations that would require another outlet to Hatters Hill Road? There is only one road to 109.

Mr. Merrikin: There is a requirement by the Planning Board about a deadend street. This is such a small piece of road, we don't fall into any significant development further on.

Mr. Sullivan: You were talking about the septic system. I understand how a septic system filters and works.

Eleanor Flynn, 29 Hatters Hill Road: Is there any idea about the size of the houses?

Mr. Merrikin: The Planning Board has no control over the houses. I would say probably the houses would be similar to the houses in the area now. Mostly four bedroom houses.

Mr. Curran: Asked for an overview of dead-end roads.

Mr. Merrikin: The Planning Board has the right to waive any regulations.

Neal Curran: What about density of houses? Is there any density requirement for dead-end streets? (Answer: no.)

Helen Lynch: Is one developer going to build all the houses, or will it be the DiGiacomo family?

Mr. Merrikin: We anticipate that all would be by one developer. It is true there may be some lots for the family.

Helen Lynch: Would they all be built at one time?

Mrs. Bancroft: Once the plan is approved they have basically eight years to complete the work. Once he begins construction then there are stronger constraints. No time for construction of houses, but there is a time limit for the construction of the street.

Mr. Merrikin: In all probability most of the houses will be built at the same time.

January 12, 1987

Page 9.

Mary Flynn: What is the footage to the southern border?

Mr. Merrikin: The border line is 140 feet.

Mary Flynn: Will some of the trees be left?

Mr. Merrikin: It depends on the developer.

Mary Flynn: It is important to the drainage to absorb water.

Mr. Gagliani asked about sub drains.

Mr. Heavey: Have any plans with this much water ever come before the Board before?

Mrs. Bancroft: Off of Hickory Drive. It was not approved. In the Colonial Park Subdivision houses were built in wet lands. The town ruled against it. The state let them go ahead. The town is conservative. We have tight regulations.

The hearing is continued to February 23rd at 8:00 p.m.

PAUL LEUDERS - BROOK STREET: Mr. Leuders met with the Board to discuss how to proceed with the construction of a garage for the storage of his trucks and equipment. Mr. Leuders said he is in the landscaping business.

Mrs. Bancroft said that this appears to be a second principal building and two principal buildings are not allowed on a lot in a B-I Zone. She suggested that the two buildings be tied together so that it could be considered one lot. Mr. Leuders said that the addition to the building would be 35x50.

Mrs. Bancroft said that this would require site plan approval process and all the items listed in the Zoning Bylaw for this would have to be shown on the plan.

Mr. Leuders said he had met with the Conservation Commission and what he plans to do meets with their approval.

Mrs. Bancroft said that lighting of the parking lot was not required, but if lighting were to be provided, the Board prefers low lights on poles with the light shining towards the building.

Mr. Leuders said he would submit a site plan in the near future.

Mr. Codispoti removed himself from the Board for this discussion.

↓
CRANMORE ROAD RETAINING WALL: Mr. Borrelli submitted a revised plan to the Board and said that the sloping would go three feet into the Hegedus property. The wall will be 7'2" at its highest point.

Mr. Brennan's comments suggested that the wall be stone in accordance with the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Mr. Borelli said he wished to put in a stucco wall.

The major questions was where does the wall go? Mr. Borrelli requested that the wall be allowed to be put into the layout.

Mr. Hegedus said that he is reluctant to have the wall on his property as he did not wish to have the responsibility that goes along with a wall of this type.

The consensus of the Board was not to have stucco, but to allow a plain concrete wall and require that vines be planted to cover it.

Mrs. Bancroft said she did not see any need for the fence at the beginning of the wall and that practically speaking heavy shrubbing would be preferable.

Mr. Borelli agreed with this.

Mrs. Bancroft said the Board will need a detail for the shrubbery which will be planted in place of the fence. Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board needs one more member in order to vote regarding the placement of the wall - inside or outside of the layout.

Mrs. Hegedus said that they would like to have somethin in writing that this wall is not our liability.

Mrs. Bancroft read Whitman & Howard's letter regarding the wall.

Mr. Borelli will meet with the Board on January 26th at 10:30 p.m.

ZONING ARTICLES:

VOTED: To submit the following articles for the 1987 Annual Town Meeting:

ARTICLES FOR APRIL 1987 ANNUAL TOWN MEETING

At the Planning Board meeting held on January 12, 1987, the Board voted to submit the following zoning changes for consideration at the 1987 Annual Town Meeting:

1. 8.3 Parking and Loading Space Standards should be changed as follows:

8.3.1 All parking or loading area (see definition 2.1) are subject to the following:

8.3.1.a) There shall be no vehicle parking or loading spaced within 5 feet of any front, side or rear lot line.

8.3.1.b) There shall be no vehicle repair facilities within parking areas.

8.3.1.c) There shall be no storage of material or equipment within parking areas.

8.3.1.d) Parking shall not be located within the required front yard area in any "R" district, however, access driveways may be located within the required front yard area.

8.3.1.e) Parking and loading spaces shall be so arranged as not to permit backing of automobiles onto any street.

8.3.1.f) The area and access driveways in any "B", "B-I" and "I-E" zoning districts and "R-U" lots containing three or more units shall be surfaced with bituminous asphalt, concrete, brick, cobblestones or pavers and shall be constructed so that there shall be no puddling or surface water.

- 8.3.2 All parking or loading areas containing over five spaces, including automobile service and drive-in establishments, shall be contained within structures, or subject to the following additional requirements.
- 8.2.3.a) The area shall be effectively screened on each side which adjoins or faces the side or rear lot line of a lot situated in any "R" District. The Screening shall consist of that required for buffers as specified in Section 6, paragraphs 6.2.9 and 6.2.10. The screening shall be set back from each street no more than the main building wall minimum setback.
- 8.2.3.b) A substantial bumper of masonry, steel heavy timber or concrete curb stop shall be placed at the edge of surfaced areas except driveways in order to protect abutting structures, properties and sidewalks.
- 8.2.3.c) Any fixture used to illuminate an area shall be so arranged as to direct the light away from the street and away from adjoining premises used for residential purposes.
- 8.2.3.d) Any repair or service facility for use by vehicles such as gas, oil or water shall be at least 25 feet from any lot line.
- 8.2.3.e) No portion of any entrance or exit driveway to the area shall be closer than 150 feet to the centerline of an intersecting street. No more than two driveways shall serve any one area.
- 8.2.3.f) For any site having one means of access or egress, the width of the driveway shall not be less than 24 feet. For any site having a separate entrance or exit, the driveway shall not exceed 20 feet in width, except for a suitable curvature at the entrance.
- 8.2.3.g) Each Parking space shall be marked with a three-inch (3") wide (minimum) solid painted line on each side and along the full depth. Paint shall be white or yellow Traffic Paint as specified for pavement markings in Standard Specifications for Highways and Bridges for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Public Works.
2. Under SECTION 6.3 TABLE OF HEIGHT AND BULK REGULATIONS under "District" add "A" and under remaining headings add (See Section 5.5).
3. Under SECTION 6.2 TABLE OF AREA REGULATION NOTES - change from "3 feet on centers" to "6 feet on centers."
4. Under SECTION 6.3 TABLE OF HEIGHT AND BULK REGULATIONS change RU to Maximum Height (ft.) to 35 feet; Permitted Height (Stories) to $2\frac{1}{2}$; Maximum Floor Area Ratio Incl. Access. Buildings to 0.35; Minimum Usable Open Space, 20; Multifamily Dwelling Minimum Unit - Floor Area (sq. ft.) 500 except Public Housing for Elderly 450 sq. ft. Remove Note 6.3.4 and remove Section 6.3.4 from Bylaw.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
January 26, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

Others present: George Pyne, Gary Baxter and Don Leighton and Pine Street area residents; Steven Cohen, Richard Bryant, Robert Borrelli and Elaine Hegedus.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

LEDGEWOOD ACRES SUBDIVISION:

Chairman Parker opened the meeting by setting forth the guidelines; namely, Mr. Pyne and his engineers will have an opportunity to explain the modified plan of his subdivision; the Planning Board will ask questions of the developer. A public meeting will be held in the future which will be open for questions from the residents.

Mr. Pyne introduced Don Leighton, landscape architect, and Gary Baxter, engineer, to the Board. He said that the road had been reengineered and the amount of spoil that would have to be removed and the amount of blasting will be reduced. A road to the Kennedy land has been shown. The maximum grade is now 6%. Mr. Baxter showed the Board plans of street elevations and noted that after the redesign the number of lots has been reduced from 52 to 49 lots. The cutting, blasting and filling has been reduced.

Mr. Parker asked if this is a fully engineered plan or a conceptual plan.

Mr. Pyne said that it is a fully engineered plan.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if there were profiles.

Mr. Leighton said he had walked the site and has developed a site analysis. He stated that the roads have been changed so that they follow the contours of the land as much as possible, allowing a minimum of cutting and filling. The biggest problem was working with the grades and keeping within the 6% grade requirement. The site now has fewer lots and the layout is more respectful of the property. The road now goes around the hill, which was difficult with the road entering from Tamarack.

Mr. Baxter showed the Board profiles of the roads. He said that Millis Engineering took the layout and put in the road

grades. He said that Road A in the original plan had a 30-foot cut and the deepest cut now will be 18 1/2 feet. With the new road configuration it may be that no earth will have to be removed from the site. Mr. Baxter said that side slopes still need to be addressed.

Mrs. Bancroft asked what the effect of a large fill would be.

Mr. Baxter said there would be a 4-to-1 slope going into the lots.

Mr. Gagliani asked if sideslopes along the property lines have been addressed along the lots at the intersection of Emerson and Tamarack Roads.

Mr. Parker said that where access is an important issue, the accesses should be properly placed.

Mr. Baxter said that Millis Engineering has more research to do.

Mr. Gagliani asked if there should be one or two accesses to the Kennedy property.

Mr. Pyne said that two accesses would be no problem.

Mrs. Bancroft said that all streets must be constructed. The access roads cannot be left as paper streets. There is a question regarding the depth of lot 4.

Mr. Baxter said that the depth of lot 4 is 150 feet. If it does not meet the bylaw, the configuration of lot 3 could be changed so that lot 4 could be fine-tuned to meet the bylaw.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the foundations will be as much of a problem with the new plan which will minimize blasting.

Mr. Leighton said that the extra fill will be used around foundations and they will try to minimize the impact of the road in a fill situation. Our next presentation will have large scale drawings demonstrating those concerns and the concerns of the sideslope issue.

Mr. Codispoti asked what waiver will be required for the plan.

Mr. Leighton said that they are trying to keep to the radius requirements and the grade requirements within the confines of Medfield's Rules & Regulations.

Mr. Parker noted that someone mentioned the possibility of waiving sloping requirements.

Page 3
January 26, 1987

Mr. Pyne said that presently they were not requesting waivers. Everything shown to the Board tonight meets the Town's Regulations.

Mr. Parker asked if the capacity of the town's drainage system to handle the drainage from the site had been reviewed.

Mr. Baxter said that some calculations which have been made will add about 1/2" to the Pine Street brook. The existing pipe in Emerson Road is 15" and we might have to replace some of the pipeline in Emerson. This will be fully addressed at our next meeting.

Mr. Parker said that Superintendent Feeney does not wish to have detention basins.

Mr. Gagliani said he is concerned about a stream being raised 1/2" by development. It will have to be demonstrated that there will be no adverse problems from this.

Mr. Parker asked if Mr. Pyne and his engineer had met with the Water & Sewer Board.

Mr. Pyne said they will meet with the Water & Sewer Board when the plan has been completed.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if Mr. Pyne would consider doing a combination of walls and slopes.

Mr. Pyne said that if a wall is needed it will be constructed.

Mr. Leighton said they have done a lot of wall/sloping combinations.

Mr. Gagliani said that tree planting is required along the roads under the Town's new Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Pyne said he did not have a problem with that as they do that now.

Mr. Pyne will come back to the Board with a more complete plan in five or six weeks. He will request an extension from the Board to May 12, 1987, within which the Board must make its decision on the Ledgewood Acres Subdivision.

COHEN, 137 HARDING STREET:

Mr. Stephen Cohen said that he owns a 6-acre parcel at 137 Harding Street. He would like to divide the land into two lots, a two-acre parcel with the house and a lot for a new home on the 4-acre lot. Mr. Cohen said that frontage was his

problem. The Board said he would have to provide frontage on a public way. It could be done with a 90-foot diameter circle. However, the Board cautioned Mr. Cohen that he might have the same problem as the Toccis; namely, drainage in Pheasant Lane is overtaxed now. The Board could give no guarantee to Mr. Cohen that a one-house subdivision could be approved. The drainage calculations for this proposed one-house subdivision would be carefully scrutinized.

McCULLOUGH/BRYANT, 139 HARDING STREET:

Messrs. McCullough and Bryant met with the Board to discuss a 7-acre parcel of land owned by Richard Bryant. Mr. McCullough said he would like to develop five lots on an 800-foot cul de sac and asked the Board if they thought this was feasible.

Mr. Parker said it would be impossible for the Board to give an answer on this proposal until drainage information has been provided.

Mr. McCullough asked about detention basins.

Mr. Parker said that detention basins are not allowed in our Subdivision Rules and Superintendent Feeney does not like the town to be responsible for their upkeep.

Mr. McCullough said that he would need two waivers; one for the length of the cul de sac and the use of detention basins. The question of how the drainage is to be handled would also have to be solved.

CALL, HOSPITAL ROAD:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Town Administrator Sullivan with a copy of a letter from Sandra Call on Hospital Road stating that since the Hutson Pines Subdivision has been started she has had excess water on her lot and the water table has risen between three and five feet.

VOTED: To request that the Zoning Enforcing Officer review the site and report back to the Board on his findings as to what is causing the excess water on the Call lot.

CRANMORE ROAD:

Mr. Borrelli and Mrs. Hegedus met with the Board to discuss again the Cranmore Road wall. The question of the placement of the wall still remains. Mr. Borrelli would like to construct the wall in the 40-foot right of way as he does not have permission from the Hegedus's to work on their property. Mrs. Bancroft said she had talked with Superintendent of Streets Feeney and he has no problem with the wall in the public way.

Page 5
January 26, 1987

Mr. Brennan does not think the 40-foot right of way should be reduced to 39 feet as this reduces snow storage area and could cause a safety problem.

It was suggested that Mr. Borrelli purchase a one-foot strip of the Hegedus land so that the wall would not be the Hegedus' responsibility.

Mrs. Hegedus asked what protection from liability would they have.

MOVED: To approve Mr. Borrelli's plan for a cement wall within the public way.

The vote was recorded, Mrs. Bancroft and Mr. Gagliani in favor of the motion and Mr. Parker and Mr. Brennan in opposition, with Mr. Codispoti, abstaining as an abutter. The motion did not carry.

Mr. Parker said that when all the agreements and easements are submitted and the issues discussed, the Board will vote again.

Messrs. Fuller and Feeney will be invited to attend the Planning Board's February 2nd meeting.

TOWN REPORT:

The Planning Board Town Report was approved and will be submitted to the Selectmen.

REQUESTS FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS:

VOTED: To request \$2,592.00 for Aerial Photographs of the town.
To request \$6,000.00 for consulting fees.

LOWELL MASON ROAD:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan under Subdivision Control Not Required, drawn by Millis Engineering, dated January 15, 1987, showing four lots, with Lot 3B noted as "not a building lot."

VOTED: To sign the plan as above-described.
The plan was signed.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani, Secretary

)

1. The first part of the report is a general introduction to the subject of the study.

2. The second part of the report is a detailed description of the methods used in the study.

3. The third part of the report is a discussion of the results of the study.

)

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
February 2, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

Others attending: Malcolm Gibson, Tree Warden; Town Counsel Charles Fuller, Jr., and Superintendent of Streets Kenneth Feeney.

PUBLIC HEARING - SCENIC WAY REMOVAL OF TREES;

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 7:45 p.m. and requested that the reading of the notice which appeared in the newspaper be waived. Mr. Parker then called on the Tree Warden.

Tree Warden Gibson said that all the trees to be removed have been marked and are within the Town layout on Foundry and Nebo Streets. Foundry Street is a "Scenic Way." Mr. Gibson said that the trees to be removed are dead or almost dead and are dangerous to have at the road side.

Mrs. Bancroft said that as a resident of Foundry Street she doesn't object to the removal of the trees currently marked for removal.

VOTED: To allow the removal of the following trees on Foundry Street:

7 ash opposite pole 3-5; 2 ash pole 5-6; 1 maple pole 8-9 and 1 ash on Nebo Street opposite pole 20.

The hearing was closed at 8:00 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING:

Chairman Parker called the Planning Board meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

CRANMORE ROAD:

The Board invited Town Counsel Fuller and Superintendent Feeney to attend the meeting to discuss liability and safety regarding the construction of a wall eight feet in height and 85 feet in length on Cranmore Road.

Regarding liability Town Counsel said that walls and fences are like any other possession; that is, if someone is hurt due to negligence, the owner is liable.

Mr. Parker said that the question to be resolved is the location of the wall.

Page 2
February 2, 1987

Superintendent Feeney said that the wall is necessary and suggested that it be placed within the town layout.

Town Counsel Fuller stated that there is a series of cases under municipal law which would allow a wall within a street layout if it doesn't impede traffic.

Mr. Brennan said that this would be a precedent and is not an isolated case. He was also concerned with the problem of snow storage if the layout were reduced to 39 feet.

Town Counsel said that a construction easement would be necessary to construct the wall and that the town would acquire the responsibility of maintaining the wall when the street is accepted by the Town Meeting.

Mr. Brennan said that the wall should be the responsibility of the town but maintained that it should be on the back of the property line, with the face of the wall at the layout line.

Chairman Parker asked if, prior to the Planning Board approving this plan, it should be satisfied that the proper easements on private property have been obtained by the developer to build the wall.

Town Counsel reminded the Board that, until such time as the town takes the road, none of it is the town's - including the wall. If the town does not acquire title to the easements and the property is sold, the purchaser could ask that the foundation of the wall be removed and then there would be trouble.

Mr. Brennan said that the problem and solution is between Mr. Borrelli and Mr. Hegedus.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Hegedus' want to be protected and they want their property to be protected.

Mr. Parker reiterated that the problem is between the Hegedus' and Mr. Borrelli and asked that Mr. Borrelli come back to the Board with his solution to the placement of the wall.

Town Counsel Fuller asked if there is a consensus regarding the concept of having a wall.

The Board is in agreement that a wall should be constructed.

Mr. Borrelli will discuss the purchase of a one-foot wide piece of land at least 85 feet in length with the Hegedus's and report back to the Board.

PONDVIEW ESTATES:

Town Counsel Fuller reported that the bank wants to make an inspection of Pondview and determine what is necessary to complete the roads.

A question was raised as to whether the road should be completed at this time as all the houses are not constructed and there will be additional wear and tear on the roads.

Town Counsel Fuller said when this matter was referred to him, it was to have the construction of the ways and municipal services completed.

Mr. Parker recommended that the bank proceed with the completion of the work as soon as possible. There was a consensus of the Board that this be done.

HICKORY DRIVE - SNOW REMOVAL:

As a result of a problem with Hickory Drive, Superintendent Feeney asked if the Board could require that a feasible snow removal program be approved for a subdivision before lots are released for building.

Town Counsel Fuller said that the requirement would have to be in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations in order to be enforceable and would not apply to subdivisions already submitted or approved.

The Board will consider this when revising the Subdivision Rules.

GEORGETOWN ESTATES - EARTH REMOVAL:

Superintendent Feeney asked if the Board could recommend changing the Earth Removal Bylaw to disallow removal of spoil below the current grade of the area. He said that Mr. Basile had received an earth removal permit and dug a pit so deep that his equipment got stuck and he buried stumps and other types of debris in the pit.

The Board will consider this suggestion when revising the Zoning Bylaw.

DESIGNATION OF ZONING LINE:

Chairman Parker asked Mr. Fuller if there was any "legal" way to determine a description on the zoning map. Mr. Fuller said that in general districts follow property lines or it is indicated on the map how many feet back from the street the change in zone is.

Page 4
February 2, 1987

Mrs. Willis was asked to research the property at the corner of Brook and Main Streets where the BI and RU zones abut to determine how far from Main Street the zone change is indicated.

MINUTES: VOTED: To accept the minutes of November 3, 10, 17 24; December 1, 8, 15; January 5, 12, and 26th.

CURVE STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Board reviewed Plan of Land in Medfield, owned by Dorothy Donahue, dated January 27, 1987, drawn by Guerriere & Halnon, Inc., Franklin.

VOTED: To sign the plan.

The vote was recorded four in favor with Mr. Brennan abstaining.

The plan was signed.

VILLAGE ROAD:

The Board is in receipt of a request from Ruth Bridge to change Village Road to Village Drive. As it is such a short street, the Board suggested that "Village Way" would be more suitable.

Mrs. Willis will contact Miss Bridge regarding this matter.

INDIAN ACRES:

The Board questioned whether the culvert under North Street had been constructed. If not, this would make a difference in the surety to be set. This matter will be checked with Kenneth Feeney.

DEERFIELD DRIVE SURETY REDUCTION:

The Board is in receipt of Mr. Marholin's December 23, 1986 letter requesting a reduction in surety. Since the receipt of the letter, cards have been signed for the completion of work.

VOTED: To release surety in the amount of \$93,000 in exchange for a bank book and assignment in the amount of \$50,000.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
John K. Gagliani, Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
February 19, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Parker, Codispoti, Gagliani, and Brennan.

Others attending: Gary MacDonald and Joseph Avis, representing HOP; Edward Beard and Richard Merrikin.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Parker at 8:00 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

HOP COMMITTEE RE REZONING:

Messrs. Gary MacDonald and Joseph Avis met with the Board to obtain support for the article in the Town Meeting Warrant to rezone lots 141 and 142 on Map 42 so that both lots, totalling 3 1/2 acres, will be entirely within the RU Zoning District.

Gary MacDonald, Chairman of the HOP Committee, said that the committee is recommending 20 units of moderate income housing be constructed on combined lots 141 and 142.

Mrs. Bancroft suggested that the site could be designed to have a street with six single-family houses on 12,000 s.f. lots and seven town houses on one lot in the rear.

Mr. Codispoti asked what the process is assuming the zoning is changed.

Mr. MacDonald said that after the zoning is changed the committee will come in with concrete plans for the development of the area. They did not wish to turn the project over to developers. The details of the process are not yet known.

Mr. Codispoti asked if any other towns had this type of program.

Mr. MacDonald said that the town of Concord was doing an area of 145 units divided among market, moderate and low cost housing. Lincoln is doing something similar.

Mr. Parker asked who will ultimately decide on the guidelines for this project.

Mr. MacDonald said he felt that the Selectmen will follow the recommendations of the committee.

Mr. Parker asked if this housing will permanently be in the so-called "moderate range."

February 19, 1987

Page 2

Mr. Avis said that a deed restriction will keep it for 50 years. If the units are sold at 70% of market value, they have to be resold at 70%. The units are for first time buyers only.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if they had had any comments from people who live on Dale Street.

Mr. MacDonald said they had not.

Mr. MacDonald said that the reason for changing zoning is not for a specific development, but for the basic concept and asked for Planning Board support on the zoning change.

MARK LORETT - NORTH STREET:

A preliminary site plan and a check in the amount of \$200 were filed with the Planning Board and an application was filed with the Town Clerk.

MOVED AND SECONDED:

That Mark Loret's application for Site Plan approval which was received on February 18, 1987, not be accepted by the Planning Board as it does not comply with Section 14.13.3 of the Zoning Bylaw and that we so notify the Town Clerk and Mr. Loret.

A question was raised as to whether the Board could reject an application or if they would have to hold a hearing and review the plan.

VOTED: To discuss the matter with Town Counsel and to the above motion until after any information is received from Town Counsel.

Town Counsel will be invited to meet with the Board to discuss this matter on Monday, February 23rd, at 7:30 p.m.

SOUTH STREET - 55-ACRE SUBDIVISION:

Messrs. Edward Beard and Richard Merrikin met with the Board to discuss a Sketch Plan on a 55-acre parcel of land off South Street and Westview Road.

The reason for the pre-preliminary phase discussion is to answer some of Messrs. Beard and Merrikin's questions. Mr. Beard said that the problem with the subdivision is getting to the flat land on top. Mr. Merrikin said that the road is a loop system and asked the Board's opinion on its configuration. He said that the deepest cuts will be 15 feet. Mr. Beard will bring the sewer from Route 27 to this subdivision. Forty-three house lots are proposed.

February 19, 1987
Page 3

The Board felt that there should be two points of access for this subdivision.

Mr. Merrikin said that there was no satisfactory second access and asked if an "emergency-type" access would be permitted as a second access.

The Board asked Mr. Merrikin to investigate the connection to Westview Road.

Mr. Brennan asked where the drainage would go.

Mr. Merrikin said the drainage would go into street drainage pipes which would go under South Street and overland to the Charles River. The Board would like to walk the land with Messrs. Beard and Merrikin.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that consideration be given to put a curve in the straight section of road at the top of the hill.

Mr. Codispoti asked if blasting would be a big issue and asked what type of removal of earth or excavation is anticipated.

Mr. Merrikin said that as an alternative to deep cuts, they may be looking for a waiver for street slopes.

OLDE MEDFIELD SQUARE:

The Board brought to Mr. Beard's attention that the Police Chief thought that "Olde Medfield Square" was a confusing name. Mr. Beard said that he had registered the name and it was part of the condominium company name and it is impossible for him to change it.

HIGH STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield dated September 29, 1987, drawn by Norwood Engineering Company, on land owned by Peter Fickeisen.

VOTED: To sign the above described plan.

The plan was signed.

GREEN STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield, dated February 2, 1987, drawn by George N. Giunta, Needham, owned by Howard A. Mills et ux.

February 19, 1987

Page 4

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan with the addition of the phrase "No determination has been made as to the compliance of this plan with local Zoning Bylaws."

The plan was signed.

DONNELLY DRIVE - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT RECEIVED:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield & Dover, dated January 29, 1987, by George N. Giunta, Needham MA, owned by Robert Crowell.

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan with the addition of the phrase "No determination has been made as to the compliance of this plan with local Zoning Bylaws."
The plan was signed.

INDIAN ACRES:

The Board is in receipt of a report from Whitman & Howard regarding the Indian Acres subdivision, including the culvert to be constructed under North Street.

VOTED: To set surety at \$220,000 to release lots 1 through 16 on Wheelwright Road.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani,
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
February 23, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

Others attending: Nancy Wolcott, Ralph Good, and others for Wolcott hearing David MacCready, Robert Borrelli.

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

LORETT APPLICATION:

Mr. Parker reported he had talked with Town Counsel Fuller regarding the Board's concern about accepting the Loretta Special Permit application. Mr. Fuller said that there is no provision in the State Law that allows the application to be rejected.

On the application it says "Site Plan Approvals," but the fee submitted was for a preliminary plan. In the subdivision process Town Counsel Fuller has recently had a Court Case that ruled an incomplete application was not sufficient ground on which to reject a plan.

The next major question was interpreting Section 6 of the Zoning Act to determine whether or not the site would be grandfathered if the Town Meeting voted a zoning change. The Board agreed with the interpretation that the special permit must be ISSUED prior to the first publication of the intended zoning change, or the plan would not be sufficient.

Mr. Loretta is scheduled to meet with the Board on March 2nd and the Board will explain the procedure and his options regarding this submission.

SNOW REMOVAL PROBLEMS:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from the Selectmen dated February 4, 1987, requesting that a safeguard be made a part of the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations which would require a developer to make the roads passable from the time they are required for access to lots, and to consider that occupancy permits be withheld until the roads are complete to protect future residents.

The Board will consult with Town Counsel as to where this requirement should be in the Subdivision Rules.

Mr. Brennan will check the DPW standards and the suggestion was made that the Board should consider including DPW standards for passable roads during construction.

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

At the request of the Bridges, the Board:

VOTED: To allow the change of the name "Village Road" to "Village Way" and to so inform the Bridges.

ROCKY ACRES:

Chairman Parker called the continuation of the Rocky Acres Subdivision hearing to order at 8:00 p.m.

VOTED: To continue the hearing to March 23, 1987.

PUBLIC HEARING - WOLCOTT SUBDIVISION:

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 8:05 p.m. and requested the applicant to explain the changes made on his plan.

Attorney Ralph Good introduced himself as attorney for Mrs. Wolcott.

It was Attorney Good's understanding that the applicant, through her engineer, has endeavored to answer all concerns resulting from the Whitman & Howard review and abutters questions.

Mr. Gagliani noted that notices of the continued hearing were sent to all direct abutters.

Sidney Vaughan explained that this was a six-lot subdivision with sewers, drains and water. The only question remaining is the depth dimension of Lot 7. The method used by Mrs. Wolcott's engineer was the "normal to the street line method." Using this method, this lot has approximately 126+ average depth. Mr. Vaughan felt that the definition for the determination of lot depth in the Zoning Bylaw should be clarified.

Mr. Vaughan said he had read in the newspaper that Mr. O'Connell felt that his sewerage disposal system would suffer somewhat from possible drainage from the proposed subdivision. Mr. Vaughan recommended that his client purchase a piece of land from Mr. O'Connell and in return he could be allowed a sewer connection. This would give the subdivision a lot with 125 feet in depth and give Mr. O'Connell a sewer connection. Mr. Vaughan went on to say that the drainage has been balanced so that no more drainage will go into the Pound Street drain than it was designed to hold. Dr. Carr said the drainage as proposed was sufficient to handle the subdivision and it was the best possible way to drain the subdivision. Mr. Vaughan said that they had taken

Page 3
February 23, 1987

six deep test pits to determine the water table, which are shown on the plan.

Mr. Brennan said the logical way to interpret the depth of a lot is to measure the shortest distance from the front to back of the lot. That is the indication of how deep the lot is.

Mrs. Bancroft asked Mr. Vaughan to show how the drainage would be changed on the O'Connell's property. Mr. Vaughan pointed out that the low point was on Mrs. Wolcott's land.

He said that the pipe had been extended on the plan. It would be placed in crushed stone. There is no maintenance for an underdrain.

If the underdrain is constructed correctly, the velocity of the incoming water is slowed to where no fine sand can be brought into the stone.

Mr. Parker asked how sensitive this drainage area would be to any changes being made by a property owner ten days from now.

Mr. Vaughan agreed that the only guarantee to keep the drain for the future is to require an easement. A person could come in and put a lot of clay material on the slope and move the low point to the property line.

Mr. Parker read the Whitman & Howard Report dated January 29th, which stated that the drainage as designed is adequate and meets Planning Board standards.

Mr. Gagliani asked how far onto the Rogers' and Mullock's property a 4-to-1 slope would go. Mr. Vaughan said that there will be a little truncation of a slope back about eight feet on the Rogers' property.

However, on the Mullock property it will be necessary to go back approximately 21 feet to conform to the 4-to-1 sloping standards.

Mrs. Bancroft asked what the total difference in elevation will be.

Mr. Vaughan said there will be a four-foot drop, which at a 4-to-1 slope will go back about 20 feet onto the Mullock lot.

Mr. Gagliani asked how the five-foot easement on the west side of the road would be used.

Mr. Vaughan said it would be a utility easement for the purpose of putting in trees, however, the utilities will be under the sidewalk.

Page 4
February 23, 1987

Under the new regulations only 45 feet of layout are needed, with the exception of the tree planting.

Mr. Gagliani asked what right the town would have in the future over that easement.

Mr. Vaughan said they could not pave it, but they could bring a curb line right to it.

Attorney Good said the problem on lot 7 is in the methodology of measuring depth. Section 5.26 of the Zoning Bylaw discusses frontage, width and area but does not mention depth. The abutters allude to the historical action of the Planning Board in approving a 45-foot wide layout in 1983 and to suggest that this Board require a 50-foot street instead of a 45-foot street is inconsistent.

Mr. Good said that Mrs. Wolcott's subdivision would not prove detrimental to Mr. O'Connell's situation. Ultimately the drainage would be improved. Mrs. Wolcott would be willing to give an easement so the O'Connell's could have a sewer connection.

Mr. Vaughan said if lot 7 does not have the average depth by eliminating the property line between lots 7 and 8 there still would not be proper depth.

Mr. Gagliani said there was no guarantee in 1983 that the 45-foot wide road could be continued.

Mr. Good agreed that there was no explicit guarantee, however, he felt the matter left everyone with the opinion that there was going to be a 45-foot wide street to service lot 3.

Mr. Parker said the Board's job now is to act on the application before us.

Letters from the O'Tooles, Lamberts and O'Connells were read.

Mrs. O'Connell said her position is that she does not wish to have a 45-foot wide roadway or a 500-foot cul de sac as she felt it would be precedent-setting.

Mrs. Bancroft said she had done an analysis of the size of the lots in the area and there is a mixture of lot sizes; however, the zoning is for 20,000 s.f. lots.

Mrs. O'Connell said she had done an analysis of the lot sizes and the average lot is 35,000 s.f.

Mr. Parker noted that, this area is zoned for 20,000 s.f. lots. The applicant is seeking waivers for the width of

Page 5
February 23, 1987

layout and the length of cul de sac, which the Planning Board is allowed to grant under the law.

Mrs. O'Connell felt that this would have a detrimental effect on the area.

Mr. Mullock, 37 Pound Street, was concerned about the effect of the proposed sloping of his land and the possibility of additional flooding as a result.

Mr. Vaughan said that no more water would go onto the Mullock's property.

Mrs. Mullock said she would prefer a stonewall instead of the 4-to-1 slope.

Mr. Parker noted that if there were an alternative design that was more satisfactory to the Mullocks, the Board would be glad to review it and suggested that this matter be discussed between Mr. Mullock and Mrs. Wolcott.

Mr. Parker said the drainage issue has been discussed and has been reviewed by the town's engineer and the Board's obligation to the abutters is that the problem be made no worse. It has been demonstrated by this plan that there will be no more water at any greater rate than is currently flowing onto abutting properties.

Mr. Vaughan said Mr. Domey, agent for the Board of Health, has told him that the water now is as high as he has seen it.

Edith O'Toole, John and Irene O'Toole, Richard Rogers, Mrs. O'Connell, Mr. & Mrs. Mullock, and Mr. Ferullo asked to be recorded as opposed to the 45-foot road. Mr. Smick of Pine Street said he would prefer to see fewer waivers granted.

Mrs. O'Connell asked how the change in the plans is going to alleviate her concerns about her basement, septic system and puddling on her property.

Mr. Vaughan said the Board had asked him to complete the 181-foot contour line. He said he had gone onto the O'Connell property approximately 50 feet and obtained an elevation of 186.6 at the top of the foundation. This would make the cellar floor at approximately elevation 180. The drainage pipe is 179.4. If the sewer were to be extended to the property, the sewer connection would come in at about 177.

Mr. Parker explained that the Board's responsibility is to assure that no more water at any faster rate will come from Mrs. Wolcott's property.

Page 6
February 23, 1987

Mrs. Wolcott felt that six lots could be made to conform to the zoning but the configuration would not be as satisfactory as the plan presented.

Mr. Brennan felt that everything is being pushed just a little to make the maximum density fit. Mrs. Bancroft agreed.

Mrs. Wolcott presented the Board with a written request to extend the time within which the Board must make its decision to April 7, 1987.

VOTED: To grant the requested extension to April 7, 1987.

The hearing was continued to March 23, 1987 at 9:30 p.m.

INDIAN ACRES:

The Board is in receipt of Home National Bank of Milford Certificate No. 04894-8 in the amount of \$220,000 and assignment for release of lots 1-16 in the Indian Acres Subdivision.

VOTED: To accept the above-described surety and release lots 1-16 in Indian Acres.

CRANMORE ROAD WALL:

Mr. Codispoti removed himself from the Board on this discussion.

Mr. Borrelli met with the Board but he did not have with him a signed contract with the Hegedus' regarding working on their property. The Board requested that he obtain permission in writing and return to the Board with that document.

EQUESTRIAN PARK:

Mr. Borrelli met with the Board to discuss the Equestrian Park subdivision which has not been built because of problems with drainage to the Mine Brook well field.

Mr. Borrelli asked if a detention basin would be approved by the Board. The Board did not assure him that it would. The Board requested that Mr. Borrelli submit the plan and then the Board would take action.

Page 7
February 23, 1987

DEERFIELD DRIVE:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Michael Marholin requesting that a detailed breakdown of how the surety was computed be forwarded to him.

VOTED: To send a letter containing a detailed breakdown as requested.

WOODEND LANE:

In accordance with a request from the owner of lot 122 Woodend Lane, it was:

VOTED: To sign a release from the covenant for lot 122 Woodend Lane.

CALL - HOSPITAL ROAD:

The Board has received a request from the Selectmen to engage the Board's engineer to review a drainage problem for the property at 12 Hospital Road.

VOTED: To send a letter to the Selectmen stating that the Board has asked the building inspector to review this situation and if he doesn't have the wherewithal to do it, he could engage Whitman & Howard. The Planning Board has no funds in its budget to settle a dispute between two individuals.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani,
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
March 2, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.
Others attending: Messrs. Borrelli and Hegedus; Mrs. Wolcott, Attorney Good and others regarding the Wolcott Subdivision.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

LORETT - SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATION:

Mark Lorette had called earlier in the day and requested that he meet with the Planning Board at a later date regarding his application for a special permit to construct additional multi-family units on his lot as shown on Assessors Map 49, Lot 77.

LEDGETREE ROAD LAYOUT:

The Planning Board is in receipt of a public hearing notice regarding the layout of Ledgetree Road from Station 0+20 to 11+23.04.

VOTED: That the Board recommend that Ledgetree Road from Station 0+20 to 11+23.04 be laid out and noted that an easement for the detention basin on lots 9 and 10 should be included.

VOTED: To release Bay Bank Acct. No. 9003261 in the amount of \$60,000 in exchange for surety in the amount of \$6,500.

SIGN ADVISORY BOARD:

VOTED: To appoint Newton Thompson to the Sign Advisory Board for the term ending January 15, 1990.

VOTED: To send a letter of thanks to Helen Weinert who has served on the Sign Advisory Board since its inception in 1977.

MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE:

Mrs. Bancroft reported that the MPIC had met and will create a data base file on the computer for all categories of open space for each parcel as information to assist with the Open Space report.

Page 2
March 2, 1987

Mrs. Bancroft will ask the MPIC Chairman, Connie Jones, for the name of a candidate to fill the one opening on that committee.

DEERFIELD DRIVE SURETY:

The Board responded to Mr. Marholin's letter of February 5, 1987, and:

VOTED: To send a letter to Michael Marholin itemizing the costs for the completion of Deerfield Drive as of January 5th with additional work signed off on Construction Cards on January 9 and 16, 1987.

COHEN - HARDING STREET:

The Planning Board is in receipt of a letter from Steven Cohen requesting the Board's support for his application to the Board of Appeals for a variance from the Town's frontage requirement.

VOTED: To send a letter to the Board of Appeals stating that serious drainage problem in the Pheasant Lane area and additional paved surfaces adjacent to that subdivision will aggravate the existing problem. There has recently been a subdivision plan submitted and denied because of the existing drainage problem downstream.

AERIAL PHOTOS OF MEDFIELD:

VOTED: To authorize John Wagner to purchase for the Town of Medfield a set of aerial photos at 100' = 1" scale, in sheets 40"x45", flown in the spring of 1986, at a cost not-to-exceed \$2,593.

SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS:

The Board will be discussing additional changes to the Subdivision Rules & Regulations at their March 16th meeting. One of the items to be included is a plan for removing snow to allow reasonable access to properties during construction.

Dan Nye's suggestion for the continuation of sidewalks will also be a topic for discussion.

Dan Nye, Roy Boudette and Kenneth Feeney will be invited to the meeting.

PHILIP STREET LAYOUT:

Before an answer is given to the Selectmen, the Planning

Page 3
March 2, 1987

Board will check into the history of the Philip Street layout.

CRANMORE ROAD WALL:

Messrs. Hegedus and Borrelli met with the Board; however, no agreement had been reached between the two regarding the wall.

Mr. Hegedus would like assurance from the Board that he would not have any legal or maintenance expenses as a result of the wall that Mr. Borrelli must build.

Mr. Parker said that the Board cannot give any such assurance, as the wall is being built by Mr. Borrelli. It is required that the wall be built to town specifications so that the town may be able to accept the wall if it is so voted by Town Meeting.

Mr. Hegedus asked for something in writing from the Board that the construction and design of the wall is satisfactory.

Mr. Brennan stated that the Board has a plan which has been signed by a Registered Engineer, which means that it is structurally adequate.

Mr. Parker said that ultimately the easement on the property will revert to the town and in the interim Mr. Hegedus should accept an agreement with Mr. Borrelli so that Mr. Borrelli should accept all responsibility for the wall. He said that the Board checked with Town Counsel and he said that liability is connected with ownership.

Mr. Hegedus asked why the town doesn't permit Mr. Borrelli to put the wall in the town layout, making the 40-foot layout 39 feet.

Mr. Brennan said that this would take away a portion of the layout that is needed for snow storage among other things.

Mr. Hegedus said he will discuss this matter with his attorney in light of information received tonight. He said that current and continuing liability is his hangup.

EQUESTRIAN PARK ESTATES:

Mr. Borrelli presented the Board with a preliminary plan of Equestrian Park Estates. The Board will send the plan to Whitman & Howard for their comments.

Page 4
March 2, 1987

WOLCOTT SUBDIVISION:

Mrs. Wolcott and Attorney Good met with the Board to discuss her plan which has been re-engineered for five lots. The extra land will be attached to the Main Street house. She said that the length of the street had been reduced as a result of changing from a six-lot to a five-lot subdivision.

Mrs. Wolcott suggested that a waiver on the diameter of the cul de sac be allowed. The pavement will be the same, but the layout would be less.

Mr. Brennan asked what the advantage of change the layout would be. Mrs. Wolcott said she was trying to reduce the length of the road.

Attorney Good said that the abutters were opposed to the 45-foot wide layout and the length of the cul de sac. Nothing can be done about the layout width and it is felt that the density issue has been answered.

Mr. Parker said that the previous Planning Board has granted the design of the beginning of this subdivision and to continue it is only a logical conclusion.

The hearing on this plan is continued to March 23rd.

VOUCHERS:

VOTED: To sign vouchers totalling \$2,280.39.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
March 9, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani,
and Parker.

Others attending: Mr. Rhoads; residents interested in zoning
hearings.

REZONING FROM RS TO RU FOR HOP PROGRAM:

The public hearing was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by
Chairman Parker. Secretary Gagliani read the notice as it
appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS on February 19 and 26, 1987.

Mr. Parker said that the purpose of this meeting is to hear
testimony on a zoning change. This is a required public
hearing under Chapter 40A. The Board will listen to views in
favor or in opposition to the change.

The Planning Board will ask questions of the petitioner. If
there are other letters from Town Boards they will be heard
or read. Questions and comments will be heard from all who
wish to comment.

Gary MacDonald is Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee which has
been formed to see if Medfield should participate in the HOP
program. The group has given a letter to the Selectmen
stating that the Town should participate in the HOP program,
using Lots 141 and 142 on Assessors Map 42 located on Dale
Street. The group has recommended that not more than 20
units be constructed there. A rezoning is needed for a
portion of lot 142 and all of lot 141 from RS to RU.

John Gagliani is a member of the HOP committee and wished to
remove himself from the Planning Board on this matter.

Mr. Codispoti asked what other areas in town were
investigated by the committee.

Mr. MacDonald said the land across from the State Hospital
was looked at. There were deed restrictions which could not
be overcome using that land. There were several lots looked
at and this one was probably the land of least resistance to
the town. It is an ideal location.

Mr. Parker asked if any gathering of facts on the impacts at
this development was done..the density of housing..the
roadway..the traffic.

Page 2
March 9, 1987

Mr. MacDonald said that it abuts and part of it is in the RU zone now. It backs up to the town garage. There would be little or no impact there. Water and sewer are readily available. One concern is the relocation of the victory gardens which are presently there. The group is looking for new locations for the gardens.

Mrs. Bancroft asked how he would envisage the impact, assuming maximum development of the site? How he would see that kind of dense residential use with the town garage use which is immediately adjacent.

Mr. MacDonald felt that the closeness to the town garage would not pose any serious problems. A natural barrier of trees could be planted or a fence could be erected. The town garage is accessed from Route 27. The HOP area would be accessed from Dale Street.

Mrs. Bancroft brought attention to the fact that in the winter there is a lot of activity through the night. Currently there is no one to complain. If you had a residential development right there, suddenly you find something that was an accepted presence before, might become a nuisance issue. It is one element to consider.

Mr. MacDonald said he felt that most of the people who will participate in this program will willingly put up with the noise.

Mr. Brennan asked if Mr. MacDonald could tell us a little bit about the program. If the town agrees to rezone, would the town then offer the land for sale to the participants?

Mr. MacDonald said after the land is rezoned, we would develop a plan that would fully utilize the area. Whether or not the town would act as a general contractor or a separate entity would be established to act as the temporary owner of the land, we aren't sure yet. We have to sit down with Town Counsel and see how that will be done. None of the land will be sold until the plan is complete. Some kind of lottery will be devised. How we use the local preference option has not yet been decided.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if all multi-family were anticipated and brought to the meeting's attention that RU could have single family houses on 12,000 s.f. lots. It seems that the area has been developed as a single-family area.

Mr. MacDonald said he thought it would be one of two ways - either all town houses which would maximize the number of units that could be put into the area - or a mix of town houses and single family houses.

Page 3
March 9, 1987

Mrs. Bancroft asked who makes the ultimate decision if this is accepted by the town.

Mr. MacDonald said he believed the Selectmen have the ultimate decision.

Mrs. Thompson, Board of Selectmen, said it would be necessary to get proposals from various developers. We have decided not to go higher than 20 units.

Mr. MacDonald said they wish to maximize use of the land but don't want to create an eyesore or anything out of character with the immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Parker asked if this zoning change is passed at Town Meeting and the town puts in the program, will 100% of the lots be in the program or will some of it be on a market basis.

Mr. MacDonald said he would hope that all the units would be for moderate income housing.

Mr. Parker said no requirement that you have a portion at market value... it can all be moderate if you can work out the economics.

Mr. Parker asked if any Town Boards were here tonight and asked for their input.

Robert Larkin, 19 Eric Road, Chairman of Board of Selectmen; The Commonwealth has \$100,000,000 set aside for housing. We will have 20 units. The change in zoning would be consistent with the other houses in the area and we do not think this will be an impact on the area. There is already water, sewer and sidewalks. We think it would be a good place for affordable housing. Will it be available for some of the citizens of Medfield? Will it be available for some of the Town employees such as firemen, police and highway?

Mr. MacDonald said obviously all the participants would have a very strong tie to Medfield. We don't have the power in deciding who the target groups will be. I believe that a portion will be designated for firemen, EMT's and police. I am not sure what the criteria will be yet. There is a minority requirement. The percentage will be between 8% and 10% of the units dedicated to minorities.

Mr. Larkin said he thought the housing program is a good start for the Town of Medfield. He felt that 20 units in the area will be good. The Board of Selectmen voted unanimously to approve the zoning change from RS to RU.

Mrs. Ann Thompson, Board of Selectmen and Member of HOP: One

Page 4
March 9, 1987

of the reasons we felt strongly about Dale Street is because of its easy access to town. The families that live in moderate housing will not be two- or three-car families. The wives will be walking. It is easy access to the library, the bus, emergency services, etc., and that is why targetting of the town center is of prime importance.

Mr. Brennan asked if any sites for the relocation of the gardens had been discussed.

Mrs. Thompson said that the ground around Wheelock, Dale and Memorial Schools could be used. The community gardens are popular and we would not like to drop them.

Mr. Gagliani: As good planning for the town we need an area for this program which would have sewer and water available and be in the proximity of the schools. The rezoning of this land is a town-sponsored project. The Town has more control over how the site is developed and surely the Planning Board would support rezoning for this program.

Mr. Parker asked if anyone in the program looked into whether there are any problems with the land because of its previous use. The Board of Health should be contacted for this.

Mr. MacDonald said he had spoken with the Massachusetts Department of Health. They did not think there would be any problem.

Mr. Parker suggested that by Town Meeting it would be good to research the question and, if you have a Board of Health problem, it could be unfortunate. We tried to find out today, but it was too short a time.

Mr. MacDonald said that the area was never used as a dump. Edith Beale said that if people could eat vegetables and other produce it must be safe.

Mr. Parker noted that as a basic question perhaps this area eventually would be enlarged back towards the town garage and the dump. I would like to know how suitable that entire site is. It seems it is an ideal place to develop this type of houses.

Richard Denton, 14 Arnold Drive: I would like to address the question on multi-family dwellings in the area. I am an abutter to a multi-family complex in my area. I have high praise for it.

Mrs. Beale: There are state funds available. How are they available to this program?

Page 5
March 9, 1987

Mr. Larkin: The governor has established a fund of \$100,000,000 and the legislature has provided \$15,000,000. The state will come out and oversee and loan money accordingly. They will loan money to the developer. The main reason the legislature hasn't provided more funds is that they have not been requested to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: There was \$200,000,000 to subsidize the interest. This would allow anybody within a certain income level the 5 1/2% interest and the rest to 8 1/2% - 9% or 2 - 2 1/2% below local market rates. There is another \$5,000,000 for developmental costs.

Mr. Gagliani: I would like to speak in favor of the zoning change. There would not be a large impact on the town but would serve a grand purpose.

Hearing was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING - ZONING CHANGE:

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 8:30 p.m. Secretary Gagliani read the notice. Chairman Parker then called on the petitioner to make his presentation.

Mr. Albert Menard and his wife Terry: We have lived in town for 30 years. We are against building multi-family dwellings. The town has been overdeveloped over the past 40 years. We also believe that all new development would increase the traffic in our area. Also, from the standpoint of accessibility, it will be harder to get to these fires. A lot of this area doesn't have sidewalks. At some time in the near future they will have to stop building in this area. It seems to me if you are going to build multi-family units, they should be in the RS Zone where there is more room.

Mr. Richard DeSorgher: A couple of things on the reason that this came about: There are two articles: One tonight, the other next Monday. The first of the articles covers a very large area. I have some problems myself with the way the article is written because you take such a very large area. I have one general question to ask the Planning Board. My own property is less than 20,000 s.f. If this were to pass we would be OK as grandfathered. Every time I wished to do anything, would I have to go to the Board of Appeals?

Mr. Parker: We have taken Chapter 40A and consulted with Town Counsel and we have an opinion for you. Mrs. Bancroft will tell you a little bit about what she has found out.

Mrs. Bancroft: The state Zoning Law protects any existing lot from zoning change forever for all dimensional requirements. If the zoning change is from RU to RS, the lot

will be under the RU dimensional rules forever. This would be for frontage, depth, width, etc. Parking, etc., which is not a dimensional category, would be subject to the new regulations of the district. Basically all the existing lots would be protected - single and two-family only.

Mr. DeSorgher: There would be no problem even though the lot is less than 20,000 s.f.

Mrs. Bancroft: That is correct. There are approximately 200 parcels of land and of those 200 parcels, 14 would comply with the zoning if it were changed. All the red marks indicate lots which are at present two-family or multi-family units. There are 29 multi- or two-family units.

Mr. DeSorgher: Because of the nature of the property, the petitioner does not want to infringe on someone's rights. They are not trying to be difficult. Certainly if I had a piece of land, I would want to use it. In looking at one piece of property for multi-family use, all the yards which surround it are small capes and ranches which have been there since 1949 and 1951. It would change the entire nature of the neighborhood. This is a residential area similar to other neighborhoods in the town. The house lots and houses are small. People have lived there 30 and 40 years and have raised their families there. They have concerns because of the distance between their homes and the lot line. To put in 12 condominiums would change the area. That is how this zoning proposal came about. This isn't a neighborhood in relation to the RU. Along North Street there are much larger homes. This was built as the first subdivision in town and it was as single family homes. The area is surrounded by RS from Pine Street to Summer Street and across the street on North Street. A couple of problems which the petitioners face: one is that they had a concern that lots be 20,000 s.f. The lot next to them was subdivided into two lots - one 12,000 and the other 8,000 to add onto the adjacent land. When this hearing took place in January, am I correct that there was no need to notify abutters on that?

Mr. Parker: Anyone who owns a property if they have proper lot area and frontage may request the Planning Board to sign such a plan. The State Law specifies this very clearly.

Mr. DeSorgher: Is it the Planning Board's job to notify abutters? If not, could they notify abutters?

Mr. Parker: It is not required and we only have two weeks to sign the plan or reject it or it is automatically approved. It is difficult to meet the two-week deadline.

Mrs. Bancroft: It is not a discretionary matter.

Mr. DeSorgher: We are beginning to see around town objections being raised to build on marginal land. There has to be some way to avoid this. My own preference is the article coming up next week. There has to be some way to protect residents. There has to be a happy medium. No one is trying to deny someone from building. The spirit of the law has to be looked at as well. I have trouble speaking wholeheartedly in favor. My main intent was to go to the Planning Board for some help.

Mrs. Bancroft: I have a couple of basic comments, looking at it from our point of view. Your concerns about the grand scale of their measure are our concerns also. Zoning is a serious matter. Zoning for this town was done in 1938. It was a deliberate process carefully done. The map on the wall has changed only in minor ways in the last 50 years. There are reasons for the zoning lines being where they are. The town was designed to grow around the center like a typical old New England model. We wanted to see this grow into a traditional New England town with a village in the center.

It is almost completely developed in the RU area according to the original guidelines. People preferred to build small houses on single-family lots. We all love it the way it is. To change the zoning in that part of town is like changing the blueprint when the house is almost built. There are only two or three parcels which have a potential for more buildings on them now. There may be a couple more on the edges which could get two or three more units. Basically the whole area is mature. That is where I have a problem with the spirit of the law. It would spoil the spirit. It would be a ploy to prevent the development of one piece of land. That is my concern. We haven't decided on this yet. Those are my thoughts.

Mr. Gagliani: One of the articles that was passed last year was that within the RU District this Board can determine the number, size and placement of multi-family units. It doesn't take away the right of a developer, but if he wanted more than one building on a lot, it gives this Board the option of deciding the appropriateness of the number of buildings on a particular lot. I think this Board has been very sensitive to neighborhoods and will continue to do so. The other problem I see with rezoning is the individuals' rights when it is put into RU. You have an equity which is higher for an RU piece of land than an RS piece of land. Once this is rezoned, you have taken away an equity that people have had on their properties. That is an important thing to consider.

John Ganley, 15 Lowell Mason Road: This was developed as a single family area. The houses that have turned over have been sold to growing families. In the hearing before this you were discussing low cost housing. You can't get any better low cost housing than here. The streets are in but there are no sidewalks. It is my concern that a hook and ladder could go into this area. I would like to have RS go into effect and leave the homes the way they are.

Ed Callow: My family owned a piece of property here for 65 to 68 years. If this goes into effect I wouldn't be in an RU zone. In the meantime, can I take out a permit?

Mr. Parker: If no special permit is required and all you need is a building permit, you have a right to take out a permit. If you require a special permit, you must have the special permit prior to the first notice of the hearing.

Norman Hall, 18 Lowell Mason Road: I am in support of the rezoning. I appreciate that most of us are not driving cars over 50 years old. I think Medfield has to go forward and protect the homeowners that are out there. This change would be very beneficial. I am a new parent. There are a lot of new children in the area. Six or seven families have children under one year old. Twelve condominium units will change the spirit of 50 years ago.

Edward Beard: I have been asked to represent Mark Lorette and Paul Nyren who would like to build condominiums on this site. They oppose the rezoning. All I can say is that if you would like to discuss this with us - Mark, Paul and I - we would like to meet with you and our engineers. Something may be done. We would like the opportunity to meet with you. Sit down and talk with us. He has spent over a year to develop the plan. If you would call Mark or Paul or me, we could discuss the matter with you.

Mr. Parker: The situation here tonight is the proposed rezoning.

Keith Mozer, 39 Dale Street: I am opposed to the rezoning going through. I think the people were singling out Mr. Lorette and were not thinking of other people in the area.

As no one further wished to speak, the public hearing was closed at 9:00 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING ON CHANGES IN ZONING BYLAW:

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 9:05 p.m. Secretary Gagliani read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Page 9
March 9, 1987

The Board reviewed the proposed changes. Regarding the change in multi-family height, the change to 35-foot maximum will be in better scale to the town.

Hearing was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

ZONING CHANGES TO BE CONSIDERED 1988 TOWN MEETING:

Standards for safety traffic markings within a site should be considered. Also a requirement for entrance and exit signs for an entrance where "in" and "out" are separated.

LORETT SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATION:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from R. Edward Beard, attorney for Mark Loret, requesting that the Board accept the withdrawal of Mr. Loret's Application for Special Permit for Site Plan Approval dated February 18, 1987 without prejudice, as permitted by General Laws Chapter 40A, Section 16, and other law.

VOTED: To allow the application to be withdrawn without prejudice and return the application and check to Mr. Loret.

PHILIP STREET LAYOUT ABANDONMENT:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Board of Selectmen Chairman Larkin regarding a petition for partial discontinuance of the Philip Street relocation.

Following discussion of the matter, it was:

VOTED: To send the following memorandum to the Selectmen regarding this matter:

"The Planning Board recommends that the Town retain the existing county-owned layout on Philip Street.

"Philip Street as it now exists is a narrow substandard street with a hazardous horizontal and vertical curve. There is no practical solution for reconstruction of the street according to town standards in its current location. The County layout, taken many years ago, gives the Town the flexibility to reconstruct the street to a safe standard in the future, should increased traffic in the area eventually require such an improvement.

"There appears to be no benefit to the Town in relinquishing the layout, but considerable future advantage in retaining it. Hence, our recommendation against abandonment of the layout."

Page 10
March 9, 1987

MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE:

At the Planning Board meeting it was:

VOTED: To appoint Joseph C. Donnelly, Jr., to the MPIC for the term ending June 30, 1988.

SIGN ADVISORY BOARD:

It was suggested that either Jerry Lake or George Basile be invited to join the Sign Advisory Board.

MAIN STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land, Medfield, MA, prepared for Sheldon W. Buck, drawn by Schofield Brothers, Inc., dated February 26, 1987.

VOTED: To sign the plan and ask that the word "Middlesex" be changed to "Norfolk" County.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani,
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

March 16, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.
Others attending: Richard DeSorgher and Mr. & Mrs. Menard;
Residents re Zoning Bylaw change hearing.

Chairman Parker called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

LOWELL MASON ROAD QUESTIONS:

Mr. DeSorgher and Mr. & Mrs. Menard requested an appointment with the Board to discuss questions regarding the possibility of multi-family units in the area.

Mr. Menard asked how many units may be constructed on the Loretta lot.

Mr. Parker said that the lot has 1.7 acres (74,052 s.f.) and the Board has "heard" that 8,000 s.f. more was to be added for a total of 82,052 s.f. That would allow 12 units.

Mr. Menard asked how tall the building could be.

Mr. Parker said it could be 35 feet in height, as there is an article in the Town Meeting Warrant regarding building height. If this article does not pass at Town Meeting, buildings in the RU zone could be 45 feet in height.

Mr. Menard asked how close to an abutter's property may a multi-family building be constructed.

Mr. Parker said that it can be 30 feet from the front lot line, 12 feet from the side and 50 feet from the rear.

Mr. Menard asked how close the driveway could be to adjoining property.

Mr. Parker said that it would have to be ten feet from the lot line to allow for the required planted buffer.

Mr. Menard asked if the Board knows how wide Lowell Mason Road is. It has been noted that it is a 40-foot layout and there is room for sidewalks to be constructed.

Mr. Menard asked what the difference was between multi-family and cluster.

Mr. Parker said that cluster is a different concept.

Mr. DeSorgher asked if either one or both of the articles before Town Meeting on this subject pass, would that impact

the plan that has not been presented or is it grandfathered?

Mr. Parker: The Special Permit must be obtained prior to the first notice of the change in zoning. It is not grandfathered and any change in the zoning as set forth would affect the site. The only way that this could be grandfathered would be to apply for a Subdivision under Chapter 41. The Zoning Act says that any application for a subdivision is protected until the vote is taken at Town Meeting.

Mr. DeSorgher asked if someone could build a duplex if this article passed.

Mr. Parker said that a person would be able to build a duplex if he could before. Passage of this would not change that.

Mr. Hall: What criteria does the Planning Board react on in the plan? What is the criteria that you use?

Mr. Parker: The Zoning Bylaw, Town of Medfield.

ZONING HEARING:

The hearing was called to order at 8:10 p.m. by Chairman Parker and Secretary Gagliani read the article which appeared in the Suburban Press.

Chairman Parker requested the petitioners to explain the article.

Mr. Menard: We brought up the article to rezone from RU to RS. We have brought up a second article to change the Bylaws. We would like to have the PB deleted and put the Site Plan Approval for Multi-family Dwellings in the hands of the Appeals Board. That would answer questions brought up last week. They would need a Special Permit to do so right now; changing from RU to RS they won't be able to build. That would be the second part of our proposal. Also, I am still in favor of the zoning change.

Mr. Parker: The Zoning Board of Appeals has a different set of guidelines for giving a special permit - such as impact on property values. Are there other reasons that you have specifically that would let the Zoning Board of Appeals hear this type of permit?

Mr. Menard: The multi-family housing is as far as it can go. The roads are much narrower and there are no sidewalks. Once they build all these condos and multi-family housing, there will be other petitions to the town to build sidewalks, etc. I think we should hold the line now.

Mr. Parker: What this should address this evening is the difference between the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Planning Board hearings. What would it do for the town and for your area to change?

Mr. Menard: To change from RU to RS people couldn't put on family room or garage. Some people have 10,000 to 12,000 s.f. lots. With a special permit they could come to the town and get permission.

Mr. DeSorgher: Did you read both sections? Currently under the Planning Board what we are talking about first of all is the area. The reason the article came about is that the area from Lowell Mason Road, Meade Avenue, etc., has been single family since the late 1940's and early 1950's. Small capes and ranches. It was reported in the paper that only 14 single family houses are in the area. That is incorrect. One house on Lowell Mason Road the garage was made into an apartment. It is a single family area. It is to save the character of the neighborhood. What the petitioner felt is that when the Zoning Board looks at the possibility of the Loret property being developed for 10 to 12 condominiums, it would change the character of the neighborhood. It is unique because it would put a horseshoe behind all the houses. People would step out of their back door and there the condominiums would be. In an attempt to try to save the neighborhood from condominiums and lowering the property value of the homes, they came up with two proposals. The one presented now, it is our understanding that the Planning Board looks at the specs. The abutters and petitioners felt if it was under the Zoning Board, a different set of rules are looked at. If I want to add something to my house, they take a look at the abutters as well. Does it fit in? Does it work under the zoning? Is it aesthetically consistent with the neighborhood, etc. Does it have an adverse effect on the property values in the neighborhood? If you add 25 or 30 cars, they are not going to go through North Street. They will go up to Main Street through Brook Street.

Mrs. Bancroft: We have fairly technical criteria to review a plan on. The general purpose of the site plan is stated that it shall make sure that the plan complies with the overall zoning. The intention of zoning is to promote safety, health, convenience and welfare of the inhabitants of Medfield by lessening congestion in the streets; securing safety from fires, panic, or other danger; providing adequate light and air; preventing the overcrowding of land; etc. The Planning Board has a general responsibility to look at those areas too.

Mr. DeSorgher: Currently under the Planning Board, this neighborhood could change drastically. It could change in

more ways than putting condominiums on Lowell Mason Road. The Menards own a piece of property on Lowell Mason Road. It is the first house on the right. If the area were developed, the Menards would be a peninsula. They would have condos and parking lots. It is tearing the neighborhood apart. It has become a hardship on the neighbors. This is why this article has come about. I had a problem with the article last week. This is not an RU neighborhood. Who's rights should be considered? Certainly the owner of the property can develop it if he can legally do so. The homeowners have families and young children. They see the character of a neighborhood being destroyed, the neighborhood being changed and being surrounded by condos. The lots are less than 1/4-acre lots. We see this all over Medfield. This has to be addressed throughout town. People should be able to build, but not spoil neighborhoods.

I strongly support this article because it says you can build on your property. No one denied you. Not a set of rules and the single family owners are out of the ball game. That is why I strongly support this article.

Mr. Parker: One of my major concerns on this article is the Zoning Board of Appeals is being looked at as someone who can stop development. This is not the case. Both the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals work under the same rules. If you come down to having just those two items in your corner, you would have a very poor chance in Court in having a project turned down. Architectural compatibility is very difficult. It is very subjective. I have not read court cases or other articles that we see coming through from the Massachusetts Federation of Planning Boards allowing that as a basis of decisions. Basically we see little difference in the two procedures. I don't think you should be misled to believe that the Board of Appeals has all power to change the zoning to what the neighbors want.

Mrs. Bancroft: Practically speaking, there will be some other considerations of this change which people should be aware of. Right now the Planning Board has a fee structure established so that when we do our site plan reviews we take in a fee and that fee allows us at no cost to the town to have the plan reviewed by our consultants. It costs about \$1,200 to have it reviewed. We have our engineering people look at traffic impacts, lighting, drainage and other technical aspects of the plan. The Board of Appeals has no equivalent service for which they could charge a fee. If the site plan were handed to them, if a technical review were done by an engineering firm, it would be at the town's expense because the Board of Appeals does not have a fee structure. To get the quality of review we do now, we don't

have any mechanism to have the Board of Appeals collect fees. A special permit issued by the Board of Appeals for a use - if it were for 12 condominiums or four, the special permit goes to the owner of the property. That means for each owner of each condo unit every time the property changes hands, they would have to go back to the Board of Appeals to obtain a special permit. It would be an inconvenience to the future use of the property. That would be a real problem. The person has no right to live in the property until they go to the Board of Appeals for the use. If we approve a project, that project has its approval indefinitely. The Board of Appeals Special Permits go with the owner and not the property.

Mr. Parker: The two items which you are talking about could be given to the Planning Board at Town Meeting.

Mrs. Bancroft: Condos in town have been done on a small scale. It has been our experience that it is not as cut and dry as it may seem. The process takes several months. There is lots of discussion in the process about architecture and about suitability of the building to the site. Plans usually change several times in the course of reviews.

Mr. Gagliani: The discussion seems to be just Lowell Mason Road area. This bylaw changes the whole downtown area. There are private home owners. The process affects them too. It just doesn't affect one neighborhood.

Mr. Codispoti: We are in a period where developers are looking at every piece of land, every lot, every 1/4 mile of roadway that could be built in the town. We have a set of rules. The same set that the Board of Appeals uses. Their charge says clearly that their decisions must be based on fact not on hearsay. There is probably no need to have this recommended change. The rules are clear and seem to be fair for everyone.

Mrs. Beal: If this change in bylaw were to occur, this would affect all RU. Would the technical considerations still be a criteria if the Board of Appeals reviewed the Special Permit?

Mr. Parker: The Board of Appeals has the same set of rules.

Mrs. Bancroft: How do we know whether the site is good? We rely on our consulting engineers. We get an independent analysis on every project from them. This is invaluable for the town.

Mr. Parker: We are lay people. In order for the town to get engineering review analysis on items such as drainage, it is imperative to have the consultant's report.

Mrs. Beal: Besides having the developer pay, how could this be done?

Mr. Gagliani: You may want to note by changing the bylaw to the Appeals Board does not affect the use of a property. If a property can get 12 units, the use is still 12 units. The two conditions - architecturally consistent with the neighborhood, and assuring property values would be difficult to prove as a court case.

Alex Smith, 17 Lowell Mason Road: My concern is that if neither one of these articles pass our recourse would not come about again until a specific site plan would be submitted for the development of the condos.

Mr. Parker: This hearing tonight is strictly on a zoning change. The Lowell Mason Road application is not before the Board at this time. If it were before us there would be another hearing. All the facts would be brought up.

Mr. DeSorgher: Could we have addressed a specific area to be rezoned? You can make an amendment at Town Meeting to reduce the area of the zoning, but you couldn't add to it. You could reduce the area if you wanted to make the amendment.

Norman Hall, 18 Lowell Mason Road: The Planning Board has talked about the same criteria as the Zoning Board, but at least we could get to the Zoning Board and those purely subjective things. Right now the Planning Board works on very technical things.

Mr. Parker: I would disagree that the Zoning Board does not have criteria on which to base their decisions.

Bruno Palumbo, 11 Lowell Mason Road: What determines who puts in the article?

Mr. Parker: This was petitioned to the Selectmen. The Planning Board practically does the same thing. The reason this hearing is being held tonight is that we omitted an advertisement from the paper. The zoning hearing tonight failed to advertise on time. The RU to RS and PB to SP were both petitioned.

Mr. Palumbo: The builder can't do what he wants to do. He has to conform to town standards.

Mr. DeSorgher: Would it be at all possible for the Zoning Board to take over the fees for this?

Mr. Parker: It might be better to add something to the Planning Board charge which wouldn't encumber the property owners. We can put in what the Planning Board wishes.

Page 7
March 16, 1987

Mr. DeSorgher: If you added an article to this and had less of area, wouldn't this be frowned upon? Wouldn't be spot zoning?

Mrs. Bancroft: Spot zoning would be for the financial gain of an individual.

Alexander Smith, 17 Lowell Mason Road: As far as the spot zoning thing is concerned, it is spot zoning if it is benefiting a person in another area. If we reduced it, we would be adding to the RS and taking away from the RU.

Mrs. Bancroft: We could establish a single-family zone with small lots. That kind of zone would be a better fit in the area. The Attorney General looks askance on an area that was already built being rezoned.

Mr. Hall: Question regarding spot zoning. Wasn't the sewer beds spot zoning?

The proposed rezoning for HOP program is not spot zoning.

The hearing was closed at 8:55 p.m.

PROPOSED CHANGES - LAND SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS:

Messrs. Daniel Nye and Roy Boudette met with the Board to exchange ideas on this matter.

The Board discussed a requirement which would necessitate the developer to connect sidewalks if a new subdivision was proposed within 1,000 feet of the existing sidewalk.

SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATION PROPOSED CHANGES:

Following discussions regarding changes in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations, it was the consensus of the Board that the following changes should be made:

1. A requirement should be added for extension of town sidewalks when they are within a specified (1,000 ft. has been recommended) distance from the nearest sidewalk. A distance of 100 feet of sidewalk to be built for each subdivision lot.
2. A requirement that \$25.00 be charged for the filing of Form A Plans.
3. A requirement for a form to be filed at the time of filing a subdivision which would state that reasonable access must be maintained when roads are under construction.

4. The Board will include Section 3.2.3 wording as recommended by Town Counsel on accessibility of streets.
5. The Board will eliminate from the Fee Schedule all fees and all references to "preliminary site plans". It is suggested that a note be put on Fee Schedule stating "See Planning Board Administrator for Details regarding discussion plans."
6. The Board will request that Representative Barbara Gardner take steps to change the state law to allow preliminary site plan approval.
7. The Board recommends that discussion site plans be reviewed before definitive site plans are filed.
8. The Board recommends that a Clerk of the Works and a fee therefore be required when subdivisions are a size to be determined after discussion with the Superintendent of Streets.
9. The Board will investigate to determine if "extraordinary expenses" may be charged to developers which they generate.

BROOK STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Planning Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land on Brook Street, dated January 30, 1987, drawn by Cheney Engineering Co., Needham, MA.

VOTED: To sign the plan as above-described.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

John K. Gagliani,
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
March 23, 1987

Member Present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani,
and Parker.
Others attending: People interested in Rocky Acres and
Wolcott Estates continuation hearings.

PUBLIC HEARING - CONTINUATION OF ROCKY ACRES:

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 8:07 p.m. and requested the applicant to explain the revised plan that was presented.

Mr. Richard Merrikin, engineer for the applicant, said that an agreement had been reached with the Kennedy's that a sloping easement could be obtained at the end of the new proposed section of Rocky Acres. The lot line which has been established has been agreeable to all parties. The change in lot line has allowed the street to be moved 20 feet so that more upland area would be a part of lot 5. This plan also reflects new property lines for lots 8, 9 and 10. Notes regarding driveway openings have been added to the plan.

The requested waivers have been put on the plans. The waiver on the center line radius has been put on the plan. The granting of this waiver would allow the roadway to be built outside of the watershed protection district. A request has been made to waive the requirement for a cul de sac at the end of Vine Brook Road. Also a waiver is requested for the placement of the utilities within the layout.

The following additional information has also been included:

1. 4.2.3.p Ground water depth at the intersection has been indicated.
2. 4.2.3.r The area is 100% wooded.
3. 4.2.3.t A copy of "Soil Limitations for Septic Tank Sewage Disposal" has been included.
4. 4.2.3.w The note regarding driveways has been included.
5. 5.2.2 A waiver has been requested to reduce minimum center line radius from 400 feet to 350 feet.
6. 5.2.1.3 The radius has been reduced to 40 feet at the street intersection.
7. 5.2.1.4.b The new regulations will be adhered to regarding the paving surface on the cul de sac.

8. 5.2.1.4.c A waiver is requested from the temporary cul de sac requirement at the end of Vine Brook Road.
9. 5.2.1.4.d A waiver is requested to allow the cross section as shown on the plan submitted.
10. A waiver from the granite curbing requirement where the radius is less than 400-foot center line on Vine Brook Road.
11. 5.2.1.6 Note regarding driveways has been placed on the plan.
12. 5.2.1.11 Tree plantings have been shown on the profile sheets. Where trees are already growing it is anticipated trees will not have to be planted.
13. 5.2.3.2 Not answered. Design criteria for drainage.
14. 5.2.6.4 Cable has been shown.
15. Invert will be changed in the riprap detail sheet 3 of 9 to read 211.65.
16. Superintendent of Streets said there were no known flooding problems along the perimeter of the wetland.
17. The project will be before the Board of Appeals.
18. Sight distance east and west on Vine Brook Road has been accomplished.

Mr. Merrikin said that his calculations show that the amount of water flowing from Vine Brook Road to the street drainage has been decreased but the water flowing to the wetland has been increased.

According to Mr. Merrikin the Vine Brook Road drainage system is able to handle a seven-year storm. Today's requirement is ten. All the water flowing toward Vine Brook Road is put into a pipe system with catchbasins at the beginning of the new roadway. It is difficult to put this information into numbers which would show how it affects an area. The best way to have a drainage system work is to get into a pipe system.

The capacity of the pipe will be changed from a 7 1/2-year storm to a 5-year storm.

Mr. Merrikin said that Mr. Domey has asked that the drainage be recalculated using outlet control vs. inlet control, as he feels there will be surging in between.

Page 3
March 23, 1987

Mr. Parker read Whitman & Howard's March 19, 1987, letter.

Mr. Parker asked if lots 8, 9 and 10 weren't developed would that remove the problem of water going into the system?

Mr. Merrikin said that the driveways from lots 8, 9 and 10 would make detention basins which would hold back the water. If we didn't develop it, it would be status quo.

Mr. Parker said that the Board can't approve a subdivision unless all our questions are answered. You would have to obtain Board of Appeals approval to work in the watershed protection district.

Mrs. Bancroft said that with this plan you are aggravating the problem basically because existing drainage capacity is already inadequate.

Mr. Merrikin said he did not think this additional drainage would cause any difference that could be seen in the system, but there would be less capacity. Mr. Merrikin said that the developer could construct 300 feet of 24" pipe in Vine Brook Road where there is 18" pipe now.

Mr. Parker said that one of our problems is that areas are being developed further and further away from the center. The town has a problem down stream.

Mr. Merrikin said that to address the problems the new subdivision would have to be at the beginning. If you approve in the middle, the neighbors complain about puddling and ponding, that is why you don't get any real serious problems somewhere. You have little problems all the way along. Unless you are planning on a major revision in a system, you have to look at each one.

Mr. Parker read some notes regarding the subdivision by Superintendent Feeney. The first thing he suggested is rebuilding Vine Brook Road. He sees no problem with the pipes in the road. If they are gurgling, according to Mr. Feeney, they may need to be cleaned. There is a problem with the placement of catch basin on Road A.

Mr. Merrikin said that when the grading is done and there are trees which are growing, will it be possible to use those trees instead of planting others?

Mr. Parker said that the tree warden will approve trees. If there is a tree where one is to be planted, that will be his decision.

Page 4
March 23, 1987

Mr. Gagliani asked if there is 300 feet of sight distance. Mr. Merrikin said that if there is a tree in the layout, it will have to be trimmed. He said that you can see around trunks, but it is the branches which could be a problem.

Mrs. Bancroft asked about the street name. Mr. Merrikin said that Mr. DiGiacomo will suggest a street name.

Mary Lynch asked the Board if they have taken into consideration additional water.

Mr. Merrikin said that had been taken into account.

Mary Lynch said that since last summer water has encroached on our house about five feet. It has been running more and in the middle of the winter the water was running and did not freeze.

Mr. Merrikin said that it is entirely possible that the area is spring fed. He also noted that there may be a blockage in the system which is not allowing water to go through. Somewhere maybe a narrow channel has been plugged.

Mrs. Lynch felt that the perking of the lots may have caused the problem.

Mr. Parker said that the Board can allow no more water at any greater rate than is currently flowing. This is a major concern of this Board.

Mr. Richard Heavey said that he lives at the weakest link in the system. He says that the system overflows at the corner of Vine Brook and he cleans the catchbasin himself. He said he put in a new driveway in 1985 and rocks are coming up through the driveway. It is his presumption it is from the pressure of water.

Mr. Heavey asked how much of the total parcel is wetlands.

Mr. Merrikin said about 30% of the parcel is wetlands.

Mr. Parker said that zoning addresses this - you can have up to 75% wetlands.

Mr. Parker said, in conclusion, he has a great deal of reservation about this plan because of the drainage on the easterly portion. Our problem is we are asked to approve a plan without the drainage. Mr. Parker asked when they plan to submit additional information on the drainage.

Mr. Merrikin said after his Conservation Commission hearing next week, they will submit a plan. Nothing physically will be changed except maybe the pipe sizes.

March 23, 1987

Mr. DiGiacomo presented the Board with a letter requesting an extension to May 19, 1987, within which the Board must make its decision on the Rocky Acres Subdivision.

VOTED: To accept an extension to May 19, 1987, as above requested and to send a certified letter to the DiGiacomos and notify the Town Clerk.

The hearing will be continued to May 11th at 8:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING - WOLCOTT SUBDIVISION:

Members present: Bancroft, Brennan, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker.

Chairman Parker called the continuation hearing to order at 9:30 p.m. and called on the petitioner to explain changes made in the plan.

Mr. Vaughan said that Sanders Way was changed from six to five lots. The cul de sac has been turned 180 degrees. Instead of going to the right it will go to the left. The lot configuration has been changed to satisfy the depth requirement. The utilities have been shortened somewhat, but the street has been lengthened by two feet to 608 feet. Two waivers are required; one for the length of the street and one for the 45-foot street layout. The five-foot utility easement has been put on the plan.

Mr. Gagliani said that frontage for lot 5 is on Main Street. Lot 5 still has frontage on the cul de sac and could be taken off. People should know that even though it is not shown as a separate building lot that it could be.

Mrs. Bancroft asked how the problem regarding the edge of the street along the Mulock's property was resolved.

Mr. Vaughan said that our proposal is to slope it. The maximum depth of the slope into the Mulock property would be less than 20 feet.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the Mulock's would prefer a wall to a slope.

Mrs. Wolcott said she would discuss this matter with the Mulock's.

Page 6
March 23, 1987

Mrs. Mulock asked how many feet would the road be raised?

Mr. Vaughan said that "worse case" the existing elevation from the rear of the house will be a three-foot rise from 179 to 182.

Mr. Mulock said there is a low spot in the front which might pond.

Mr. Vaughan said that the developer will take care of ponding of any nature.

Mr. Mulock said he didn't understand why this won't add to the drainage.

Mr. Vaughan said that if you are collecting surface runoff, by putting a wall up all you are doing is altering 20 feet of your property to a steeper slope so that we are only considering the water on the 20 feet.

Mrs. Mulock said that she is concerned about her back yard.

Mr. Vaughan said that the Planning Board's engineers have been satisfied and what we have done is to be sure that there is not additional water flowing on the Mulock property than happens now.

Mr. Parker said that the Planning Board's charge is that no more water at any additional rate flows onto abutting property. Whitman & Howard has reviewed the plan and it tells us that it won't cause any additional amount of runoff. The Mulocks will still have water; however, it is not the Board's or the developer's charge to alleviate a problem. We just can't make it any worse.

Mrs. Mulock is concerned that the water will be worse.

Mr. Codispoti asked why the Board should allow a waiver on the 45-foot street in view of several other marginal pieces of land that will be before us over the next 3 or 4 years.

Mr. Good said one of the reasons is that there is a cut of 45 feet there. There is a requirement that this road should be wider than Pound Street.

Mr. Brennan said that the reason was to permit two lots to front on Pound Street.

Mr. Vaughan said that 3.3 feet are lacking to put a 50-foot wide street with houses on both sides.

Maryanne O'Connell said she would like to go on record again, although there are five lots instead of six, as opposed. Her

Page 7
March 23, 1987

concern is the overcrowding plus the road width. She opposes for her husband also who couldn't be here for medical reasons. Mrs. O'Connell asked that the Planning Board grant no waivers for this subdivision.

Mr. Parker said that just for the record this subdivision meets all density zoning requirements. The Board cannot be arbitrary. If these plans are rejected it must be based on the law.

Mr. Parker said the Board's job is to review the plan as a whole, consider the rights of the developer as well as the rights of people who live in the area. The Board would like to balance a solution that will work for everyone.

Mr. Lamb said he saw this plan as a substantive change from the original plan. He questioned if the allowing of the 45-foot road with the five-foot easement would set a precedent.

Mr. Parker said that it does not. Waivers are granted often. Waivers are not precedent-setting.

Mr. Lamb said that if this would not be a condition that would weaken the bylaws that now exist, at great risk of offending friends and other abutters, I would personally approve and express my satisfaction with the plan.

Mr. Gagliani said that Mr. Codispoti's question hasn't been answered.

Mr. Vaughan said that they would end up with lots on one side of the road because of the lack of 3.3 feet.

Mr. Parker said that an alternative would be to go to the Board of Appeals.

Mr. Vaughan said the town will end up with the use of the 50-foot width and everything else will be in the street and the street will be much wider than Pound Street.

Edith O'Toole and John O'Toole opposed the waivers for the length of the street and for its width.

Mr. Mulock asked if he has some rights regarding replanting where the grading will be.

Mr. Parker said that Mrs. Wolcott has shown a willingness to work with you on this matter.

Mr. Mulock asked if there was some type of bonding for the grading to be done on her property.

Mr. Parker explained the bonding for Sanders Way and suggested that anyone who feels they may have a problem that they seek legal or engineering counsel, or both as preconstruction information is important.

The hearing was closed at 10:45 p.m.

VOTED: To approve "Plan of Sanders Way - Wolcott Subdivision" dated November 26, 1986, and revised to March 6, 1987, drawn by Cheney Engineering Company, owned by Nancy Wolcott, subject to the following conditions:

1. "Utility easement" on plan should be relabelled "Easement to the Town of Medfield"

The following waivers have been granted from the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Town of Medfield:

1. Waiver from Section 5.2.1.4a to allow a cul de sac 608 feet in length.
2. Waiver from Section 5.2.1.1 to allow a 45-foot layout width from approximately Station 1+90 to approximately Station 4+70 and to require a five-foot easement to the Town of Medfield along the west side of Sanders Way, between the above-mentioned stations as shown on the plan.

This decision is also subject to approval of any other Town Boards as required.

The vote was recorded three in favor with John Gagliani and Joseph Codispoti voting in opposition as they were opposed to the waiver to allow a 45-foot wide layout with a five-foot easement to the Town of Medfield.

PLANNING BOARD POSITION ON TOWN MEETING ARTICLES:

ARTICLE 28: Changing from RS to RU all of lot 141 and that portion of lot 142 presently in the RS District for HOP program.

VOTED: To recommend passage.

ARTICLE 29: Changing from RU to RS a portion of land bounded by Summer, Green, North, Frairy and Dale Streets.

Page 9
March 23, 1987

VOTED: To recommend dismissal.

ARTICLE 30: Amend Zoning Bylaw by having the Board of Appeals grant special permits for site plans rather than the Planning Board.

VOTED: To recommend dismissal.

ARTICLES 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44.

VOTED: To recommend passage.

PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED - WHEELWRIGHT ROAD:

As this plan did not have the proper information, it was returned to the applicant to be updated.

BLASTING:

In accordance with a request from the Selectmen to impose controls on ledge control in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations, the Board:

VOTED: To send the following memorandum to the Selectmen:

Some time ago your Board asked that the Planning Board consider imposing control on ledge removal in subdivisions through new subdivision control regulations.

Because the authority to regulate blasting appears to rest with the State Fire Marshall's Office - and through it, with the local Fire Chief - we doubt that controls via the Subdivision Control Law would be permitted. However, we are very aware of the problems which inadequate control of blasting has already caused in the Town, and of the growing potential for even more serious problems in the future, as development cuts into areas of severe ledge. Therefore, we believe it is important for the Town to take steps now to protect its residents against future damage.

During a discussion of this issue at our meeting of March 16th, it was suggested that the Town should work with Representative Barbara Gardner to draft legislation to address the blasting problem, possibly by establishing no-fault insurance for claims up to a given level; by requiring pre-surveys; and/or by raising permit fees to cover the local cost of monitoring blasting.

Page 10
March 23, 1987

Our Board would welcome your ideas as to how to proceed on this matter and would be glad to serve as sponsors or co-sponsors of such legislation.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, .

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
April 6, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani, Parker and Rhoads.
Others attending: Selectmen Thompson, Larkin and Nourse and others re Library Driveway rehearing; Richard DeSorgher, Mobile Excavating hearing, Orchard Park hearing.

HEARING RE LIBRARY DRIVEWAY REAPPLICATION:

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 7:30 p.m. which purpose was to present specific and material changes in the driveway plan which was a part of Board of Appeals Decision No. 497 in order that the variance may be reheard by the Board of Appeals before two years have elapsed.

Selectman Chairman Nourse said that the Appeals Board has granted the special permit requests but denied the driveway entrance because of its width going onto a narrow street. Mr. Nourse said that the Selectmen and the Planning Board agree that the driveway should be wide enough for two cars to pass or a minimum of 20 feet. Mr. Nourse asked that the Planning Board recommend that the driveway matter be allowed to be repetitioned for variance before the Appeals Board within the two-year period.

Mr. Parker said that under Chapter 40A, Section 16, what we need to be informed of are specific and material changes upon which the previous unfavorable action was based. He asked that someone explain what is going to be done to address the denial on which the decision was based.

Town Administrator Sullivan said that the Board of Appeals is concerned about the proposed driveway width. The driveway which was turned down was within 150 feet of an intersection. The changing conditions that will be made in line with the suggestion of the Board of Appeals is that we will come in with a recommendation for a narrower driveway width. The Zoning Bylaw calls for a minimum driveway width of 24 feet. For safety they felt the driveway should be narrower. We still will have to apply for a driveway from 24 to 20 feet in width. Any narrower would not be safe.

Mr. Gagliani said that a driveway narrower than 24 feet would need a variance from the Board of Appeals. He sees an alternative to remove the historical building from the site.

Town Administrator Sullivan said that they were concerned with a one-way driveway out onto the street as there could be stacking on the roadway. He felt it is better to have stacking within the parking lot rather than on the 16-foot

wide street. The Appeals Board also expressed concern about the driveway being shown so close to the building.

Mr. Rhoads asked why the driveway couldn't be moved over two or three feet from the historical building. Mr. Sullivan said that they would still need to have a variance because the driveway is not 150 feet from the centerline of the intersection.

Mr. Rhoads suggested that the driveway should be the required 24-foot width.

Mr. Nourse said that the only realistic change is the reduction in the driveway width.

Mr. Parker asked if an engineer had looked at this driveway plan and made any recommendations for a minimum safe ingress and egress.

Mr. Sullivan said it had been discussed as a committee and they felt that the 18-foot width would be the minimum safe width.

Mr. Parker said that all the Planning Board needs to do is to be convinced that there are specific and material changes proposed. Four out of five affirmative votes are needed to recommend that the petition be reheard.

June Doucette, 15 Pleasant Street, said that the Board of Appeals were concerned about safety and the aesthetics of a parking area in view of the residential abutters when they turned down the 24-foot wide driveway.

Mr. Parker asked if Mrs. Doucette was opposed to a further hearing on the matter.

Mrs. Doucette said that the neighbors were opposed to the driveway, however, if it is necessary to have a driveway, it should not be wider than the street upon which it enters and it should be shrubbed. The narrower the driveway the better.

The Planning Board will send the plan to Whitman & Howard for their recommendation on safe driveway width.

VOTED: To allow the reapplication for the variance from the minimum distance of the driveway from an intersection because of the changes proposed in the plan.

PROPOSED REZONING FROM RU TO RS:

Mr. Richard DeSorgher met with the Board to ask the Board's interpretation of Section 6 of Chapter 40A as it pertains to

the proposed rezoning of a large portion of the RU zoning district.

Mr. Parker said that he had discussed the matter with Town Counsel Fuller and suggested that the Board meet with Mr. Fuller before giving a final interpretation. Mr. Parker said he would be glad to give his translation of what Mr. Fuller said. If the zoning is changed, a lot that is not currently conforming to RU will change to RS, which requires 20,000 s.f., then lots with less than anyone wishing to alter or extend their home to go to the Board of Appeals regardless of the size of the alteration.

Mrs. Bancroft did not agree with this interpretation.

Mr. DeSorgher asked that before this matter comes to the Town Meeting floor that a decision be made as to how it will affect the homes in the area.

HISTORICAL STREET NAMES:

In another matter, Mr. DeSorgher requested that the Planning Board put an article into the 1988 Town Meeting to do the following:

1. To reinforce Historical Commission to do what they can to urge that historical names be used when naming new streets.
2. To present an article to town meeting that would require future developers to use historical names for streets.

Mrs. Bancroft explained that the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations in its appendix has a Street Name Guideline for developers to follow.

MOBILE EXCAVATING PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairman Parker called the Mobile Excavating hearing to order at 8:20 p.m. Secretary Gagliani read the notice which appeared in the Suburban Press.

Attorney Debra Nelson introduced the trustees of 30 Realty Trust, William D'Innocenzo, Robert D'Innocenzo and Ronald D'Innocenzo and their engineer, William Snow. They are seeking a special permit to build a 5,250 s.f. addition to the property at 25 West Mill Street. Ms. Nelson explained the history of the project. In 1983 a purchase and sale agreement was signed pursuant to the granting of all permits. Due to title defects the land had to go through Land Court. As this was a long process, the building permit and other permits had expired by 1985. At that time the plan was not accepted by this Board as it required a Special Permit from

the Board of Appeals. Heritage Associates had been hired to formulate a plan using the recommendations of the Whitman & Howard letter of September 1985. If there are any legal questions Ms. Nelson will answer them. Mr. Snow will answer engineering questions.

Mr. Snow said that the plan has been revised to meet the recommendations of Whitman & Howard's March 30, 1987, letter. The eight points in that letter could be addressed in short order.

1. Site drainage is not designed using the manhole system.

The drainage system in the parking lot will have gas traps before it enters Turtle Brook. Mr. Snow did not feel that the grading and topography required a manhole system. He explained how the system works and said it was a standard system.

2. A minimum pipe size of 12" is required.

That change has been made on the plan.

3. Drainage information provided with the plans proposes to place outlet pipe inverts one foot higher than inlet pipe inverts. The drainage system will not function properly under this design. A minimum cover of 2 1/2 feet over drain pipes as it is anticipated that the site will contain heavy loadings.

Mr. Snow said that the cover is 12" and the manufacturer guarantees the pipe with the 12" cover.

4. It is recommended that a detention basin be required to the rear of the property.

Mr. Snow said that they will be "more than happy" to put drainage into the swamp. This would allow a slower flow under West Mill Street.

5. Minimum of 12" of gravel should be used under the pavement.

Mr. Snow said that the plan has been changed and 12" of gravel has been shown on the plan.

6. Suggest a note be added to the plans that explains how the owner will know when the holding tank needs to be pumped out.

A dipstick arrangement will be provided.

7. The height of the building is shown as incorrect.

The height has been changed to 22.5 feet.

8. The proposed 36-foot wide driveway does not meet zoning.

This will be discussed. It appears a variance may be required.

Mr. Parker said it was his observation that this will be a truck repair facility. According to the Board's requirements, there should be nine 9 1/2' x 18' parking spaces.

Mr. Parker asked about the existence of the guardrail shown on the plans as exiting.

Attorney Nelson said that the garage would be an overflow-type facility. Most of the trucks would be on construction sites and would come to this facility for servicing or repair. Medfield would have the overflow of trucks from Natick.

The Board of Appeals decision was read into the proceedings.

Mr. Parker said that there are items required under Section 14.13 of Medfield's Zoning Bylaw which have been omitted.

Attorney Nelson said that water is already on the property and is not shown. She asked for other specifics.

Mr. Parker said that no contours were shown to the rear of the site or for the adjoining land as required. Mr. Parker noted that the plan had been changed to show 12" of gravel under the driveway and parking lot and also mentioned that a 2" base coat of pavement is required plus a finished course of 1 1/2".

Mr. Snow pointed out where the lights would be placed. Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board prefers to have the lighting on a pole facing towards the building.

Mr. Parker noted that the plan shows Cape Cod berm and brought to Mr. Snow's attention that a vertical curb is required. Mrs. Bancroft said she did not think it would matter for a parking lot.

Mr. Snow said he would be glad to provide a vertical curb if the Board would prefer. Mr. Snow also said that red oak trees with a 6" caliper would be planted.

Mr. Parker said he was concerned with the standing water and asked Mr. Snow what he thought the water would do.

Mr. Snow said that the gravel will allow subsurface drainage.

Page 6
April 6, 1987

It is possible that the parking lot will have some standing water during a 50-year storm. It is at elevation 139.5.

Mrs. Bancroft asked how much the grade of the site will be raised.

Mr. Snow said 18" - 12" of which is the required gravel.

Mr. Parker said that the Board does not like to give conditional approvals. He said that the drainage is the issue which has not been solved. It is the most important issue regarding this site.

Mrs. Bancroft said she would like to have an additional determination of the drainage by the Board's engineer.

Mr. Gagliani said he would like to see everything shown on the plan before a vote is taken.

Mr. Parker said our next step is to consult with our engineer. If we gather more information, we will contact the applicants. If additional information is requested, we will set up another appointment.

Mr. Yered: I own the land next door. My only concern is the runoff. There is a lot of water there. He asked if Mobile would be required to keep haybales on the site. He wanted to be sure that there is enough retention area as his building is three times the size of the building being proposed at this hearing.

Mr. Parker asked Mr. Yered what the elevation of his lot is. Mr. Yered said it goes from 147 to 143.

Mr. Snow said the elevation 147 could not hold water because when it reaches 140 it will flow over West Mill Street.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

ORCHARD PARK DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairman Parker called the hearing to order at 9:35 p.m.

Secretary Gagliani read the notice which appeared in the newspaper.

Chairman Parker explained the procedure to be followed.

Bruce Kirkland, Norwood Engineering, represented Orchard Park. He said that the plan showed one roadway 950 feet in length, with nine single-family lots. It is located within an RT Zoning District. All the lots have 40,000 s.f. or more. They have a minimum of 142 feet on the roadway and 175

at the 40-foot setback line. The site is wooded and goes from elevation 216 to a high point of 253 at the rear of the property. Each lot will be tested for septic system design. The ground water is down 5 1/2 to 7 feet in the area of the roadway. There is a 50-foot right of way with a five-foot wide sidewalk on the easterly side of the street. The grades go from 1% to 3%. The discharge from the pipe flows into a pond and thence into a larger wetland. 8" ductile iron water main is proposed with a hydrant at each end of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Kirkland is working with the Conservation Commission on the vegetated wetland.

The Whitman & Howard report of March 19, 1987, was discussed. The Board will check with Superintendent Feeney to determine if there is any known flooding over Granite Street where the 24" pipe goes into the swamp.

The catchbasin situation needs to be discussed with the Superintendent of Streets. There must be no icing at the intersection.

Mr. Gagliani asked where the existing drainage was in the street now.

Mr. Kirkland said that there isn't any. There is an 18" metal corrugated pipe that goes under High Street, which is not in a zoned wet area.

The intersection has been designed with a set of basins which will take all flow coming from this proposed subdivision. Whitman & Howard suggested that the new basin be located 40 feet from the existing basin.

Mr. Gagliani said that there will be icing in the winter at the intersection if there is sheeting across the road. The water should not flow in this manner.

Mr. Kirkland said that the intersection would have to be regraded. The gutter is the edge of the pavement. He said he would meet with the Superintendent of Streets and design the intersection to his satisfaction, including catchbasins, etc. We will be requesting a waiver for the 950-foot long street.

Mr. Kirkland said they would be glad to cooperate with the Planning Board regarding a street name. (Since that time he has reviewed the list of historic names and has recommended Rockwood as a street name for Orchard Park.)

Mr. Gagliani asked about the configuration of the "cul de sac". The way it is shown in the plan is not satisfactory.

Mr. Kirkland said that there are three lots with an area of

over one acre each and at the recommendation of the Planning Board we provided access. Presently Orchard Park Realty Trust is talking with the owners of these lots. All three of the land owners would have to work together. There is also some question regarding the ledge in the back. As it stands now the turnaround is part of the right of way. That is necessary to get width for lots 4 and 5.

Mr. Gagliani asked if we would end up with a "big bump" if the road were extended to include the three lots not now owned by Orchard Park.

Mr. Kirkland said the right of way would have two "bumps".

Mr. Parker said that the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations call for a turnaround at the end of a cul de sac. Mr. Parker was also concerned that the frontage of Lot 5 was measured along the street part of the stub.

Mr. Kirkland said that the cul de sac could be moved to the end but there is a big knoll of ledge which would be in the layout.

Mr. Parker asked if Lot 4 would have the proper frontage if the temporary turnaround was put at the property line?

Mr. Kirkland said that either lot 4 or 5 would lose its frontage.

Mr. Parker said that the turnaround must be built.

Mr. Kirkland said he understood that it would be necessary so that school busses and emergency vehicles could have proper access.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board is concerned that the street meet the Town's standards for streets.

The Board brought Mr. Kirkland's attention to Section 5.2.1.4 of the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations which states that "Rotary circles or cul-de-sacs shall be constructed at the terminus of nonthrough streets."

Mr. Kirkland said he will go back and redesign the "bump."

Mr. Parker asked if the amount of water running from this site would be increased or would be kept the same.

Mr. Kirkland said, "There is a large drainage area. We are changing some of the upper reaches. We have multiple points to consider. We will be increasing the discharge at the end of the first lot. There will be a small increase."

Page 9
April 6, 1987

Mr. Parker asked about the sight distance coming out on Route 27. Mr. Kirkland said it was adequate. On the left it is 850 and the sight distance on the right is 885.

Mr. Parker noted that all the water from the street will come down to the front. Mr. Kirkland agreed that is what happens.

Brian Henderson, abutter on west side: My concern is that they will increase the water flow and flood my land. I am lower and so is Camelot Lane. My concern is that the wet area isn't extended.

Mr. Kirkland said he was trying to get the drainage into the large swamp area. We will be adding 11 c.f.s. during a five-year storm.

Mr. Parker asked how would the drainage be treated if you were required not to put any water off the site than is going now naturally.

Mr. Kirkland said that there are no wetlands on the site. In answer to your inquiry we could look at narrower pavement, leaching catchbasins in the roadway. This is a relatively impervious area because of the ledge. There is a lot of runoff currently.

Mr. Parker said that you must provide for a ten-year storm. We want to be sure that this doesn't add to any problems that exist. Please provide some information that would show what the increase would be of downstream calculations.

Mr. Kirkland said that they will show the impact of development at that point for a ten-year and 100-year storm. If it is equal, the impact downstream is negligible.

Mr. Gagliani asked that topos be supplied to the Board on Mr. Henderson's pond to show that the pond will not be overtopped and any further information on abutters along the swamp area to prove that the water doesn't become a problem.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if it would be necessary to do any blasting in conjunction with street construction.

Mr. Kirkland suspected that there may be some blasting in the area of the cul de sac.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if blasting would have to be done for cellar holes.

Mr. Kirkland said he did not know yet.

Linda Kushner asked if you have to be a certain distance away from a house in order to blast.

Page 10
April 6, 1987

Mr. Parker said that the blasting would be under the guidance of the Fire Chief. Presently there is no minimum distance. We hope to have some legislation on this matter in the future, but it will not be in force in time for this.

Mr. Parker said that if there is to be additional information we will continue the public hearing.

Mr. Parker noted that a decision is due on April 27th and a request for an extension is required if you wish to keep the process going.

James Rohnstock said he could see a swale coming down towards High Street. He was concerned where the highest point of the lots is as a lot of water is coming down the street. Mr. Rohnstock also asked if there is a chance that there will be a road which would loop down to Forest Street.

Mr. Parker said that the grade cannot exceed 6%. Mr. Kirkland said that the drainage is divided.

The hearing will be continued to May 11 at 9:00 p.m.

CRANMORE ROAD:

The Board reviewed the Cranmore Road plan dated March 4, 1987. It has been noted that there is an agreement between Borrelli and Hegedus for the construction of the wall on the Hegedus property.

NEEDHAM BUILDERS - LOT 13:

VOTED: To release lot 13 formerly owned by Needham Builders from the covenant.

The release was signed.

CASTLE HILL ESTATES:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Ralph C. Good Jr., for Castle Hill Estates, requesting that more surety be released because of work completed on Deerfield Drive.

VOTED: To release \$93,000 in surety in exchange for new surety in the amount of \$38,000.

HOMMAGE AU VIN:

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Hommage au Vin dated April 2, 1987, containing a parking plan for the premises at 72 North Street.

Page 11
April 6, 1987

VOTED: To accept the parking plan as submitted, but alerting the applicant that the parking spaces must be painted in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw, Section 8.3.6.h.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

April 13, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani, Parker and Rhoads.

Others present: MacCready, Merrikin, Fox, Miller, Devine.

Chairman Parker called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m.

TANNERY FARMS:

The Board is in receipt of Tannery Farms Preliminary Plan. Nine new lots are being created, one of which will have the existing house. Mr. MacCready said that the land is hilly. There is a big slope to a flatter area on top. The proposed road is 558 feet in length to the center of the cul-de-sac and will require a waiver. The grading is shown on the preliminary plan to demonstrate it will work. The highest point is in the back. A stone retaining wall is being considered to assist with meeting the sloping requirements. Utilities will be underground. They propose to tie into an existing sewer. There is drainage in the street. The roadway grade requirements of 6% maximum will be met.

Mr. Parker asked about sight distance. Mr. MacCready said it met requirements.

Drainage from this subdivision will go into Vine Brook. No structures will be built in the wetlands.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if they propose to put a buffer between the new lots and the cemetery. Mr. MacCready said it was heavily tread in the rear and he did not think a buffer would be planted.

Mr. MacCready said that they had met with water and sewer. The sidewalk will be on the town side. The face of wall should be at the layout line.

VINE BROOK ESTATES - PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairman Parker called the public hearing to order at 8:45 p.m. The purpose of the hearing is for a Special Permit for Site Plan Approval. Secretary Gagliani read the notice which appeared in the Suburban World.

Chairman Parker said that Town Meeting will be starting on April 27th. There are three articles which could affect this site plan. If Article 30, which gives the permit-granting authority for multi-family sites to the Board of Appeals, passes, this hearing tonight and the procedure the Board has taken will be modified. Mrs. Willis notified the applicant of this fact. Article 44 changes the maximum height allowable to 35 feet. Article 43 changes the spacing of the

plantings in the buffer zone. For the record, the applicant is aware these articles are before Town Meeting.

Chairman Parker said that this hearing is conducted under the authority of the Medfield Zoning Bylaw and the procedure to be followed is first to have the applicant explain his project, followed by questions by Planning Board members, then questions by other Board members and finally questions by abutters and others present.

Allen Fox, Vice President of Fox Properties: On the three items you are asking for at Town Meeting, we spoke to our counsel and because we have had a preliminary plan before you he feels they are all grandfathered.

Chairman Parker: According to Charles Fuller, Jr., Town Counsel, a special permit must be issued prior to the first notice of any zoning change. Mere application is not sufficient to grandfather your application.

Mr. Fox said that they had just received a copy of Whitman & Howard's report. He said the original plan had 32 units. They received a copy of the Board's letter from Whitman & Howard and, after going through the plan, they could not do what Whitman & Howard wanted them to do. They have scaled down to 23 units. They are in a flood plain and there are more wetlands than originally thought. Through a combination of town houses and split-level ranches, there are 14 town houses, seven split level ranches and two flats. They have met all the zoning criteria. They are currently at Conservation Commission. They have been heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Emil Miller, 17 Oakland Street, Wellesley Hills: Starting with the over-all property, this is the landscaping plan. The orange line is the property line, the gray line is problem area. We have several easements for wetlands, sewer, etc. We put in 23 units of town houses and split level ranches. The scale shown is 1/8" to a foot actual building area. Ten town houses which are attached single-family units have their own garages. Unit A.

Unit B is a two-story building which has a two-bedroom flat on the ground floor and on the second floor. Eleven units have the identical floor plan. All the units have an uninterrupted view to natural land. We are not damaging any of the surrounding adjacent area which is identically marked by haybales. As far as parking goes, we are trying to mitigate it. We have a total of nine parking spaces exposed to the street. We have a large, landscaped area in the middle. Architecturally we tried to design a building which has a residential character and is compatible with buildings in the area. (Showed picture of proposed buildings as they

Page 3
April 13, 1987

will be seen from North Meadows Road.) The highest building is 35 feet in height; other buildings are 31 or 32 feet in height. The south elevation is 154 feet.

Mr. Parker read Whitman & Howard's March 26, 1987, letter.

Mr. Fox said that the plan was designed to meet the National Fire Prevention Association standards.

Mr. Parker said that a new plan is needed. The driveway as shown is a minimum of 20 feet. Twenty-four feet is the required minimum for a two-way driveway. There is two-way traffic throughout the site. The parking spaces should be 9 1/2 x 18'.

Mr. Gagliani asked about the traffic flow and suggested that the traffic pattern be one-way and suggested diagonal parking.

Mr. Parker asked how many usable square feet is this plan based on.

Mr. Miller said 199,764 total. He said the buildings are 32 feet long and the parking as submitted is the only way it can fit.

Mr. Fox: We can conceivably go four feet. During the storms last week, we took many pictures. That was a 50-year storm.

Mr. Miller: If we had a one-way pattern, we would relocate the dumpster.

Mr. Gagliani: Will this driving pattern be a problem with emergency vehicles?

Mr. Fox: Twenty feet is adequate for a hook and ladder truck.

Mr. Parker was concerned with snow storage.

Mr. Fox pointed out two areas on the site for storage. He said that snow would be removed with a front-end loader, not a plow.

Mr. Codispoti asked how many parking spaces would be constructed.

Mr. Miller: 46 - 10x20.

Mr. Fox said that a landscaping plan and a lighting plan would be submitted.

Mr. Parker read the requirements for plantings where a multi-family development abuts residential lots.

Page 4
April 13, 1987

Mr. Fox said there is a natural buffer of plantings which he does not wish to disturb.

Mr. Parker said that the Board has to go by the Zoning Bylaw, Section 6.2.10. He asked what Fox proposes to do in the 20-foot easement.

Mr. Fox said he plans to landscape the easement.

Mr. Parker said that the entire site must be landscaped. Until we have a plan showing a buffer, we cannot act on the plan favorably. If you do not wish to show the required buffer you must go to the Board of Appeals for relief.

Mr. Parker said that he would like to have photometrics provided on the lighting and landscaping plan.

Mr. Miller: We want to keep the residential character of the area. Three lights on poles should be adequate for lighting of the parking lot.

Chairman Parker read from the Whitman & Howard report that a plan showing the proposed watershed has not been submitted to us. He asked what happens to the roof drainage?

Mr. Fox said that they have filed with the Conservation Commission.

Chairman Parker said that the Board must review the drainage under Section 14.13.3.k. The site plan cannot be acted on until we have more information. This is a more complicated and sensitive area because of what is around it. Our concern is that the water collected on this site is going to be put in a pipe and dumped into a drainage easement.

Mr. Miller said that everything will be drained off the site in catchbasins.

Mr. Parker said that the Board has asked for information required in the Zoning Bylaw. Another concern is what happens in the winter when you salt the driveways and parking.

Mr. Fox said that there will be no salt or other chemicals on the parking lot or driveways. The drainage is a sheet flow system. It flows out into a very large area. We would not be creating more than 1/2" of water in a 100-year storm. We will not be affecting the area any differently than it is now. It is a fairly impervious material. We are not concentrating the flow out. There is a series of catchbasins with oil and grease traps so that no oil/gas or grease will be in the wetlands area.

Mr. Parker asked about the roof runoff.

Mr. Fox said that the front will be sheeted off to the wetlands.

Mr. Gagliani asked how the basins are interconnected and during a storm how deep will the water be in the swale?

Mr. Fox explained the interconnected basins. He said that each basin would overflow into the next basin. He felt that there would be very little water sheeting out of the swale.

Mr. Parker said that the Board needs legible contours for Whitman & Howard. We cannot apply drainage calculations unless we have a plan from which it is derived. The last item you said you have taken care of is the drainage into the vegetated wetlands.

Mr. Parker said he would like to ask a question regarding the proposed trash collection system. Would one dumpster be sufficient for 23 units?

Mr. Miller said that the dumpster will be located at the front of the site and will be screened by a fence with planting so that it will not be seen from inside or outside of the development.

Mr. Parker said the problem he sees from a buffer standpoint is to the rear. If you walk down to that site you can see that vehicles are using the sewer easement as a road which goes out to the cemetery land. His concern is that the development is so close to the town cemetery so that if someone in the rear unit wanted to obtain access they could do so through the cemetery and could drive up to their back door. It would be necessary to put in a gate to prevent driving from one area to the other.

Mr. Gagliani noted that it is proposed to pave on top of the town's drainage easement and asked if permission had been obtained from the Selectmen.

Mr. Fox said that he thought that the easement had been abandoned and is serving no purpose.

Mr. Gagliani suggested that Mr. Fox speak with the Selectmen on this matter.

Mrs. Bancroft said that a sidewalk connecting the shopping center to the residential development would be desirable.

Mr. Fox said that it was a possibility that he would look at.

Mr. Gagliani noted that there were no internal walkways

within the development.

Mr. Miller said that there is an independent entry to each unit so no sidewalk system is required.

Mr. Parker said that the Superintendent of Public Works has some concerns. Mr. Feeney is concerned with the tie-in of this driveway onto a high speed highway.

Mr. Fox said that as large an entrance as possible could be designed. The preliminary plan recommendation was to screen the area from North Meadows Road. For that reason, we decided to go with a smaller opening.

Mr. Parker said that a new catchbasin should be on the high side of the driveway.

Mel Procaccini, 54 Frairy Street: Having an open brook is a sore sight, I would like to see it piped. In the summertime it is dry and unsightly.

Mr. Parker said that the Zoning Board of Appeals and Conservation Commission would have to rule on that.

Mr. Gagliani said he would like to see some information showing that fire apparatus can maneuver the parking lot. It is a general safety concern under Section 14.13.3.g of the Zoning Bylaw. He wants to be sure if there is a fire, a hook and ladder can get in there quickly and safely.

Mr. Parker asked for a plan giving the turning radius which we require. He asked what the net floor area of the 23 units will be.

Mr. Miller said he thought it was 23,640 s.f. The units go from 740 s.f. to 1,250 s.f.

Mr. Parker said that we need the following additional information:

1. Turning radius for fire apparatus.
2. Drainage calculations.
3. Buffer to be shown, including at SE.
4. Topo lines should be legible.
5. Hydrants should be shown.
6. Design a safe ingress and egress.

Mr. Parker suggested that this hearing be continued to some future date so that the applicant would have an opportunity

Page 7
April 13, 1987

to make the proposed changes on his plan.

Mr. Parker suggested the applicant discuss with Superintendent Feeney what should or should not be done on the 20-foot easement.

Mr. Parker asked that the sidewalk which would connect the abutting shopping center should be considered. This is a safety issue. It is a good location to walk to shops. How are people with strollers or small children going to get to the shops? If you could provide access to the shops it would be in the best interest of safety.

The hearing will be continued to 8:30 p.m., May 18th at the Town House.

ROCKY ACRES:

Mr. Merrikin met with the Board to discuss the detailed drainage analysis to try to assess the situation as it exists and what we can do about it. This report is 99% calculations. The summary sheet is on the second page. In a 10-year storm the runoff will be 7.6 c.f.s. and in a 100-year storm, it will be 9.4 c.f.s. The 100-year flood elevation is 223.2. We anticipate putting in two driveways for three lots. We felt that the driveways could be used as dams and this should benefit the system. Two 12" culverts provide for ten- and 100-year flows through the property. It reduces greatly the amount of water getting to this point. We have reduced the flow now to 4.5 c.f.s. for a ten-year storm and to 7.0 for a 100-year storm. We feel that that would address the issue that the Board was concerned about. It provides for some temporary measures. It does not create a serious situation or a hazard to anyone involved. It will not change the character of the area because it is temporary ponding and actually this is pretty wet now and these areas are being used to control the flow of drainage.

It is difficult to assess what is going to happen. The best thing we can do is look at it as a single entity. In a ten-year storm you would raise the level of the swamp 1 1/2"; and 2.3" in a 100-year storm. There will be no significant impact on this as in a very severe case it would rise 1 1/2 to 2" with no outfall. In accordance with these calculations, we will include the driveways that were proposed. They are subject to review by other Boards, however, we are within the status quo of the drainage system.

Mr. Parker asked if Mr. Merrikin knew where the pipe goes which takes the water from a portion of the lots.

Mr. Merrikin: There is a drain in Cheney Pond Road. It intersects with Cheney Pond Road and Vine Brook Road. There

Page 8
April 13, 1987

is no problem with the pipe. I was out there on Sunday and there was no water ponding in the area. At that particular time everything seemed to be working.

Mr. Parker: I think the important thing is to send these calculations to Mr. MacKinnon. I would like to reserve questions and comments on this until that time. We cannot comment on the merits of this until we have an engineering report.

Mrs. Bancroft: A particular concern of the abutters on the west side is that you should be able to demonstrate that the water level affecting their properties will not be significantly changed.

Mr. Merrikin: We can carve out more wetlands here. It won't accomplish much. It would add more area which would be able to be flooded. I don't think it would do alot.

Mr. Parker noted that compensatory water storage would require Conservation Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals approval.

Mr. Merrikin: We will do it where required. Where it is not necessary it is overkill.

Mrs. Bancroft: Somehow you need to show that the effect on abutting property is negligible.

Mr. Parker: There are people here this evening who need some demonstration that we can all understand. Maybe you can give some thought to how you can explain it to us. It is noticeably different now from previous years. Why is this occurring? What effect will your development have on this entire area?

CRANMORE ROAD - BORRELLI:

Mr. Codispoti removed himself from the Planning Board on the Cranmore Road matter. Mr. Robert Borrelli and his attorney Richard Jensen met with the Board to discuss the status of the release of lots on Cranmore Road. Attorney Jensen said that the easement has been signed by the Hegedus' and upon the Board's signing the plan the Hegedus' would sign the grant of easement. Attorney Jensen said on Town Counsel's advice that the Selectmen will sign the easements.

BOW STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

Attorney Jensen presented a Plan of Land under Subdivision Control drawn by Cheney Engineering Company, dated February 10, 1987, showing a retaining wall easement on Lot 50, Land Court Plan 42462.

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan.

The plan was signed.

The Board has reviewed Plan of Retaining Wall on Cranmore Road dated March 4, 1987, regarding the Cranmore Road wall.

VOTED: To sign the plan.

VOTED: To accept copies of the easement as accepted by the Medfield Board of Selectmen between two private parties regarding the easement for the construction of the wall.

EQUESTRIAN PARK:

The Board brought to Mr. Borrelli's attention that its posture is not to accept retention or detention basins.

The Board reviewed the Equestrian Park Preliminary Plan dated January 3, 1985, and received on March 2, 1987. The Board also reviewed Whitman & Howard's March 23, 1987, report.

It was brought to Mr. Borrelli's attention that the Subdivision Rules & Regulations require a road to be brought to the property line to provide access to abutting property.

Another concern is that there is no place to put the water because the wells for both Medfield and Walpole are in this area. The Subdivision Rules do not allow retention or detention basins. To allow such water retention in the well area would require very precise environmental information.

The 1200-foot long cul-de-sac would require a waiver. The drainage system as shown would require a waiver. It will be necessary to bring a stub to the Palson's land. The Board will act on this plan on April 14, 1987.

A revised plan was shown to the Board, however, it was too late to be included in this preliminary review.

COSTELLO SUBDIVISION - OFF CURVE STREET:

Mr. Ralph Costello met with the Board to discuss his preliminary subdivision plan. He said it is a five-lot subdivision encompassing land where there is an existing house.

Whitman & Howard's March 23rd report was reviewed.

1. Preliminary plan does not conform to Subdivision Rules & Regulations which are currently in effect.

Mr. Costello said that the turnaround has been modified in

Page 10
April 13, 1987

accordance with Rules & Regulations. He said that the sloping from the proposed road to the house is 4 to 1 and they were trying to meet the existing grade at the end of the cul de sac. There will be a little fill at the entrance.

Mr. Parker asked if any trees would be removed.

Mr. Costello said they would have to clear the roadway and the sloping.

Mr. Costello said that the house to be constructed on Curve Street would be a duplex - colonial in style - and each unit would have 1,650 square feet of area.

Mr. Parker asked how this would relate to the other houses to be built in the area.

Mr. Costello said that once the street is in the elevation might change 20 feet or so. A wall might make sense here.

Mr. Nelson said that the drainage from this area would be about 1 or 2 c.f.s. This subdivision would drain quickly.

Mr. Parker said that Lot 5 is a strange lot.

Mr. Nelson said that sewer will serve the lots. The front of the lots would need fill at the transition between the lots and the sewer. There will be three or four feet of fill in this area.

Mr. Parker noted that the total street length is 393 feet. He suggested that the sidewalk be constructed on the Pleasant Street side of the street.

Two hydrants will be required.

SIGN ADVISORY BOARD;

VOTED; To appoint Deanna Egelson to the Sign Advisory Board.

BLASTING LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE:

VOTED; To appoint Joseph D. Codispoti as the Planning Board member on this committee.

GRANITE STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan showing lot changes on Granite Street and Oriole Road. This plan has been drawn by Norwood Engineering Company showing Lot 1, Parcel "A" and Lot 28-A. The plan is dated March 4, 1987.

VOTED: To sign plan.

Page 11
April 13, 1987

The plan was signed.

CRANMORE ROAD:

A copy of a letter was received from an abutter at 42 Hillcrest Road regarding building foundations being constructed on Cranmore Road on unreleased lots. This is being done by John Rosata.

ORCHARD PARK:

VOTED: To accept an extension to May 19, 1987.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 midnight.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

1

2

3

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

April 14, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani, Parker and Rhoads.

Chairman Parker called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

EQUESTRIAN PARK PRELIMINARY PLAN - DATED JANUARY 3, 1985:

VOTED: To deny the above-described preliminary plan received on March 2, 1987, based on the following:

1. In order to evaluate a plan showing a retention basin, which the Medfield Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations do not allow, the Board would have to have extensive engineering information demonstrating that the system would be satisfactory, especially considering its proximity to Medfield's and Walpole's water supply.
2. The Subdivision Rules, Section 5.1.1, require that provision for access to adjoining property which is not yet subdivided should be shown, which in this case would require that Citation Road be designed to provide access to the undeveloped land at the western boundary.
3. Secretariat Drive does not meet the minimum horizontal alignment with centerline requirements of 400 feet.

The revised plan, received on April 13th, was received too late to be included in the engineering review for this subdivision.

The issues raised in Whitman & Howard's March 23, 1987, letter, as follows, are considered to be part of this decision:

1. The plans are adequate for preliminary plan review, but many changes are required in these plans before definitive plan submission, in order for them to conform to the December 1, 1986, amended subdivision regulations.
2. Secretariat Drive does not meet the minimum horizontal alignment with centerline requirements of 400 feet.
3. Secretariat Drive and Citation Road are in effect a deadend street, exceeding the maximum allowed length of 500 feet.
4. An intermittent stream may cross the site from Lot 5 toward Lot 11. It should be determined if there is any wetland vegetation bordering on this area. If there is,

the scope of the project may be changed.

5. Storm water is required to be directed to the nearest natural water course. The proposed retention basin would require a waiver from the Board.
6. The drainage calculations provided are not sufficient to determine if the proposed retention basin is adequate to handle the proposed drainage conditions.
7. The proximity of the Town wells will require a thorough Environmental Impact Statement for a definitive plan submission.

Mr. Borrelli was requested to make an appointment to discuss this matter with the Board before proceeding with a further plan.

NONCONFORMING, PRE-EXISTING - SECTION 6, CHAPTER 40A:

Town Counsel Fuller and Richard DeSorgher met with the Board to discuss what the procedure would be to change properties which would be made nonconforming by a proposed zoning change.

Town Counsel Fuller said that there have been no Court cases on this subject, however, it is his opinion that in order to change a structure on a nonconforming lot it would be necessary for the Board of Appeals to make a finding. This would require a public hearing with notices published and sent. The finding would be in the form of a special permit and filed with the Registry of Deeds.

MOBILE EXCAVATING:

Dale MacKinnon of Whitman & Howard met with the Board to discuss the Mobile Excavating site plan. The Board is concerned with the drainage issue and feels that a downstream study to include the stream and drainage structures to Adams Street is required. The Board would like to know what will happen with the 30" pipes and the 18" pipes.

Mr. MacKinnon suggested an upstream detention basin which would allow the water to drain off more slowly. It was noted that only 5,000 feet can be filled because of the vegetated wetlands. Mr. MacKinnon recommended that at least two feet of dirt should cover the culvert as the vehicles using this area will be very heavy.

The Board is concerned with putting a tank underground in the wetlands.

The Board will check with the Conservation Commission on this matter.

Page 3
April 14, 1987

A summary of inadequacies of the plan will be drawn up for discussion with the applicant on May 18th.

WHEELWRIGHT ROAD - ANR PLAN:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan Under Subdivision Control Not Required dated March 23, 1987. This plan shows changed lots 1A, 2A, 3A, 12A, 16A and Parcel A. The plan was prepared for MN Development, 2 Milliston Road, Millis, by Darna Engineering Company, Millis.

VOTED; To sign the above-described plan.

The plan was signed.

COSTELLO SUBDIVISION - PRELIMINARY PLAN:

The Planning Board reviewed the Costello Subdivision Plan, drawn by Guerriere & Halnon, Inc., dated February 24, 1987. A revised plan was presented on April 13th, however, that plan was received too late to review.

VOTED: To approve the above-described preliminary subdivision plan, dated February 24, 1987, with the following changes:

1. Remove planting island.
2. Add catchbasin on the upstream side of the proposed street to keep water out of the intersection.
3. Change water main to 8".
4. Discuss placement of fire hydrants with Charles Evans and the Fire Chief.
5. Driveways on the cul-de-sac must allow for snow storage.
6. Calculations should be submitted to show that the existing 15" drain pipe at the intersection of Pleasant and Curve Streets has sufficient capacity to handle the additional flow from the proposed subdivision.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
John K. Gagliani,
Secretary

11

12

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

May 6, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani, Parker and Rhoads.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

ROCKY ACRES AND ORCHARD PARK CONTINUED HEARINGS:

The hearings will be rescheduled for Tuesday, May 12, 1987, as the Town Meeting has been adjourned to May 11th. The meeting will be posted for 7:45 p.m. on May 12th, and Ralph Copeland will be scheduled for the 7:45 appointment.

MINUTES: VOTED: To approve the minutes of February 2, 9, 19, 23, March 2, 9, 16, 23, April 6, 13 and 14.

CRANMORE ROAD:

The Board has surety in the amount of \$65,000 and an easement from the Hegedus' to allow a wall to be built on their property, including the footings.

VOTED: To release lots 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56 and 57 Cranmore Road.

The release was signed.

OFFICE AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES:

VOTED: To authorize Mildred E. Willis, Planning Board Administrator, to sign invoices for payment of ordinary office and administrative expenses of the Board.

SIGN ADVISORY BOARD:

Mr. Codispoti reported that the Sign Advisory Board met and disapproved an application for second sign for Medfield Gardens.

BLASTING COMMITTEE:

Mr. Codispoti reported that the Committee on Blasting Legislation will meet after Town Meeting.

VINE BROOK CONDOMINIUMS:

The Board will request the Selectmen's opinion on the 20-foot easement along the front of the Vine Brook lot.

Page 2
May 6, 1987

PARKING PLAN FOR DISABLED VET BUILDING:

The Board had sent the plan back to have the plan changed so that it met the Board's criteria. It has not been returned.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
MAY 12, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Gagliani, Parker and Rhoads.
Others attending: Ralph Copeland, Rocky Acres developer and
abutters, Orchard Park developer and
abutters.

The meeting was called to order at 7:45 P.M. by Chairman
Parker and the following business was transacted:

WAMPATUCK SUBDIVISION:

Mr. Copeland met with the Board to determine the fee to
petition the Board for the modification of a subdivision plan
under Chapter 41 Section 81-W and approval of a plan under
Section 81-U on the grounds that there has been approval
and/or a petition for approval if it is considered that there
was no prior approval.

Mr. Copeland said he would like to submit the petition
because he did not feel that the condition which has not been
met will ever be resolved; namely, the connection between Gun
Hill Park and Wampatuck. He said that the abutters would not
give sloping rights.

The Planning Board brought to Mr. Copeland's attention
Section 5.1.1 for extension of streets to adjoining property.

The Board will require a fee of \$750 plus \$25 for each lot
over 15 or a total of \$1,250.

ROCKY ACRES CONTINUED HEARING:

Mr. Richard Merrikin, engineer for Rocky Acres, said that he
did a detailed engineering study on the project. He said he
looked at the drainage two ways. He looked at it with the
proposed catchbasins in place. As an existing condition,
there is a brook and a swamp going into an 18" pipe. There
is some backup on the 18" pipe in a 10/20 year storm. This
was treated as if the lots were built on and put drainage
into street drains as well as in the swamp. In the 10- or
20-year storm there is no increase in flow in the Vine Brook
system. 18" pipe provides some control even in the proposed
condition. There is a slight increase in runoff. It is our
intention to build on three lots on the extension. Ponding
would be allowed at two points. Compensatory storage would
significantly reduce the amount of flow in the 100-year
event. The addition of the driveways with the 12" pipe will
be a plus to the entire system. Compensatory storage is
shown on the plan.

Page 2
May 12, 1987

Mr. Parker read the Whitman & Howard report dated May 6, 1987, on the Rocky Acres drainage.

Mr. Rhoads asked about detention basins and asked if there would be any absorption of water into the ground.

Mr. Merrikin said that in this case we are getting our ground water flow rather than the opposite.

Mr. Parker asked if we are to assume that the drainage from the three lots crossing the wet area is included in this review. You do not have approval from either the Zoning Board of Appeals or the Conservation Commission. Could you explain to us how your drainage calculations will work if the driveway hasn't been constructed?

Mr. Merrikin: We made the assumption that if you didn't build the driveway, you couldn't build the house. We took the scenario that we would build seven houses and found that the drainage is slightly increased. If you do not have driveways, you couldn't have the house.

Mr. Parker: Our concern is for the public good.

Mrs. Bancroft: In what areas does the water get two or three feet deep?

Mr. Merrikin: The wetland near the houses gets lower in the 100-year storm. The other gets higher.

Mr. Gagliani: Would the driveways be lower than the street?

Mrs. Bancroft: You say there will be no effect from the drainage?

Mr. Merrikin: We looked at the proposed volume of the water increases in a 100-year storm. 2" does not take into consideration that this is two acres which is a portion of a 10/12/15-acre ponding area, because of this we would not see any significant increase.

Mrs. Bancroft: What is your definition of significant increase?

Mr. Merrikin: You have to put it in prospective. The flow regulates the water level. If we added significantly to the grade, that will cause significantly more water to come down. If this is most of the wetland area, we would have to go look at those properties to see if a 1" or 2" rise will be a significant amount of water. It was not necessary. Our computations showed that 2" will dissolve to nothing. It is a moving system. The water is constantly flowing.

Page 3
May 12, 1987

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the closest abutters have been keeping track of the water level from a particular point.

Mr. Merrikin pointed to the Lynches property. They have recently seen an increase in the water level. They thought a spring had opened. To answer the question, as a result of the subdivision they would see no change in the water level.

Mr. Parker asked if the drainage of the site could be explained again.

Mr. Merrikin said that the problem is the very steep bank. The district is at elevation 218. The water level is 211. There is a big difference in elevation.

Mr. Parker said that the drainage structure will be in the watershed and not in the wetlands.

Mr. Parker: Are there any other Board considerations on drainage? Have you talked with the Highway Department? How will you tie into Vine Brook Road? The existing stub pavement will be wider and there will be only one sidewalk. Superintendent Feeney requested that the stub from Cheney Pond Road be rebuilt. Further extensions of the road may be made as the stub will be built to the lot line.

Mr. Merrikin: I might balk at bringing the road all the way from the intersection with Cheney Pond Road. We have to put in a drain. Would the Board be interested in waiving the underground requirements in lieu of some considerations for the construction of the road?

Mr. Gagliani: My personal opinion is that all utilities should be underground.

Mr. Parker: I don't think we would ever waive underground utilities.

Mr. Merrikin: We would work with Mr. Feeney on the matter.

Mr. Heavey: Is the drainage proposed for a five-year storm rather than ten?

Mr. Merrikin: Ten-year storm.

Mr. Heavey: He is asking for a variance to put the road up to the Kennedy property. Is that accurate?

Mr. Parker: How long is the stub?

Mr. Merrikin: 150 feet from centerline to the end.

Mr. Heavey: He wants a variance from the 175-foot frontage

requirement.

Mr. Parker: As far as this Board is concerned the three lots on the right require access through the frontage.

Mr. Merrikin: This Board doesn't approve the lots as buildable. This Board only sets up the dimensional requirements of the lot.

Mr. Heavey: You are going to decrease the drainage even though you are putting in three houses and two driveways? Where are the holding areas as compared to my property? What is the terminology of the holding areas which will be two feet deep? There will not be any water retention areas beside me?

Mr. Merrikin: Water level drops now from existing?

Mr. Heavey: Where does the flow of water come from or where does it go?

Mr. Merrikin: There is a stream which comes from the Kennedy property. It is the headwaters of Vine Brook. It ends being a definable flow here. It goes through the wetland and backs up here.

Mr. Heavey: Are there any other streams to your knowledge?

Mr. Merrikin: It could flow over the bank to the ditch.

Mr. Heavey: Is the Planning Board taking into account the distinct possibility that if you do not require a turnaround but a road is connected to the Kennedy property at sometime in the future there could be substantial building on the Kennedy land?

Mr. Parker: That is the reason why the road is built to the property line.

Mr. Heavey: Water is flowing into the 18" pipe next to my property. That wouldn't have any effect on houses in the neighborhood? It would have no effect on the condition of the pavement within the subdivisions?

Mrs. Flynn, 29 Hatters Hill Road: We understood that there is a pipe underneath our property.

Mr. Parker: The brook under Mr. Heavey's house goes straight down. If there are additional pipes, they are somewhere else.

Mr. Heavey: The Board determines whether they are proper lots or not?

Page 5
May 12, 1987

Mr. Parker: If they meet the frontage, area, width and depth requirements, our responsibility has been met.

Mr. Heavey: They were doing some digging today. Does it pertain to this matter?

Mr. Merrikin: We were doing perk tests with the Board of Health.

Mr. Merrikin asked for an extension to May 20th for the Planning Board to make its decision.

VOTED: Upon a written request, the Board will approve an extension to May 20th.

The hearing was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

ORCHARD PARK DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION PLAN:

This hearing is a continuation of the Orchard Park Subdivision hearing.

Mr. Parker explained the process.

Bruce Kirkland, engineer with Norwood Engineering, representing Orchard Park Realty Trust.

Mr. Kirkland said a plan has been submitted for the Board's review. We have relocated the existing right of way so that the turnaround is to the LaPointe's property. As part of this change, we have reduced the size of the subdivision from 9 to 8 lots. We have talked with Mr. Feeney regarding the drainage at the end of High Street. After discussions with Mr. Feeney, we have agreed to add catchbasins on the upstream side of the intersection and construct a new manhole along the line of the existing basin. That will address freezing or flooding problems within that intersection. We have added the name of "Rockwood Drive." We have also filed a notice of intent with the Conservation Commission for work adjacent to the wetland area on Mr. Manganiello's property. This was also given to the Planning Board and sent to Whitman & Howard for review. We are increasing the volume of flow going through the area. The larger area will drain through a closed drainage system. The volume will increase approximately 8 to 9% in a 100-year storm and 6% in a 10-year storm. We have done topography in the back yards. We shot basement and sill elevations of the houses. During a ten-year storm, the maximum height that this will rise to is elevation 203. The water will be approximately 4" above the top of that pipe. The green line is the edge of the flooding which is 203, 204, 206 1/2 and 207 1/2. Most of the shots in the backyards are 203, 204, 205 and 203 1/2. Basically, what is happening is that the flow from the subdivision will be

Page 6
May 12, 1987

continued in the wetland area. It will not impact on the homes. This plan will also be submitted to the Conservation Commission, which meeting I believe is scheduled for May 21.

Mr. Gagliani: What is considered the sill?

Mr. Kirkland: The sill is where the wood meets the cement.

Mr. Parker: I believe you have a copy of a letter from Whitman & Howard dated May 5th. The memorandum from Supertintendent of Public Works Feeney was read.

Mr. Kirkland: We used the rational method on the pipes and the SCS method on the manholes.

Mr. Parker: Our Rules & Regulations call for the rational method.

Mr. Kirkland: The rational method is a very conservative design. SCS is a much more computerized method. There is a manual of 100 pages on that. SCS stand for Soil Conservation Service. It looks at the time element of the flow in much more detail. It allows hydrological relief at peak flows. The rational method doesn't let you know when the peak flows will be. S.C.S. is the accepted method to answer that questions that was presented.

Mr. Gagliani: Quick question on the cul de sac at the end. You are showing that as a temporary cul de sac.

Mr. Kirkland: Yes. The pavements ends approximately 10 feet from the property line.

Mr. Parker: The slope will be up hill?

Mr. Kirkland: The projection of this would allow the continuation for the three lots in the back. The roadway would have to be extended 100 to 150 feet.

Mr. Parker: All utilities are shown to the property line.

Mr. Kirkland: Water is shown beyond the end of the pavement.

Mr. Gagliani: The shape of lot 4. Is that for setting up a septic system?

Mr. Kirkland: Yes. It is a large lot.

Mrs. Bancroft: What is the configuration of the pavement in the cul de sac?

Mr. Kirkland: It is offset to the right with a 15-foot planting strip on this side.

Page 7
May 12, 1987

Mr. Parker: I want to be sure about your connection with Route 27. There should be no water in the intersection.

Mr. Kirkland: The street is sloping into 27 so that there will be some water. There will be a small amount for the last 60 feet. There is a vertical curb at Route 27.

Mr. Parker: The water is coming from your street onto 27. It would go down the vertical curb to the gutter. What is the radius there?

Mr. Kirkland: It is a 40-foot radius. The right of way is 50.

Mr. Parker: What kind of grading on that town property do you envision on both sides?

Mr. Kirkland: Very little disturbance.

Mr. Parker: Do you have to clear any trees for a short distance?

Mr. Kirkland: When you get up to the pavement there would not be any problem.

Mrs. Bancroft: What is the radius of the curve in the street?

Mr. Kirkland: The 400-foot centerline is based on a tangent of 750 feet long and there is another 400-foot radius following that.

Mr. Parker: Have you shown on your plans and will you review with us again any waivers you are asking the Board to grant?

Mr. Kirkland: The length of the cul de sac is the only one.

Mr. Paul Cassidy, 31 Granite Street: Before the manhole was put into Granite Street we had no problem. If he gathers all this water and they clean out the pipe under Granite Street, I am afraid we could get more water.

Mr. Parker: The developer is not allowed to put any more water at any greater rate than currently is there. It has been determined that the water can go through the pipe at Granite Street. How far downstream can we have this developer be responsible? We can't allow him to put more water on it at a greater rate. He is meeting that requirement. Our Board can only be concerned with this subdivision application and what Chapter 41 allows us to be concerned with.

Page 8
May 12, 1987

Mr. Cassidy: This may be a problem to me.

Mr. Kirkland: The water will be running 1/2 hour instead of 1 hour.

Mr. Parker: Do you think your water comes from ground water? What is your guess?

Mr. Cassidy: No trouble with the 8" pipe. I guess the water table should be looked at at the brook.

Mr. Parker: I think it would be interesting to talk to Mr. Feeney to see what the town's responsibility would be.

Maria Gruzinov: I am concerned with flooding in my driveway.

Mr. Kirkland explained that the water which floods her driveway comes from another watershed.

Mr. Parker: The applicant had to demonstrate that there wouldn't be any flooding problems by this increased volume.

Mrs. Wilson: I don't see how this has been demonstrated. I am not an engineer and I don't understand what you have done.

Mr. Kirkland: We have shot your basement and sill. We calculated how high the water will rise when it goes through this pipe to the brook and knowing that we can demonstrate that 203 is 2.7 feet below your basement.

Mr. Parker: We need to explain volume. The 100-year storm is a lot more than we have here. We only required the ten-year storm for this. In the 50-year storm which we had recently, the water would come up higher. We need to know what volume means.

Mrs. Wilson: Our septic field is in the rear yard and obviously that will be impacted if there is flooding in that area.

Mr. Kirkland: If your septic is in the back yard, it won't make it flood. It will be there for one hour instead of one-half hour. For 23 or 24 hours when the storm is occurring, the pipe can take all the flow.

Mary Wilson: Do you know the land adjacent to the Manganiello Drive is always flooded when it rains?

Mr. Ron Kushner: Do you have any idea what the proposed location of the house is on the lot?

Mr. Kirkland: Presumably the septic field would be in the front and the tank in the rear.

Page 9
May 12, 1987

Mr. Kushner: We have a water problem. I am curious to know what effect leaching systems and systems in the back have on the water table. How far down the end of the street do the storm drains go?

Mr. Kirkland: It ends about 50 feet from the end of the street.

Mr. Parker: Will there be water from the underground flowing over the vertical curb at this end?

Mr. Kirkland: Yes. There is a rainfall runoff plan that shows it.

Mr. Parker: The Planning Board is bound by a set of laws. Our job is to prove Mr. Fickeisen's development will not have an adverse impact on the area.

Mr. Fickeisen: This is the fourth project we have done in town. We have gone out of our way to work with the town. For us to do something that would be detrimental would be foolish. We will do everything we can to do a good job. We will do nothing to hurt any abutters.

Linda Kushner: I have one question - the ledge is right behind our house will you have to blast?

Mr. Kirkland: If the ledge is less than 4 feet down, we will have to blast.

Mr. Parker explained that it is the fire chief's responsibility to see that the blasting is done in accordance with requirements.

Helen Rohnstock: Will there be any more blasting in the back of the lot? How close would you be bringing a house or septic tank?

Mr. Kirkland: No blasting for septic system. Not allowed.

The abutters would like to be notified when blasting is taking place.

Robin Beadwell: We abut lot 5. Where does the new street come out?

Mr. Kirkland: We are showing a new driveway for lot 5 and a relocated driveway for the Beadwell's. The new driveway will go between the two big trees.

Mr. Gagliani: Would it be safer to relocate the Beadwell driveway into the new street?

Page 10
May 12, 1987

Mr. Kirkland: It would be impossible.

Mary Wilson: If there is any work done in the wetlands, it would have to be done with the approval of the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Fickeisen asked for an extension for the Board to make its decision to May 20th.

VOTED: If the extension request is received in writing the extension to May 20th will be granted.

The hearing was closed at 10:00 p.m.

Mr. MacKinnon will be requested to review the drainage plan submitted this evening.

MEETINGS:

The Board will hold a meeting on May 19th. Mobile Excavating, Robert Borrelli and George Pyne will be rescheduled to this meeting. The Fox Properties Public Hearing will be held on June 1st.

MINUTES:

VOTED: To accept the minutes of May 6, 1987.

BUILDING-CORNER OF MAIN AND PARK STREETS:

As the use intended for this building requires only five parking spaces, it will not be necessary to have parking plan approval.

ROCKY ACRES:

The Board discussed the approval of Rocky Acres but noticed that the cross section for the streets was incorrect.

LIBRARY DRIVEWAY:

VOTED: To send a letter to the Board of Appeals stating that the Planning Board recommends that the Whitman & Howard proposal be used for the design of the library driveway.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 midnight.

Respectfully submitted

John K. Gagliani
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

May 19, 1987

Members present: Codispoti, Gagliani, Rhoads and Parker.

Others attending: Residents interested in Ledgewood Acres;
Mobile Excavating, Attorney Debra Nelson
and Engineer William Snow and Conservation
Commission member, Lee Howell.

Chairman Parker called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. and
the following business was transacted:

MOBILE EXCAVATING:

Attorney Debra Nelson and Engineer William Snow met with the
Board to discuss the Board's questions and concerns regarding
the Mobile Excavating Site Plan. Mr. Rhoads removed himself
from the Board for this matter.

The Board reviewed 14.13.2 with the applicant's attorney and
engineer as follows:

- (a) Name and address of applicant. That is O.K.
- (b) Name and address of applicant. That is O.K.
- (c) Nature of applicant's interest. That is O.K.
- (d) and (e) of Section 14.13.2 is O.K.

The Board next reviewed Section 14.13.3 as follows:

- (a) Locus is shown.
- (b) Bearings and distances of all lines is shown.
- (c) Watershed protection district is shown.
- (d) Topography for the entire site and adjacent land
when appropriate of two-foot intervals with
contours and principal elevations.

Mr. Parker said that there is no topography noted
on the back piece of property and asked that the
topography be put on the plan.

Mr. Snow said it is pointless to survey the water
as it is flat. We could wait until the middle of
summer for the actual topography.

Mr. Parker said he would like adjacent topography
to be shown as well, as the Board must determine
whether the water is leaving the lot or coming onto

it and the amount.

Mr. Snow said he would take the general contours off the USGS and superimpose it over the site.

- (e) Regarding location of all existing and proposed buildings. That has been accomplished. According to Mr. Snow the building height is on a separate plan. The Board would like the height on the site plan if it has not already been done.
- (f) The 25-foot front, side and rear setbacks have been shown.
- (g) The driveway is 17 feet wide and the parking spaces are 9 1/2' x 18'.
- (h) A landscaping plan has been included.
- (i) All facilities for water supply and distribution, fire protection, lighting and facilities for the prevention of air pollution have been shown. The type, height wattage and foot-candle output of the lighting has been shown.
- (j) The dumpster will be shown on the plan. It will be fenced in. Not proposing any toilet or wash-up facilities within the proposed building. Truck washing water will be collected in a holding tank and removed from the area by a licensed carrier. It was brought to Mr. Snow's attention that the town has passed a bylaw on underground tanks at the Town Meeting in May. The tank will be a double-wall tank and must meet Fire Chief approval.
- (k) Mr. Snow stated that there was an increase of 5.01 c.f.s. off the site. A drainage issue is the depth of the pipe. Our engineer recommends a cover of from 2 to 2 1/2 feet. The cover shown on the plan is 12". Mr. Snow said that is all that the manufacturer of the pipe requires. It is an H-20 highway load in the pipe design. Mr. Snow said it would be impossible to have 2 1/2 feet of cover over the pipe based upon the outflow of the grading. One of the reasons Mr. MacKinnon suggested the 2 1/2 feet of cover was the fluctuation in frost heaves and ground water could cause the pipe to break. Mr. Snow said it would have to be at a depth of 4 feet in order to preclude frost heaves. Mr. Snow said that the maximum threshold for the pipe is 12". Mr. Parker said that his biggest concern is that the system work. Mr. Snow said that the water table doesn't

rise higher than the inlet to the system, which would be the rim of the catchbasins. The answer would be not to have any underground piping but to allow a surface drainage system.

Mrs. Howell asked if a surface drainage system would eliminate the grease traps. Mr. Snow said that is "likely." Mr. Parker said this would be a disadvantage. (Mr. MacKinnon said that this drainage system would allow for puddling.) Mr. Parker said his concern would be if the water was going to flood out onto West Mill Street.

- (1) Mr. Parker said that there could be a problem downstream. He showed a small handdrawn map with all the pipe sizes noted. The pipe under Adams Street is the problem. As far as we can determine downstream from that there are no major problems. If Mr. Snow's argument is that the extra five cubic feet per second is not harmful downstream, then he would have to demonstrate that it is not a problem. Mr. Snow said he would study the alternatives - one is to contain all of the runoff from the site until such time as it can be safely released into the existing system: - two is to consider some offsite improvement to help mitigate existing problems to which we would be adding. Mr. Parker said that the detainment of water is going to be dependent upon design ingenuity and the Conservation Commission's view of the situation. He suggested that the Conservation Commission would be a good place to start.

Mr. Gagliani suggested that a study of the system and what the extra 5 c.f.s. would do. He suggested that Mr. Snow review the Town's master drainage plan which shows both existing and proposed culvert sizes for the town.

The Board is in agreement that it is the increase in water both in rate and volume that is the problem.

It should be noted that the way the parking plan is designed, the center of the lot will flood during a sizeable storm as the center of the parking lot is depressed for this purpose.

Mr. Parker suggested that the applicant first find out if Conservation is going to approve some water storage scheme and then, if there is no other option open to you, a downstream study to the outfall of Adams Street culvert would be required. You would have to convince this Board that it would do no harm to the Town's drainage system.

Mr. Snow said that they will limit offsite discharge to the present discharge.

- (m) A plan for the control of erosion and siltation has been shown.

Mr. Parker said the Board would rather see a wider driveway to make it safe. He stated that our Subdivision Rules & Regulations do not recognize Cape Cod berms. It was his concern to enable the water to be contained on site. Mr. Snow said that Cape Cod berm could be 7" and is becoming standard in most other towns.

Mr. Parker asked the Board's view on the berm. Should it be vertical or Cape Cod? Mr. Snow felt that Cape Cod berm will last longer and is not as susceptible to being ruined by a plow or tractor.

It was noted that it said "guardrail" on the plan. The Board asked if Mr. Snow was planning to install a guardrail. Mr. Snow said he would remove the guardrail from the plan. Mr. Snow will change the major configuration of drainage and get some indication of what Conservation Commission will allow them to do. The Planning Board cannot approve the drainage scheme as proposed.

Mr. Snow summarized what he intends to do as follows:

1. Superimpose USGS contours at the rear of the lot.
2. Check to make sure pipe data has been forwarded.
3. Determine if a study of the downstream area is required.
4. Remove the guardrail from the plan and rename the brook.

Mr. Snow said that Board of Appeals approval has been obtained.

Mrs. Willis will send to Attorney Debra Nelson a copy of the Drainage Master Plan as it pertains to culverts and also a copy of the underground storage bylaw.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES:

George Pyne and his engineer, Gary Baxter, met with the Board to discuss a newly engineered plan.

Chairman Parker said that this is an appointment among Mr. Pyne, Mr. Baxter and the Planning Board and it is not a public hearing. The Board is happy to have everyone in attendance; however, as we are limited to one hour for this appointment, we will not be asking for questions or comments from the audience.

Page 5
May 19, 1987

Mr. Pyne said that he has gone from a 50-lot subdivision to a 12-lot subdivision. The new plan will require no sewer or no blasting. He said he is looking for one waiver for the length of the cul de sac.

Mr. Parker said that the Board will not make any commitments on a plan until it is reviewed by the Town's engineer. He also said that anything that is said tonight, the Board could change their view after an engineering report. The general reaction on this plan is favorable for a hearing.

Mr. Baxter explained the new plan as follows:
12-lot subdivision. Access off Pine Street. Length of cul de sac 1170 plus 50. Lot size will be from two to eleven acres each. Grades will be 6% or less and will be at 3% for 100 feet before intersecting with Pine Street. A profile of existing grade with proposed grade superimposed was shown. Drastic reduction in the amount of road. Cuts and fills balance out. All drainage will flow down the road. Detention basin proposed to reduce rate of runoff. Drainage will run down Pine Street to an existing stream. There will be onsite septic systems. A water booster station will be required. The land area is the original 62 acres.

Mr. Gagliani asked about the connection to the back land.

Mr. Baxter said that Kennedy's land has access to an existing road in two separate places. He thought the connections were for landlocked land.

Mr. Pyne said he would like only one entrance to this area to keep it as private as possible.

Mr. Parker said that the safety issue is primary and our next concern is the flow of traffic throughout the town. The Board's concern is not just for today but for the future as well.

Mr. Parker said that Medfield's Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations do not recognize detention basins. He asked if there was a problem putting water off the site.

Mr. Baxter asked if there has been a development in town using detention basins.

Mr. Parker said that the Indian Acres Subdivision requested a detention basin. They went to the Board of Appeals who did not allow the basin and they were required to complete a master plan drainage improvement.

Mr. Baxter said that the question of drainage could be worked out.

Page 6
May 19, 1987

Mr. Pyne asked what if the Board of Health recommends a detention area. It was his thought that the Board of Health approves drainage.

Mr. Parker said that the Board of Health reviews drainage. The Planning Board approves drainage.

Mrs. Willis will check this matter with Town Counsel.

Mr. Pyne said that they were trying to leave some type of way into Rocky Woods because there is a lot of interest for people to install stables.

Mr. Parker said that there are two points which need to be reviewed; namely, the Board has been pretty consistent in their requirement for access to undeveloped land and the Board must approve the basic drainage scheme. We will review whatever you present to us.

Mr. Pyne said he would like this piece of land to be on its own. The real issue is that the backland has adequate access and it is not landlocked.

Mr. Gagliani said he would feel better looking at a plan with a connection to the abutting land. Mr. Parker said that what is being proposed will not connect in any logical way to what might be built later. If you want to submit the plan as it is, we will act on it.

Mr. Pyne said if a connection to abutting land was required, the cul de sac would have to be 1500 feet.

Mr. Parker said the important issues are (1) drainage without detention basis; (2) street to abutting property; and (3) full engineering review.

Mr. Codispoti said he feels this plan appears to be a more responsible use of the land.

Mr. Pyne said he wanted to work with the Board. He will upgrade the plan and have the Board review it.

ROCKY ACRES SUBDIVISION:

VOTED: To approve the Rocky Acres Definitive Subdivision Plan drawn by R. F. Merrikin Associates, East Walpole, dated November 20, 1986, and revised to March 5, 1987, owned by Horace R. DiGiacomo, 584 Main Street, Medfield concerning property located at the end of Vine Brook Road, showing ten proposed lots, with the following modifications:

Page 7
May 19, 1987

1. A street name shall be added to the plan after approval by the Planning Board, Fire Chief and Police Chief.
2. Vine Brook Road shall be rebuilt under the approval of the Superintendent of Public Works from its intersection with Cheney Pond Road to the first pair of catchbasins at Station 0+0.

The following waivers have been approved:

1. Waiver to allow Vine Brook Road Extension to have a centerline radius of 350 feet.
2. Waiver of requirement for granite curb on Vine Brook Road section with 350-foot centerline radius.
3. Waiver of requirement for a temporary turnaround on Vine Brook Road extension.
4. Waiver to allow roadway section as shown on plans.

All requirements of other Town Boards must be met.

ORCHARD PARK SUBDIVISION:

VOTED: To approve Orchard Park Definitive Subdivision Plan drawn by Norwood Engineering Co., Inc., dated February 12, 1987, and revised April 23, 1987, owned by Orchard Park Realty Trust, 2 West Mill Street, Medfield, showing eight lots, with the following modifications:

1. A street name shall be added to the plan after approval by the Planning Board, Fire Chief and Police Chief.
2. Note 5 should be added to Sheet 5 of 6, as follows:
"Construction of the proposed drainage improvements will not increase the flood elevation of the wetland area east of Granite Street."
3. The proposed relocation of the Smith driveway is subject to the approval of the Superintendent of Streets.

The following waiver has been approved:

1. Waiver to allow a cul de sac 959.67 feet in length.

All requirements of other Town Boards must be met.

Page 8
May 19, 1987

WEST STREET/HARDING STREET ANR PLAN:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield, drawn by R.F. Merrikin Associates, 46 East Street, East Walpole, Massachusetts, dated February 24, 1987, owned by Vincent A. Palumbo.

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan with the addition of a note reading: "No determination has been made as to compliance of lots on this plan with Medfield Zoning Bylaws."

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John K. Gagliani,
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
June 1, 1987

Present: Bancroft, Gagliani, Parker and Rhoads. Others present: Fox Properties; Bernard J. Monbouquette; Frank Shugrue; Walter Renear; Robert Borrelli's engineer.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Parker and the following business was transacted:

MINUTES: VOTED: To accept the minutes of May 12 and 19, 1987.

Chairman Parker thanked the Board and Mrs. Willis for their assistance and support over the past year.

Mr. Rhoads saluted Chairman Parker on behalf of the Board members for the excellent job he has done as Planning Board Chairman for the past year. Mr. Rhoads then nominated the following slate of officers:

Chairman, Margaret E. Bancroft
Vice Chairman, John K. Gagliani
Secretary, Joseph D. Codispoti

The above slate was voted.

FOX PROPERTIES - VINE BROOK ESTATES CONTINUED HEARING: Chairman Bancroft called the continued hearing to order at 8:15 p.m. and called on the applicant to explain the changes in the plan.

Mr. Alan Fox introduced his architect, Emile Miller, and his engineer, Azu Etoniru to answer questions.

Mr. Miller said that the plan that will be discussed this evening has been slightly changed since being reviewed by Whitman & Howard as the Conservation Commission has required that no buildings be set within the flood plain. This has reduced the number of units from 23 to 22 and has reduced the number of parking spaces to 44. Changes have been made to the plan in accordance with Whitman & Howard's March 26th letter. The plan was redesigned in accordance with Whitman & Howard's March 26th letter was further reviewed by Whitman & Howard. The May 27th Whitman & Howard report stated that the problem of maneuvering, parking and the like have still not been addressed. Whitman & Howard was also concerned because one unit is shown constructed over a portion of the sewer easement. The Landscaping Plan showed a 24-foot wide double entrance and a curb radii that differs from the Briggs plan.

Mr. Miller said that he had gone over the plan with the Fire Chief and he could maneuver fire trucks in the complex as long as the driveways were a minimum of 20 feet in width and no parking was allowed along the sides of the driveway.

The Board expressed concern over the parking for the first unit on the "Enter" side of the area. The driveway itself is shown only seven feet in length and a car backing out would have to be in the line of traffic before turning. The Board felt that this was a safety issue.

June 1, 1987
Page 2

Mr. Fox said that they had reviewed many designs and had the number of units reduced from 36 to 22 and he felt that the design was adequate.

Mr. Fox's engineer suggested that a sign could be installed saying "Caution - Blind Driveway."

Mr. Parker said that he was concerned with the one-way traffic and the people who will enter driveways incorrectly and who will park in the driveway while "running in to see a friend." IF only the usable land were counted for development, the density would be less. Mr. Parker asked what the Fox experience has been with a restricted traffic flow.

Mr. Fox said that they train "their people" to use the roads correctly.

Mrs. Bancroft asked about the signage for controlling traffic on the site.

Mr. Fox said that signage would be provided.

Mr. Miller suggested that mirrors be used for safety. That is the way the problem of backing out into traffic is solved in Back Bay.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if there is anything different from this site plan which has not been commented on by Whitman & Howard.

Mr. Fox said that the only difference is one unit and two parking spaces have been removed and more open area has been shown.

The Board asked that the entrances be revised to 20 feet in width instead of the 24 feet shown.

Mr. Miller agreed to reduce the two entrances to 20 feet and move the parking space about which the Board is concerned.

Superintendent of Streets Feeney's letter was read into the meeting.

Mr. Parker asked if one dumpster would be sufficient for a complex of this size. Mr. Fox said that they would have private pickup and the pickup would be made as often as necessary.

Mr. Parker said that the buffer is shown along the entire front of the property and the Jones' property. Since a portion of this is within the wetlands, you will have to obtain a special permit from the Board of Appeals to work in the wetlands. If you feel you do not wish to put in the buffer, you would need a variance from the Board of Appeals. Mrs. Bancroft noted that the buffer was not shown between the complex and the cemetery. This should be shown and a special permit received to work in the wetlands or a variance from the Zoning Bylaw be requested to eliminate the buffer. Which ever avenue is chosen, the matter will have to go back to the Board of Appeals.

Mr. Parker asked the following questions:

1. Number of units Mr. Fox said 22.
2. Gross usable area of Mr. Fox will obtain this information.
 land on which the
 buildings are
 proposed.
3. Net floor area of units. Mr. Miller said that floor area
 ratio would be .14.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that another issue is connecting to the Country Village Plaza with a foot path.

Mr. Fox said it couldn't be done because there is a culvert and the path would be too narrow.

Mrs. Bancroft said she had walked the area and a gravel footpath could be shown on the inside of the guardrail. An 18" gravel path would be a nice amenity.

Mr. Gagliani asked about the photometrics. Mr. Miller said that the light poles will be ten feet in height. The actual photometrics are shown on the plan.

Mr. Fox said the only thing left to do is to have the Zoning Board of Appeals rule on the buffer and change the parking on the righthand corner of the plan. It was suggested that the dimensions be shown on the parking spaces so that the Board can be sure that they are correct.

Mr. Fox said he would resubmit the plan for Board review.

The hearing was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

PHILIP STREET LAYOUT: Mr. Bernard Monbouquette met with the Planning Board to ask the status of the Philip Street layout. Mr. Cebrowski would like to construct a house on a lot which abuts the layout. Mr. Monbouquette said he would check with the County Commissioners to see what they will do. The County Commissioners informally said that they had allowed someone to use the unconstructed taking as an access way to the existing public way.

The Board suggested that there are two options which would allow building on the Cebrowski lot; namely; (1) obtaining a variance from the Board of Appeals; or (2) apply to the Planning Board for a subdivision. Both of these procedures would require the County to allow work to be done within the layout.

FARM STREET - ANR PLAN: Mr. Frank Shugrue presented a Plan of Land in Medfield drawn by Guerriere & Halnon, Franklin, dated June 1, 1987, showing three lots.

VOTED: To sign the above-described plan.

The plan was signed.

ERIK ROAD - 8.3 ACRES: Mr. Walter Renear met with the Board to discuss a plan showing ten lots on an 8.3-acre site at the end of Erik Road. There is a brook which meanders through the lot. The Board suggested designing a development scheme which would insure the least possible intrusion into the brook area. Concern for preserving natural features of the site was also expressed.

EQUESTRIAN PARK - PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN: The Board reviewed the plan and as it was incomplete it was returned to the engineer. He will submit a complete plan on Tuesday, June 2nd.

TANNERY FARM - PRELIMINARY PLAN:

VOTED: To disapprove Tannery Farm Preliminary Subdivision Plan of Land in Medfield, Massachusetts, drawn by R. F. Merrikin Associates, dated March 10, 1987, and submitted by Davna Corporation for the following reasons:

1. Proposed lots 4 through 6 have one foot less than the required frontage.
2. It remains to be demonstrated to the Board's satisfaction that sight conditions at the intersection of Main Street and the proposed road are adequate, and taken into consideration the location of the Mattison house on the adjacent lot. (The location of this building should be shown on any subsequent plan.)

The Board also will inform the developer that the location of the existing sewer line should be shown on the drain profile of the outfall pipe.

The Board viewed favorably the concept of the proposed nonthrough street of 600 feet.

The project should be reviewed by the Conservation Commission since the proposed drainage will outlet within the buffer zone of a wetland.

The decision will be given to the Town Clerk and sent certified mail to Davna Corporation.

PRENTISS PLACE PRELIMINARY PLAN: The Board is in receipt of a letter from Paul Nyren requesting the withdrawal of the Prentiss Place Preliminary Plan.

VOTED: To allow the withdrawal of the plan without prejudice and to return their check in the amount of \$300.

SUMMER SCHEDULE: The Board will meet as follows:

June 8	July 27
15	August 10
29	August 24
July 13	September 14

It will be necessary to have members Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani and Parker present to vote on Mobile Excavating. Four members will also be required to vote on the Vine Brook Plan. These two decisions are anticipated to be made on June 29th.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES:

VOTED: If the Board does not receive a request for extension within which the decision on LedgeWood Acres is to be made, the Board will contact Whitman & Howard and Town Counsel to assist the Board in writing a decision.

RELEASE OF LOTS PREVIOUSLY RELEASED: As the release of lot 36 Penobscot Street could not be found in the Registry of Deeds by a bank attorney, the Board

VOTED: To sign a new release for lot 36 Penobscot Street and the other lots which were released at the same time; namely, lots 27, 28, 29 and 30 on Mohawk Street and lots 34, 35, 36, 37, 44 and 45 on Penobscot Street.

VOTED: To sign a new release for lot 26 Indian Hill Road.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 M.

Respectfully submitted,

John D. Gagliani
Secretary ProTem

7

7

7

"437.19.0

"POSSESSING SOME SENSING BUT NOT ALL OF THE

" I have a copy of the following information on file:

" 03.10"

" 401 SEM

"Jew Jew stay no but Jew try and

"MEI/AG BU/NOZ EY/ JEPUN

Whitman & Howard and a copy was given to Mr. Fox.

[illegible]

Mr. Millett said that some driveways are 18 feet in length and some are not. He read off the driveway lengths as follows: 1st, 15 ft.; 2nd, 13 ft.; 3rd, 15 ft.; 4th, 13 ft.; 5th, 13 ft.; 6th, 13 ft.; 6th, 18 ft.; first driveway on the "V" shaped parking area, 15 ft.; others in that area, 5 ft., 14 ft., 5 ft. and 16 ft.

Mr. Miller asked why the driveway should be 18 feet in length.

Mrs. Bancroft said that there were standards and those standards should be met for safety considerations.

Mr. Parker said that the Board needs to have it demonstrated how your scheme will work.

Mr. Etoniru asked if when a car comes out of the garage it needs the equivalent of a parking stall.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board has two concerns; one is traffic within the site and, secondly, the reversal of the normal entrance to the area which could cause confusion.

Mr. Parker read the definition of a parking space from the Zoning Bylaw, as follows: "An off-street space having dimensions of not less than 9'6"x 18' plus access and maneuvering space, for exclusive use as a parking stall for one motor vehicle whether inside or outside a structure." He said that it has not been adequately demonstrated that these garages are safe parking spaces which have the proper maneuverability and meet the requirements of the Zoning Bylaw. This is still a concern of our consulting engineers, Whitman & Howard.

Mr. Miller said that they needed a better definition. He felt that the Board's definition is a matter of safety perception. He asked for added definition of the problem.

Mrs. Bancroft said that Whitman & Howard's March 26th letter explains the Board's requirements.

Mr. Parker said that going back to Whitman & Howard's May 26th letter the access and maneuverability question has not been answered. The 18-foot requirement has been here on the table since the original review.

Mr. Miller asked for an opportunity to talk with Dale MacKinnon, our consulting engineer, on this matter.

The Board did not allow Mr. Miller to talk with Mr. MacKinnon as they felt that the matter has been clearly documented by Whitman & Howard.

Mr. Parker said that the Board is here to listen to Mr. Miller so that he could convince the Board that the plan is safe. At this time Mr. Parker said he had not heard any explanation put in layman's terms that the parking and maneuvering would be safe.

Mr. Codispoti said that people are going to want to park their cars in the driveway from time to time.

Mr. Miller suggested mirrors and signs to alleviate problems with the short driveways.

Mrs. Bancroft said that when we are starting with a brand new plan we don't want to start out with problems.

Mr. Parker felt it was important to design a site with safe ingress and egress as well as maneuverability of cars from parking garages and spaces.

Mr. Codispoti said that the problem has been brought up three times in letters from Whitman & Howard. We have had a nonresponse to the questions.

Attorney Mark Gladstone said that he has sat in on a couple of meetings. He said at the last meeting the Board requested certain changes, which have been made. Now the Board wishes to have additional items changed. He said that the plan has been approved by the Building Inspector and the Fire Chief.

Mrs. Bancroft said that Whitman & Howard's March report noted that there was a problem with parking and maneuvering. To date an adequately safe solution has not been offered to alleviate the problem.

Mr. Codispoti said that these concerns were raised before and have not been answered.

Mr. Miller said, "As a professional I think 18-foot long driveways are more than adequate."

Mr. Codispoti asked Mr. Miller if he thought that a driveway five feet in length is adequate? Mr. Miller did not respond.

Mr. Parker said that the Board's job is not to design a site plan. The 18-foot driveway was first mentioned back in March. No one has given the Board anything to support or refute this item. One other point of history the one-way circulation was discussed at the original hearing. The Planning Board did not say how to design it. Whitman & Howard has told us that this is counter to how the traffic should flow. The Board agreed at the hearing that a one-way scheme might work better because of the short driveways. Mr. Parker thought it important to explain the whole matter.

Mrs. Bancroft said that there is a site constraint. The site is so difficult that this was the only solution. However, the reverse one-way system is of concern.

Mr. Etoniru said that if 18-foot driveways are required, it would be very difficult to come up with an economically feasible plan. Mr. Etoniru said that a 20-foot wide driveway is not necessary and that a 15-foot wide driveway would be adequate.

Mrs. Bancroft said that it would be necessary to have a 20-foot wide driveway. It is to avoid creating problems which would come to light later on not to mitigate a safety problem which you have created.

Mr. Codispoti said that the site is difficult to develop and it is the Planning Board's job to be sure that it is done correctly.

Mr. Parker said that the maneuverability problem has never been addressed although it was mentioned in each of three of the Board's reports from Whitman & Howard.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board will discuss this matter one more time with Whitman & Howard. The Board must act on this plan at its June 29th meeting. Whitman & Howard is a disinterested party. They have nothing to gain or lose. They have no reason for a bias.

Mr. Parker said that Fox Properties has been very slow to face the problems. The density of this site is unlike anything in Medfield. This density doesn't meet the spirit of the Bylaw, though the density does meet the zoning requirements.

Mr. Fox asked the Board to make its decision. He said that there is nothing further he can do on this plan that the Board's consultant requires. It is Mr. Fox's opinion that the Board will not be satisfied with his plan until he reduces the number of units. Mr. Fox said he would be present at the Board's June 29th meeting where the Board will make its decision on the plan.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board will discuss the matter once more with our consultants.

SANDERS WAY: Mrs. Wolcott was present and submitted a bankbook from Brookline Savings Bank in the amount of \$120,000.

VOTED: To accept Brookline Savings Bankbook in the amount of \$120,000 and to release lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 on Sanders Way.

NYE, 393 MAIN STREET: Walter Nye, Susan Thornton and Wayne Thornton met with the Board to discuss the possibility of constructing a two-lot subdivision at 393 Main Street with a 40-foot layout with a 13-foot easement so that the three-family house would meet zoning.

The Board did not feel that this would be possible.

Mrs. Thornton said that a second thing they would like to accomplish is to separate the two houses at 393 Main Street so they would each have its own lot.

Mr. Parker felt that this could not be done as frontage could not be provided for each lot.

Mrs. Thornton said that what she heard was that the Board could not approve a subdivision road of 40 feet with a 13-foot easement to separate the lots and that it would be necessary to go to the Board of Appeals for relief.

CASTLE HILL ESTATES: Attorney O'Brien requested the release of Lot 5 from the Castle Hill Estates covenant.

VOTED: To sign the release which had been prepared to release Lot 5 from the covenant.

Attorney O'Brien explained to the Board that the reason lots 16 and 5 are separated is because the lettered lots are registered in the Land Court and the numbered lots are not. Mr. O'Brien asked if the Board would approve a covenant which would combine lots 16 and 5 with the note that the lots would not be further subdivided. If it were necessary to combine the lots with a Form A Plan the Board could not sign the plan because access could not be provided through the frontage.

The Board will check with Town Counsel regarding the request to allow a covenant combining Lots 5 and 16.

MINUTES: VOTED: to approved the minutes of June 1, 1987.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

Medfield Planning Board
July 13, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliardi, Parker and Rhoads.

Others attending: Attorney Virginia Fetting re Abandonment of Way H off Indian Hill Road; Attorney Vincent O'Brien; Richard Merrikin; Huma Rosenfeld and David MacCreedy.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Bancroft and the following business was transacted:

ABANDONMENT OF WAY H - PUBLIC HEARING: Chairman Bancroft called the public hearing to order and requested Secretary Codispoti to read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Mrs. Bancroft invited the spokesman for the abandonment procedure to explain why they wish the way to be abandoned. She said that abutters and others will have an opportunity to speak in favor or in opposition to the abandonment of Way H.

Attorney Virginia Fetting is representing the Condellios who formerly lived at 29 Indian Hill Road. The bank is requiring that Planning Board covenants be released. The main lot (Map 3 - Lot 10) was again released about a month ago. The Condellios also had a second lot, which turns out to be Way H. Way H goes between two lots and ends at lot 57 or map 3. These folks feel that they own Way H and would like to consider it part of Map 3, Lot 10.

Mr. Parker asked if Lot 10 meets zoning requirements as it stands.

Attorney Fetting said that it does.

Mrs. Bancroft said that there is a constraint on the sale of Way H.

Attorney Fetting said that the bank's examiner came across the notation that there was a Planning Board covenant in 1969 and it had to do with Assessors Lot 10 on Map 3 and Way H. Mrs. Fetting said it was interesting that this property had changed hands before.

Mrs. Bancroft said that in the past some short stubs which did not provide frontage were not bonded; however, we make sure now that the bond covers the cost of the construction of the stub even though it did not provide frontage/

Mr. Parker said that Way H was designed to be used as a public way to the back land. It is necessary to determine if Way H has any potential as a way. It depends at Lot 57 on Assessors Map 3 and doesn't go anywhere. Therefore, Mr. Parker said he didn't see any reason for not abandoning Way H.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that it was obviously intended to provide an entry

to the back land. When Fenobscot Street was constructed, it wasn't noted that there was a connector. Does anybody have any further questions?

Mr. Parker asked if it is a 50-foot layout.

Mrs. Fetting said it is.

Mr. Gaglianti did not see any future use of this way in the town.

Mr. Parker asked if there is any interruption in the curbing or any town structures which indicate where Way H would be. The Board would be concerned with the town's liability.

Attorney Fetting said she had not visited the site.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if anyone know if the curb was there.

Barbara Tempel said her family is the second owners of the lot in the rear (Map 3, Lot 57). This was formerly a cowpath. Now the children have made it a natural path. She said she did not have any objection to the abandonment of the way.

Mrs. Bancroft said that we require access to back land be provided at certain points. It was not followed through.

Barbara Tempel said that houses were built on all the lots except this one. It needed to be filled in and the house was not built until 1984. Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board would like to be assured that all the abutters have no strong objection.

Barbara Tempel said, knowing my neighbors, they would be here if they had any objections.

Mr. Gaglianti suggested that the Board inspect the area.

Mr. Richard Moon said he was an abutter across the street and that he had no objection.

Mrs. Bancroft suggested that if the Board is agreeable that action be taken.

Mr. Codispoti moved that, in accordance with the application, Way H be abandoned.

Mr. Gaglianti wanted to be sure that the Selectmen were aware of the abandonment. It was noted that they had been notified of the hearing.

VOTED: To abandon Way H.

The decision will be prepared for the Board's signatures on July 27th.

The hearing was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

CASTLE HILL ESTATES II. Attorney Vincent O'Brien said he had sent a letter to the Board on July 2nd with a covenant which he has drawn up which would have the effect of making Lots 5 and 16 on Deerfield Drive combined as one building lot. He said that he had discussed the matter with Town Counsel Fuller who suggested that Mr. Vincent discuss the acceptability of a covenant with the Land Court. Mr. Vincent said that the Land Court thought it was unique, but they had no objection. He said he had explained the situation to them and they said a merger automatically takes place when there is one owner. For added protection, the Planning Board and the Building Inspector would like a covenant combining Lots 5 and 16.

Mr. Parker said that the covenant seems to cover all the points which were of concern to the Board. Mr. Parker asked where the driveway for this lot would be.

Mr. O'Brien said that there is an existing drive which was designed for this lot so that there would not be a problem with entering from Deerfield Drive. Attorney O'Brien said that the restriction of the covenant would be on the deed for these properties.

VOTED: To accept the covenant dated July 13, 1987, with John P. Ryan, Rocco P. Rinaudo and Jack O'Toole, the purpose of which is to combine Lots 16 and 5 to treat them as a single building lot.

ROCKY ACRES: Mr. Richard Merrikin met with the Board to discuss the change in the placement of the extension to Vine Brook Road. He said that he had an appointment with the conservation Commission for their review of the placement of the street in conjunction with the wetlands. After this meeting, Mr. Merrikin plans to request a modification of his original Rocky Acres plan.

MINUTES: VOTED: To accept the minutes of June 15 and 26, 1987.

TANNERY FARMS: Messrs. Merrikin, MacCreedy and Rosenfeld met with the Board to discuss the Tannery Farm Preliminary Subdivision Plan dated March 10, 1987, and revised to June 8, 1987.

VOTED: To approve the plan with the following modifications:

1. Safe sight distances must be demonstrated on the definitive plan.
2. A waiver must be requested for a northrough street longer than 500 feet.
3. The proposed area of riprap leading up to the Vine Brook storm water discharge area should be shown.
4. Any proposed riprap within the 100-year flood plain will require a

special permit from the Board of Appeals.

5. This project should be reviewed by the Conservation Commission since the proposed drainage will outlet within the buffer zone of a wetland.

EQUESTRIAN PARK:

VOTED: To approve Equestrian Park Estates Preliminary Plan dated June 1, 1987, with the following modifications:

1. Conservation Commission must review this project since some wetlands have been filled without authorization and others are proposed to be filled.

2. The proposed contours will interrupt the natural flow of runoff from the Palson property; therefore, a drainage system must be designed which will adequately address any potential drainage problems on or off the site.

3. The proposed vertical curves at Stations 1+50 and 6+50 must be modified to provide the required 300-foot sight distance.

4. A radius of 50 feet would be preferable at the street side line to satisfy safety concerns.

5. The proposed method of sewerage disposal must be shown.

6. The zoning classification must be provided.

7. The proposed deadend street is longer than 500 feet and would require a waiver.

8. The benchmarks must be based on the USGS datum.

9. The proximity of the town wells will require a thorough Environmental Impact Statement for a definitive plan submission. You must demonstrate conclusively to this Board based on a rigorous technical analysis by a professional engineer that this proposed project will not have an adverse impact on Medfield's or Walpole's water supply.

10. A 1-to-1 slope is shown where the proposed road crossed the wetlands. Regulations require a 4-to-1 slope.

11. The typical roadway cross section must be changed to conform with the current Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Town of Medfield.

12. The proposed drainage system includes a detention area, which would require a waiver. The Board has serious concerns as to whether this is a satisfactory design and will require evidence

that it is a viable solution. (Note again Item #1 of this decision.)

13. A special permit will be required from the Zoning Board of Appeals since the proposed road and undersized culvert are in effect creating a dam in a wetland. (Sec. 5.4.4.27 of Medfield's Zoning Bylaw.)

JACKSON FABRICE. The Board is in receipt of a letter containing a plan marked in red showing minor changes on the Site Plan dated June 1986.

VOTED: To allow the changes and send a letter to John Anderson, the engineer for the project so stating.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

100

100

100

Members present: Bancroft, Gagliardi, Parker and Rhoads. Others present: Locci, Acorn Circle Subdivision participants, Messrs. George Pyne and Gary Baxter; Attorney Debra Nelson and engineer. ACORN ESTATES: Chairman Bancroft called the public hearing to order at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Parker read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Chairman Bancroft said that this hearing is being conducted in accordance with Chapter 41 of the General Laws of the State of Massachusetts and the procedure will be (1) applicant will present and explain the plan; (2) Planning Board members will ask questions at which time the engineering report from Whitman & Howard will be read into the record; (3) other town boards will have an opportunity to ask questions; (4) residents will have an opportunity to ask questions and to comment on the plan.

George Giunta, representing the owner, said the proposed four-lot subdivision is off Hickory Drive. There is an existing house on each side of the proposed street. Sewer and drainage proposals have been shown on the plan.

Questions raised in the Whitman & Howard report were discussed as follows:

4.2.2 Plan Form. Borders on the 24"x36" plan of 1-1/2 and 2-14" on the left side of the plan have not been provided.
Mr. Giunta asked the Board to waive the requirement so that the plans would meet Registry of Deeds requirements of 3/4" all the way around.
Mrs. Bancroft said that as there were just a few pages, the Board will consider a waiver.

4.2.3.a. There is no name for the subdivision.

Acorn Estates will be the subdivision name.

d. No scale is shown. Required scale is 1" equals 800'.

A scale will be added.

k. The width of Hickory Drive has not been shown.

This change has been made on the plan.

4.2.3.m. No benchmarks are shown.

Mr. Giunta said that some benchmarks have been shown but additional ones will be located on the plan.

p. Intersection angles are not shown for the curved edges of roadway.

This will be shown.

An indication of the depth to the normal high groundwater within the street layout has not been shown.

Mr. Giunta said that a test hole had been dug at Station 2+50. This test hole was about 12 feet in depth and no water was observed.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the holes were dug at the lowest point in the proposed roadway.

Mr. Giunta said that they were dug at the lowest point.

Mr. Ronald Tocci Sr. said that there will be 10 feet of fill over the road as it now stands.

Mrs. Bancroft said that there is a letter in our file dated June 18th regarding test holes.

Mr. Parker asked if drainage conditions would be the same flowing off the site after development as presently.

The dash lines for the left and right sidelines will be changed so that they are in accordance with the Board's regulations.

The profile should be corrected to show the proposed fill. The existing grades shown on the profile sheet differ from that shown on the topographic sheet.

Mr. Giunta said that Sheet 3 is correct and he will change the other sheets to match.

4.2.3.r. Major site features such as stone walls and woodline have not been shown.

Mr. Giunta said that the stonewall that was there originally has been removed and the woodline will be shown on the plan.

4.2.3.s. The entire watershed area within which the subdivision is located is not provided.

Mrs. Bancroft said that is a provision which is within the discretion of the Board to require. This is a sensitive area and the Board would be negligent not to require a study for this proposal.

4.2.3.u. The erosion and siltation plan has not been provided.

Mrs. Bancroft said that this is a requirement and must be shown on the plan before it can be approved.

5.2.1.4.e. A vertical curve is required for the proposed road profile.

Mr. Giunta said that this was an inadvertent error and would be corrected.

5.2.3.1.b. Catchbasins are to be piped into manholes and not from one catchbasin to another.

Mr. Giunta said that this concern is regarding two catchbasins at the end of the cul de sac. He feels that another structure at the end of the circle, in his opinion, is totally unnecessary. If you require it, we will put in a manhole.

Mr. Gagliani asked where the water flows onto Hickory Drive.

Mr. Giunta said the water flows across the intersection.

Mr. Gagliani said that having drainage running across the intersection would cause a problem with ice in the winter.

Mr. Giunta said that it is at a 2% to 2-1/2% grade and the water will not be in any one place long enough to freeze.

Mrs. Bancroft said that a catchbasin is required on the high side of an intersection so that water will not flow through the intersection.

Mr. Gagliani again voiced his concern regarding water running across the intersection.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board will seek the recommendation of the Superintendent of Streets on this matter.

5.2.3.1.e. No information is provided concerning the location of basins or the existing conditions on Hickory Drive. Calculations should be submitted to demonstrate that the existing drainage system on Hickory Drive can adequately handle the additional runoff from the proposed site.

Mr. Giunta said that this information will be made available.

5.2.5.1 Public sewers. Because of the fill (which is not adequately shown in the profile plan) and the shallow depth of cover over the pipe, we recommend that the 8-inch pipe between Sewer Manhole Sta 1+55 and 3+55 be insulated ductile iron pipe. Also, unless there is proposed a tremendous amount of fill in lots 1, 2 and 3, these houses will have to pump up to the proposed street sewer. Also 0.35% is less than the minimum slope allowed for 8" sewer.

Mr. Giunta said that the three lots in question will have injector pumps. The amount of fill will be shown. We have shown .35% so that we could have a three-foot cover over the manhole at the end. Mr. Giunta said he did not wish to put in ductile iron pipe. He felt that three feet of fill over the sewer pipe is adequate.

Mr. Giunta said that they will be applying to the Conservation Commission for a Notice of Intent.

Mrs. Bancroft said that no comments have been received from other town boards.

Mr. Parker said he had reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement. One of the requirements is that it be prepared by a professional engineer. It has no date or signature. Regarding the EIS, he asked that the wetlands be delineated and asked what device will be used to ensure that this area will be left in its natural state.

Mr. Giunta said that they must go to the Conservation Commission for filling. On the Conservation Commission plan a line of haybales will be shown. It will be noted that no construction would take place beyond the line of haybales. The limits of construction will be placed on the plans. There will be plenty of safeguards through the Conservation Commission requirements.

Mr. Parker asked for better evidence of what is or is not going to take place.

Mr. Baglianti said that a note should be placed on the plan regarding the area in the wetlands to be protected.

Mr. Parker said that one other question he has relates more to the Hickory Drive subdivision. The Harding Street section of the subdivision should have been completed by July 24, 1987.

Mrs. Bancroft asked Mr. Tocci what his timetable is for completing Hickory Drive.

Mr. Tocci, Jr., said he plans to have his section of Hickory Drive completed by September 1st. He said he had been waiting for granite curbing, but it has arrived.

Mr. Tocci, Sr., said that the Farm Street side of Hickory Drive would also be completed at the same time. He would like to have the Board's approval of the Acorn Subdivision so that the construction of the new street will not cause the digging up of the completed street.

Mr. Tocci said that he has a lot of fill and they will be filling seven feet for the lots.

Mr. Baglianti noted it was said no work will be done within the limits of the wetlands, but the house on lot 3 seems to be in the wetlands.

Mr. Giunta said that this was the old lot 8 and there will be 12 feet between the edge of wetlands and the haybales.

Mr. Gagliani asked what the slope will be at the end of the cul de sac.

Mr. Giunta said 2 to 1.

Mr. Gagliani said that it should be 4 to 1.

Mr. Giunta said that eight feet of fill is proposed for the cul de sac area.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that trees are required to be planted at the edge of the layout. Also regarding the oak tree that was previously discussed, she felt that the tree should be removed as it is not a specimen tree and the radius of the street should be 40 feet as required. Mr. Parker concurred.

Mr. Parker asked for calculations which would prove that the drains in Hickory Drive can take the additional drainage proposed.

Mr. Giunta said that it would be easy to do those calculations. The additional runoff would be for an area about 28X140.

Mr. Parker said that the Board is very concerned with the sensitivity of the area.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that the figures be provided to the Board.

Mr. Parker asked if by putting this amount of water into the wetland area it would cause problems down stream.

Brook Pietsch, 14 Hickory Drive: We are talking about an amount of water that would seriously affect the water in the drains. After you have done paving and water goes into the pipes there will have to be more water coming off the site.

Mr. Gagliani said that the Board requires access to backland for future access and traffic patterns and felt that this should be considered.

Mrs. Bancroft agreed that this is an issue that the Board should think about in conjunction with the land that hasn't been developed.

Mr. Parker felt that this is not prime developable land and that Mr. Cohen's abutting land would require approval from the Board of Appeals before it could be used.

Mr. Gagliani suggested that access be kept for the future as the drainage problem in the area may be remedied at some time in the future.

The hearing was closed at 9:20 p.m.

The developer will forward the missing information and, in accordance with Subdivision Rules & Regulations, there is a \$500 fee to present a revised plan.

LEDGEMOOD ACRES: Chairman Bancroft welcomed those in attendance and explained that the meeting is a discussion between Mr. Pyne and the Board and is not a public hearing.

Mr. Pyne said that the drainage and the extension of the road are issues which have been addressed.

Mr. Baxter, engineer, explained the plan briefly as follows: There will be one access point onto Pine Street. The road will be 1400 feet long with 12 lots ranging from three to nine acres in size. The proposed street grades will meet the Subdivision Regulations. There will be a 17-3/4-foot cut followed by a 15-foot fill and other cuts and fills as required to keep the grades within the 6% limit.

There is a 100-scale grading sheet of the whole parcel.

According to Mr. Baxter, the predevelopment runoff paths drain to a culvert in Pine Street. An analysis of flows will show a reduction in drainage.

Mr. Parker noted that if that is the case, it would be a drainage improvement.

The preliminary design for a water pumping station will be discussed with the Water & Sewerage Department in August.

All lots will have onsite septic systems.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if a low wall would make the contour of the lots more attractive or easier to develop.

Mr. Pyne said he would be more than happy to put in a low wall if it required less cutting.

Retaining walls at the entry of the subdivision were suggested due to the grade change between the edge of the road and the pavement.

Mr. Baxter said that the sight distance will be 370 feet towards the right and 379 feet to the left.

The Board would like a 25-foot radius for the new road at its intersection with Pine St.

Mr. Baxter requested that waivers be granted to allow no sidewalk, overhead of underground utilities, bituminous cape cod berm instead of the vertical berm required and for the length of the deadend road.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the matter of curbing will be discussed with the Superintendent of Streets; however, the Board will require underground utilities and sidewalks in accordance with the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Town of Medfield. The Board felt that this was necessary for future planning.

Mrs. Bancroft said because there is no reasonable alternative regarding the length of the cul de sac, this waiver will be granted.

A public hearing on the 12-lot subdivision plan will be held on September 14, 1987.

MOBILE EXCAVATING: Attorney Debra Nelson met with the Board to discuss the advisability of returning to the Board with a revised Site Plan. She inquired as to whether or not the Board wished to have the Mobile Excavating lot further developed.

She requested that Mobile Excavating's engineer and the Board's engineer meet to solve the drainage problems.

Mr. Gaglianti said that he did not wish to put Whitman & Howard in the position of designing site plans. He also mentioned the repetitive permit issue.

Mrs. Bancroft said the main problem was that the Board ran out of time; not that the plan was totally deficient.

Mr. Parker was not sure that there were engineering solutions to the problems as the rate of water going off the property cannot increase in either amount or rate.

Attorney Nelson suggested that fill would solve three problems; namely, the detention basin would be higher; the pipe would be properly covered and the drainage would flow nicely into the brook. The filling would require Conservation Commission approval.

Mobile Excavating's engineer said that 12" of gravel has been added and another 18" is required.

Attorney Nelson requested that her client only pay Whitman & Howard's charges for the next review instead of the \$500 fee. A waiver will be requested for a detention area and hearings will be held to allow the plan to be reheard before two years has elapsed.

GRANITE STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED: The plan of Granite Street showing Parcel A and Lot 7 and 28-A was reviewed.

VOTED: To sign Plan of Land in Medfield, dated March 4, 1987, and revised June 25, 1987, drawn by Norwood Engineering Company, owned by Cynthia and Graham Blandy and Joseph & Susan Rugnetta.

The plan was signed.

HUTSON PINES: The Board is in receipt of a report from Whitman & Howard on which to base surety for the release of lots on Hutson Pines. VOTED: To set surety on Hutson Pines at \$68,000 for a two-year period to release lots 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on Clayton Road.

SHEPHERD'S LANE: Mr. Shields, the developer, has requested return of his surety. Mr. Shields will be notified that the Board requires certification of bounds and inverts and as-builts before the release of surety.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

John Gagliami
Secretary Pro-tem

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
August 10, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliardi, Parker and Rhoads.
Others in attendance: Representative Barbara Gardner; Alan Fox,
Emile Miller and Atu Etoniru; Richard McCullough and George
Basile; Edward Beard, Richard Merrikin, Paul Nyren and Mark Lorett
The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Bancroft
and the following business was transacted:
REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA GARDNER: Representative Gardner updated
the Board on changes in the Massachusetts General Laws which will
affect planning and zoning as follows:

1. Chapter 122 - 21 days (instead of 14) on which to act on ANR
plans.
2. Chapter 191 - re family day care centers for six children or
less.
3. Beekeeping and aquiculture have been added to agricultural use.
This may be restricted to areas of five acres or more if the Town
wishes to make this restriction.
4. Legislation regarding review fees and impact fees is being
studied.

Representative Gardner gave the Board a written Summary of Chapter
774 and other bills under that umbrella. A copy of Ashland's
Traffic Impact Fee Assessment Procedure will be forwarded for the
Board's use.

Representative Gardner intends to set up a small-scale regional
meeting for local Planning Boards to discuss concerns.

The NMRA dumping sites for ash from sludge were briefly
discussed. One site proposed is in Walpole in the area of the
Walpole/Medfield well field. Representative Gardner said that the
area was identified as a "low-yield aquifer."

Representative Gardner asked about progress regarding proposed
blasting legislation. Mr. Codispoti said that the Blasting
Committee would meet in September. Representative Gardner noted
that the deadline for submitting bills to the Legislature is the
first Tuesday in November for action in this calendar year.

FOX PROPERTIES - SITE PLAN HEARING: Chairman Bancroft called the
hearing to order at 8:40 p.m. Secretary Codispoti read the notice
of the public hearing which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the public hearing is being conducted in accordance with Massachusetts General Laws and the Zoning Bylaw of the Town of Medfield. Mrs. Bancroft explained the procedure to be followed.

Alan Fox, Vice President of Fox Properties, showed the Board the revised site plan. The plan shows 15 townhouse units with 30 parking spaces on approximately 36,000 s.f. of land.

Mr. Fox said that he felt that all the concerns of the Board and its engineer have been met with the revised plan.

Mrs. Bancroft read Whitman & Howard's comments on this plan.

Sheet 2 should be corrected to show 30 parking spaces. Mr. Fox said that 30 spaces had been provided. It was noted that the Sheet said "29" spaces. It will be corrected.

On Sheet 3 under "Legend" 6" white pines will be changed to 6' white pines. Mr. Fox felt that pines planted 6' on centers would soon smother each other. He also said that a variance has been requested from the Board of Appeals to waive the planting of pine trees adjacent to the cemetery and in the wetlands.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that the Board's decision on this site plan would include all conditions of other town boards.

Regarding the need for 2.5 feet of cover over the 24" drain pipes under the entrance and exit, Mr. Fox will provide the Board with a statement from the manufacturer that the cover shown on the plan will be adequate.

Mr. Parker asked about drainage and traffic flow.

Mr. Etoniru said it was his assumption that the drainage for the new plan would be essentially the same as the previous plan. He said there will be a reduction in the amount of impervious surface as requested by the Conservation Commission.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that there was no change in the drainage calculations submitted with the plan; however, it appears that there will be more pavement on the site. She asked that the traffic flow and circulation through the parking lot be explained.

Mr. Miller said that the ingress and egress had been reversed. There is a minimum 18' driveway in front of each garage. The dividers have been removed from the plan to provide more maneuvering space. The buildings have been pushed out closer to the wetlands to obtain the required additional area. An area for snow storage has been shown.

Mrs. Bancroft asked about signs to indicate proper access.

August 10, 1987

Mr. Miller said there will be a sign in front of each of the entrances specifying "Entrance" or "Exit."

Mr. Parker asked about illumination of the area.

Mr. Miller stated that they are trying to make it a "very residential" area and propose to have three spots with miniature lights on each building. The plantings surrounding the driveways will be chosen so that they will not grow higher than 18". The units will vary in size from 1500 to 2400 s.f. The buildings will be less than 35 feet in height and will be built in traditional style with clapboards. The dumpster will be fenced.

Mr. Parker asked how far downstream was the drainage calculated. Mr. Etoniru said that they primarily analyzed Vine Brook and have routed the drainage so that it will flow from the site into the channel.

Mr. Parker asked if there was an agreement with Conservation regarding the workability of the scheme.

Mr. Fox said that they have reapplied to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Parker noted that the Board of Appeals decision denoted concern with additional drainage in each of the streams.

Mr. Fox said that they have started the procedure to have the Appeals Board decision revoked.

Mr. Parker said that pollution is obviously a big issue. He asked what was being done to minimize pollution in Vine Brook and the drainage area in general.

Mr. Etoniru said that grease traps will be provided and it will be a "no sale, no chemical" area in the winter.

Mrs. Bancroft asked how that would be enforced.

Mr. Fox said it would be a part of the Conservation Commission order of conditions.

Attorney Gladstone said that this stipulation could be made a part of the condominium documents.

Mr. Parker asked the square footage of the land to be used for this project.

Mr. Fox said it would be between 35,000 and 38,000 s.f.

Mr. Rhoads said that he felt this was a good plan.

Mr. Parker said he felt the new scheme is a much more sensitive and better thought out plan.

Mr. Basile asked if cellars were proposed for the condos.

Mr. Fox said that half cellars would be provided.

Mr. Parker asked if an agreement with the Selectmen had been obtained to cross the 20-foot easement.

Mr. Fox said that they had talked with Superintendent Feeney.

Mrs. Bancroft declared the hearing closed at 9:15 p.m. and noted that Mr. Fox will be kept informed of the Board's progress in reviewing the plan.

MEDFIELD TECHNOLOGY PARK - SITE PLAN SUBMISSION: Messrs. George Basile and Richard McCullough met with the Board to discuss a site plan for Medfield Technology Park.

Mr. McCullough showed the Board the Master Plan for the development of the park. He said that the landscaping plan will be forwarded to the Board within ten days. Mr. Basile is in the process of constructing the roadway and detention basins. It is planned that the park will be a three-phase project.

Mr. Basile said he is seeking high-tech tenants for the park. His first tenant is proposed to be George Strichman, formerly with Proton and now working basically for Harvard Medical. He will be using 25,000 s.f.

Mr. McCullough said that there will be building on the southerly side of the site only and the northerly side will have the 150-foot buffer required between residential and industrial uses. The building will be 21 to 22 feet in height. The parking is designed for total development. 93 parking spaces will be provided. The building will be brick with solar glass windows.

Each unit will have a corner window.

Mr. McCullough said that the parking is based on one parking space per 1000 s.f. of building area. Any office use would be a function of an industry and not the primary use.

Mr. Parker stated that Mr. Lane was required to construct the road, drainage, utilities and lighting for the entire site.

Mr. Basile said he intended to do so also.

A public hearing will be held on this site plan on September 14th at 8:00 p.m.

PRENTISS PLACE: Messrs. Beard, Merrikin, Lorette and Nyren met with the Board to review the layout and setbacks for the condominiums on proposed Prentiss Place.

Mr. Beard explained that six parcels have been purchased from six separate owners, with land totalling just under 3-1/2 acres, on which 24 units are proposed.

Mr. Lorette has been working on this project for about three years and is focusing on history and architecture in the area. Two buildings on the site are vintage 1700. Both of these properties will be upgraded, protected and preserved as condominiums. The architect for the project is Royal Barry Wills.

Mr. Merrikin, engineer for the project, said that the frontage for the parcel will be North Street and it was his interpretation of the Bylaw that the line opposite the front is considered the rear, with which the Board concurred. The setbacks from Meade Avenue, Lowell Mason Road and North Street will be 30 feet for new construction. Drainage from this area will be connected to North Street drainage. The units will contain from 1800 to 2100 s.f. of space.

The Board will ask the Fire Chief to review the proposal.

HUTSON PINES - SURETY:

VOTED: To revise surety to release lots on Clayton Road to \$53,000.

Mr. Gaglianti abstained from voting on this matter.

SHIELDS ZONING VIOLATION - SOUTH STREET: The Board will request the status of this matter from the Selectmen.

LIBERTY ROAD: Mr. Ralph Manganiello requested the release of lots on Liberty Road. Upon review of the plan it was noted that the subdivision had lapsed.

VOTED: To send a letter to Mr. Manganiello informing him of the matter.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

August 24, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gaglianti, Parker and Rhoads

PUBLIC HEARING - PARKVIEW ESTATES: Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 8:00 p.m. and described the procedure to be followed. Secretary Codispoti read the public hearing notice.

The applicant, Ralph Costello, introduced his plan to the Board. He said the subdivision consisted of approximately four acres of land with a 390-foot long road showing five lots. Lot #1 is in the RU Zoning District and Lots 2, 3, 4 and 5 are within the RS Zone. Each lot is 20,000 s.f. or larger. There is an existing house on Lot 2 which is currently rented. The area is to be serviced by town sewer, water, underground utilities and drainage which will go into an underground system.

Whitman & Howard's report dated August 18, 1987, was discussed as follows:

#1. Mr. Neilsen explained how the galley system works. He said it is like an underground (storage) detention basin which detains water before leaving the site.

Mr. Gaglianti asked if the galley is U-shaped.

Mr. Neilsen said the bottom of the galley is open. The top is perforated and the sides are concrete. This structure does not include discharge or recharge water in the ground.

Mr. Gaglianti inquired as to what happens when the structure becomes filled 10 or 20 years down the road.

Mr. Neilsen replied that septic systems of this design last 20 years or more so that because this is discharging clean water it should last indefinitely.

Mr. Gaglianti asked if this becomes the responsibility of the town after it is constructed.

Mr. Neilsen said it would be accepted by the town when the street is accepted and the town will be given an easement.

Mr. Gaglianti asked if there is a water problem in the area currently.

Mr. Neilsen said that he was not aware of a water problem.

Mr. Neilsen said that the use of the galleys would allow the regulation of the flow as it now exists. He said the drainage would go all the way to the brook at South street and the brook will be protected by haybales or a silt fence during construction.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the calculations have been provided to prove that no additional drainage will be added to the system.

#2. Galley system and its affect on the neighboring property.

Mr. Neilsen said this will have no effect on the neighbors as we will be taking water away from the abutting property.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if it would be feasible to install an impervious liner so that water would stay in the galley.

Mr. Neilsen said a liner could be put on the bottom and the sides to make the structure completely effective.

Mrs. Bancroft said that a statement would be required from an engineer that the galleys would not be a problem for the weinstocks.

Mr. Baglianti stated that the contours of the weinstocks' property and their basement elevation should be shown on the plan.

Mr. Neilsen asked the weinstocks for permission to enter their property. The weinstocks gave verbal approval for Mr. Neilsen to go onto their property.

Mr. Pekens said that the road should drain well.

#3. 10-minute time of concentration:

Mr. Neilsen said that the procedure followed was part of the Board's regulations. However, they are combining Chapter 3/TR-55 and the Planning Board requirements. They will submit new hydrological calculations along with the ones the Board already has.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board will check with Superintendent of Streets to be sure that there are sufficient catchbasins.

#4. Existing manholes and pipework:

Mr. Neilsen will make the changes requested and will label them "proposed or "existing" which should make it clear.

#5. Existing utilities:

Mr. Neilsen said that their intention is to connect the existing house to the utilities within the subdivision. The driveway will be changed so that it will go off the new street.

#6. Sidewalk:

Mr. Neilsen, at the request of the Board, designed the sidewalk on the left-hand side.

#7. Regulation 4.2.3.p.

Mr. Neilson said the utilities are shown in the cross section of the roadway.

#8. Add the beginning and ending stations of granite curbing and shade-in on plan view. Show curb inlets.

Mr. Neilson said he would add the beginning and ending stations of granite curbing, shade-in on plan view and curb inlets as requested by Whitman & Howard.

Mr. Codispoti asked Mr. Neilson to review the contours again. Mr. Neilson explained the topography of the site.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if any blasting were anticipated.

Mr. Neilson said they might hit some ledge installing the sewer and that is why the street was set at the existing grade.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the building on Lot 1 will be a two-family.

Mr. Neilson stated it was his understanding that Lot 1 will contain a duplex.

Mr. Parker noted that as this plan has been submitted under the latest Subdivision Rules & Regulations, it is necessary to show trees to be planted and a determination of the ground water in the roadway should also be shown.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that the trees and planting plan must be approved by the tree warden.

Mr. Parker asked if any waivers were being requested.

Mr. Neilson said the only waiver required would be to have the sidewalk on the left hand side instead of the right.

Mr. John Fay, 135 South Street, stated concern regarding the possibility of blasting.

Mrs. Bancroft explained that the Planning Board has no control over the blasting process and the Board feels helpless because of that.

Mr. Bernardo, 23 Curve Street, said he abuts the Weinstocks and his house is situated on ledge. He said his house is situated about 75 feet back from the street and he constantly has water which runs into his playroom.

Mr. Parker asked if it can be predicted how much the street will interrupt water flowing to Mr. Bernardo's house.

Mr. Neilson said that this will keep a portion of the water from that area.

Leslie Weinstock, 25 Curve Street, was concerned as to who would be responsible for any damage incurred if the galley system doesn't work. Mrs. Bancroft said before approving the plan the Board requires definite assurance from our engineers that the system will work. Once the street is accepted, the town would be responsible.

Gerald Finn said he has a lot of water flowing onto his lot and was concerned with the possibility of blasting.

Mr. Gaglianti suggested that the abutters might wish to discuss blasting with the fire chief.

Mrs. Bancroft reported that the Town is working on blasting legislation with Representative Barbara Gardner.

Richard Connors, Curve Street, said he was concerned with drainage.

Mrs. Bancroft explained that the engineer has shown calculations that there will be no additional impact as the drainage leaving the site will not be in any greater amount or speed than currently.

Lynn Beck, 7 Curve Street, asked if a traffic survey had been submitted as Curve Street is a narrow and dangerous road.

Mrs. Bancroft said that a traffic study was not required.

Mr. Gaglianti asked about sight distances.

Mr. Neilson said that there is a sight distance of 350 to 400 feet on both sides.

The Board asked for sight distance information.

Mr. Fay expressed displeasure because people have to go several different places to obtain information.

Mr. Codispoti suggested that current traffic problems on Curve Street be brought to the Selectmen by the abutters.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the biggest thing on the Board's agenda is safety.

Mr. Fay expressed concern that if the storm drains do not work properly he will have water in his basement.

Mrs. Bancroft announced that there will be a continuation of this hearing on Monday, September 21st.

Mr. Parker suggested to the applicant and his engineer that an alternative to the galley system be submitted.

MEDFIELD SHOPS: Messrs. Thomas and Gogan presented an application for a special permit for site plan approval to expand the Medfield Shops by approximately 7,500 s.f. They plan to improve the existing truck dock, which requires going back into the embankment. They anticipate blasting in the rear. The hill will be taken back to give good vehicle circulation.

Mrs. Bancroft asked about parking requirements. Mr. Gogan said that there are 441 existing spaces for the area.

The Board asked for a delineation of the turning radius of trucks. The public hearing for this site plan will be scheduled for September 21, 1987.

GRANITE STREET: Messrs. Edmund Lapointe, Joseph King and Melvin Urban met with the Board to discuss the possibility of development Map 17, Lots 27, 91 and 92.

The Board explained that frontage would have to be provided on a public way for the three lots.

COLONIAL PARK SUBDIVISION: Messrs. Ralph Copeland and Ralph Manganiello met with the Board to discuss the expiration of the Liberty Road section of the Colonial Park Subdivision. Mr. Copeland said that the Colonial Park Subdivision was a 79-lot subdivision approved in 1976. According to Mr. Copeland, the building has progressed at an average rate of 9 houses per year. It is not a case of the land lying idle. The development has been completed to Liberty Road. The only thing left to be done on Liberty Road is the sidewalk and surface coat of asphalt. He feels it is a legal technicality and would like to determine the easiest way out of the problem.

Mrs. Bancroft said a new subdivision plan would allow the opportunity to have current street standards observed. There have been many changes in our subdivision standards.

Town Counsel's position is different from Mr. Copeland's. In his opinion the subdivision which had not been completed or bonded had expired and a new plan and a new subdivision hearing and procedure is required.

Attorney Copeland submitted a Memorandum of Law in Support of the Applicant's Request for Amendment of Subdivision approval which contended that:

1. The condition setting forth the expiration of approval after seven years in the original order of approval of this Board was void and

illegal.

2. The equities of the situation clearly indicate that the reason for time limitations being inserted as a matter of policy by this Board in its approvals are not applicable in the instant situation.

3. The petitioner contends that within the provisions of General Laws C. 41B, the Board may amend the prior order of approval by extending the time or deleting the condition of the time limit so that the petitioner can finish the subdivision without additional expense or delay.

Attorney Copeland has requested that the Board approve a new covenant and not require a public hearing.

He will prepare a covenant and a vote for the Board's approval.

ACORN DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION PLAN:

VOTED: To send a letter to Mr. Ronald Tocci reminding him that the Board is waiting for additional information.

VINE BROOK ESTATES - NORTH MEADOWS ROAD: Mrs. Bancroft suggested that the Board walk the area with the Cemetery commissioners and determine where they would like to have the planted buffer in accordance with the Zoning Board of Appeals decision.

#1 HICKORY DRIVE: Mr. Philip Kelly telephoned. He lives on the corner of Farm Street and Hickory Drive. He said he would like to have his electric service underground as a part of the Doe Acres Subdivision.

The Board will visit the site and determine if this is part of the Doe Acres Subdivision.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
September 14, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani, and Rhoads.
Others attending: Richard McCullough, Claudette Caruso and Thomas Gabriel re Medfield Technology Park, and Beals and Thomas representative.

MEDFIELD TECHNOLOGY PARK SITE PLAN HEARING: Member Lawrie Rhoads removed himself from the Board during the hearing.

Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 8:00 p.m. and Secretary Codispoti read the notice which appeared in the Medfield Suburban Press.

It was noted that there were only three Board members present who could act on this plan and as four were required, the hearing was considered null and void.

This will be reheard on October 19, 1987.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES: Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 8:40 p.m. and Secretary Codispoti read the hearing notice.

Chairman Bancroft noted that this is the second public hearing to be held on this subdivision. The original plan was submitted on October 18, 1986. That plan has been modified. All abutters have again been notified of the hearing by certified mail and the hearing will be conducted as though it were a completely new plan.

Mr. George Pyne, developer, said the original proposal was a 50-lot subdivision. The proposal currently before the Board is for 12 lots.

Mr. Garry Baxter, engineer for the project, explained that the site contains 62 acres of land and will have one road exiting onto Pine Street. The 1430-foot long cul de sac goes to the property line so that access may be provided to the Kennedy property, as requested by the Board. All the grades are within the Planning Board regulations. There is an area of fills and cuts. The cuts have been reduced drastically from the previous plan. Any extra material will be used onsite for the lots. The drainage system can handle the runoff. A portion of the drainage would continue overland and would be piped into Brook D. Catchbasins 300 feet apart are provided. Catchbasins will be installed on the uphill side of the road to intercept water from running down and causing icing in the winter. Onsite septic systems are proposed. The water line will be extended and a pumping station constructed. The booster station would have capacity for additional houses to be connected. The booster pump will provide adequate fire protection. The sight distance at the intersection is at least 300 feet.

1

2

3

September 14, 1987
5

Mr. Baxter answered to provide domestic service for fighting fires, we have proposed a booster station to be installed on Pine Street. A generator will supply auxiliary power when there is a power outage.

Mr. Bonnano asked why we would allow more homes when we can't provide for the ones we now have.

Mr. Baxter said there was never any question of the town not being able to supply the volume of water needed.

Barbara Meyer noted that she was concerned that there may be noise and vibration from a pumping station.

Mr. Codispoti asked how long the driveways are proposed to be? Are they single width? Are they blacktopped?

Mr. Pyne explained that the broken spots on the plan show approximately where a house would be placed. On the side where lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are located, we are exploring the possibility of putting in one common driveway for 3 or 4 lots.

Regarding the placement of the pump house, Mr. Baxter said, the land would be carved out of Lot #1. It would be a part of lot #1 by easement.

Mrs. Paul asked where the driveway for Lot 1 would be.

Mr. Pyne explained that lots 1, 2 and 3 may possibly have a common driveway.

Mr. Baxter said perk tests still have to be conducted.
Mr. Gagliani asked what the increase of runoff from Ledgewood Acres to the stream be? He asked about the predevelopment and postdevelopment treatment.

Mr. Baxter said that information is included with the flows. An increase in runoff downstream to the choke point is approximately 3/4" rise in a 100-year storm. (All this is explained in the Drainage Calculation Sheet No. 20 of 21.)

Mr. Gagliani asked how does the rate of water affect the stream where it hits the natural detention area.

Mr. Baxter said it would reduce the velocity of the water so that when it exits the swale it would be entering at 2-1/2 feet per second.

Mr. Gagliani asked how the velocity relates to the amount of water.

September 14, 1987

6

Mr. Baxter said he had visited the site on September 13th. There are a few rocks in the stream at the culvert. There are no obvious signs of erosion. It is a vegetated stream beyond the culvert. There is a swale which will keep the velocity down. Mr. Perloff, 51 Pine Street, is a 100-year storm just one storm that you can expect once in a 100-year period? Mr. Baxter said you could have a 100-year storm tonight and another tomorrow.

Mrs. Bancroft said the town has high standards for streets and drainage. In this our requirements are being exceeded.

Mr. Baxter said that the analysis to the Planning Board was based on the culvert design for 50 years. The 100-year storm information will be provided to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Perloff asked if the stream would be affected by the subdivision.

Mrs. Bancroft said the development will have no effect on the stream.

Mr. Murphy asked if silt would affect the flow rate and asked what the impact on the wetlands will be when silt enters the stream.

Mr. Baxter said that during construction there is siltation control. After construction is completed any silt/sand will filter into the sump of manholes.

Mr. Murphy was further concerned with silt from driveways. Mrs. Harwood said that there already is a water problem on Tamarack Road and asked if any water would flow back and add to the problems.

Mr. Baxter said that any increase in runoff would be spread over a very large area and he does not anticipate any change. Mr. Stokes, 93 Pine Street, asked if the house near him would flood towards his house. He also said that the two abutting houses have well water and wanted to know how this would affect the wells.

Mr. Baxter said that it would not flood toward the Stokes' property and also stated that the septic system will be designed in accordance with Title 5 and approved by the Board of Health. The wells in the area would not be affected.

Paul Orcutt, 9 Tamarack Road, said it looks like there is quite a

17

17

September 14, 1987
Page 9

VOTED: To sign the plan.

The plan was signed.

NORTH STREET - ANR PLAN: The Board is in receipt of a plan of land in Medfield dated August 25, 1987, drawn by Cheney Engineering Company, Inc., Needham, Mass., showing four lots off North Street owned by Mr. Verni.

VOTED: To sign the plan.

The plan was signed.

HIGH STREET - ANR PLAN: The Board is in receipt of a plan of land in Walpole and Medfield, dated May 5, 1987, drawn by John R. Anderson & Associates, Walpole, Mass., showing a small parcel owned by Michael & Mary Viano, which is not a building lot.

VOTED: To sign the plan.

The plan was signed.

LIBERTY ROAD: VOTED: To approve updated covenant for Liberty Road. This is in place of a new subdivision.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

HIGH AND GRANITE STREETS ANR PLAN: The Board is in receipt of a plan of land entitled "Subdivision of Lot 2 shown on L.C. Plan No. 3589-B, Medfield" owned by John D. & Beatrice B. Williams, dated August 25, 1986, drawn by GLM Engineering Consultants, Holliston, showing two lots - Lot A - 112,827 s.f. more or less and Lot B 77,245 s.f. more or less.

VOTED: To sign the above described plan.

The plan was signed.

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

September 21, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Parker and Rhoads.
Others present: James O'Neil and John Thomas re Medfield Shops.

MEDFIELD SHOPS SPECIAL PERMIT FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL:

The hearing was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Bancroft. Secretary Codispoti read the public hearing notice.

Chairman Bancroft explained the procedure to be followed.

Messrs. John Thomas and James Goggan of Beals & Thomas and James O'Neil representing Flatley met with the Board to introduce the special permit request.

Mr. Thomas said that the proposed addition is 7,000 S.F., which would be in the rear of the existing 70,000 S.F. building. There would be regrading and other work behind the building. There would be no construction change for the front of the building except for the modification of the facade. The tenant that has been secured for this facility is Shaw's Supermarket. Shaw's would occupy that portion of the building currently occupied by the cleaner, hairdresser and J. C. Penney's, plus the 7,000 S.F. addition. J. C. Penney will be relocated within the mall. The hairdresser and cleaner will go elsewhere. There would be increased docking and loading facilities to allow fresh produce and other products to be moved in and out on a daily basis. There would be no dead storage in the supermarket itself. The traffic circulation for trucks and emergency vehicles would be improved. The drainage would be to the detention basin at the western side of the site. The building will be connected to the Medfield sewer system.

Secretary Codispoti read the Whitman & Howard report.

- No. 1. Bearings of lot lines are not included. Mr. Thomas said the information could be provided on the plan.
- No. 2. Drainage cutoff swale be installed above the retaining wall or ledge face to direct the runoff. Mr. Thomas said the same thing could be accomplished by half-moon pipe which would require less site disturbance and would accomplish the same goal.
- No. 3. Inverts of the pipes in DMH1 and DMH2 should be adjusted so that they have matched crown elevations or a minimum of equal energy gradient. Mr. Thomas

said that means match the crowns of the two pipes as they come in. This adjustment could be made.

Mr. Thomas met with the Conservation Commission on September 17, 1987, and it was their opinion that the change was not significant enough for a notice of intent.

Mr. Rhoads said he noticed that there is a lot of vegetation within the detention area and asked if the vegetation would alter the capacity of the basin.

Mr. Thomas said that the only decrease is the volume of the vegetation itself and is not significant.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the outlet had stayed unplugged.

Mr. Parker asked if the drainage under 109 was plugged would the water from the site and from Route 109 cause sheeting and asked for an explanation of this situation.

Mr. Thomas said that the system is designed to take care of all the water. There will be no problem as far as the upstream flow is concerned.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the wall is probably going to be the issue of most concern and asked that the applicant explain what he proposes for the embankment.

Mr. Thomas said that they have done additional soils exploration and noted that there are some rockcroppings on the site. They would have to excavate the whole area to find out where other rock is located. A structural plan of the retaining wall will be submitted.

Mr. Parker asked that the lighting in the rear of the building be explained.

Mr. Thomas said that the lighting would be on 30-foot high utility poles and would be 400-watt high pressure lights. Photometrics will be supplied.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if all the construction would be on the Flatley property and how far into the residential zone is the construction proposed. The Board recommended that more poles be installed and that the poles be 40 feet or 42 feet in height.

Mr. Thomas said that it would go 10 to 15 feet into the residential district.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that there is a buffer requirement for screening between residential and business zones. Section

6.2.10 on page 33 of Medfield's Zoning Bylaw was read.

Mr. Codispoti asked a question regarding the wall.

Mr. Thomas said construction easements would not be required on abutters' property. He also said that the landscaped buffer is there in terms of width. In this case *rosa rigosa* is proposed on one side of the fence and *euonymus* on the other side.

Mr. Parker asked about parking requirements. It was explained that as the addition does not exceed 15% of the original building there would be no change required in parking.

Mr. Thomas said that if additional parking were required that there is space on the site.

Mr. Parker asked that the applicant support the statement that the parking is O.K.

Mrs. Bancroft said that she thought that there are other aspects of the plan which need more effort and study than the parking.

Mr. Codispoti asked how much additional cutting is proposed in the rear of the property.

Mr. Thomas said it would be 60 feet maximum on the east side and 40 to 50 on the right.

Roger Hicks, Cheney Pond Road, is concerned with additional traffic on Route 109.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board is concerned with safety and noted that there had been discussion with the owner of Old Medfield Square to connect the two malls with a driveway.

Mr. James Moynihan, Crest Circle, asked how far toward his property is the construction proposed.

Mr. Thomas said it would be approximately 60 feet from the SE corner of the existing building.

Gary Lehman, Hatters Hill Road, expressed concern for the tenants which were not to be relocated.

John Willis, 14 Hearthstone Drive, expressed concern that the blasting would cause damage to his inground cement swimming pool.

Ben Iris, 24 Hearthstone Drive, also expressed concern

regarding the blasting as he has a 3-sided glass porch.

McClure Ellsworth, 16 Hearthstone Drive, is concerned that blasting would cause problems with his house.

Mrs. Bancroft explained that the whole matter of blasting is under the fire chief.

Mr. Thomas said he would submit specifications for the blasting work to the Board. He said that they would follow the proper procedures for blasting.

Kenneth Backer, 18 Hearthstone Drive, is concerned that the wall will encroach on his property. He felt that the proposed wall and fence would be an "attractive nuisance" and felt that this matter had not been completely thought through and wondered about both safety and aesthetics.

McClure Ellsworth, 16 Hearthstone Drive, voiced concern about the trucks entering and exiting the property. He was concerned with the possibility of trucks idling for long periods of time and causing fumes and noise.

Mr. Ellsworth asked if deliveries could be restricted to the hours between 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. only.

Mrs. Bancroft said she thought this type of ordinance is under the Selectmen.

Mr. Ellsworth asked if instead of a chain line fence a sound barrier could be erected.

A question was asked regarding the maintenance of the fence.

Tony Cipriani noted that the new store will be twice as large as before and suggested that a traffic survey should be done.

Kenneth Backer asked if consideration could be given to allowing the addition to the front of the store.

Mr. Thomas said that this would cut into the parking which is already in place.

Beverly Fowle, 22 Hearthstone Drive, expressed concern with blasting.

Mrs. Bancroft said the Board will consider if a traffic study should be done.

The hearing was closed at 9:45 p.m.

VOTED: To request a traffic impact study of the Medfield Shops.

VOTED: To send a letter to Flatley so stating.

PARKVIEW ESTATES DEFINITIVE PLAN

Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 9:50 p.m.

VOTED: To continue the hearing to September 28th.

SPRING STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield, owned by Estate of Blanche M. Kingsbury, dated June 19, 1987, revised September 10, 1987, drawn by GLM Engineering Consultants, Inc., Holliston, showing a new lot 2.38 acres.

VOTED: To sign the plan.

The plan was signed.

SPRING STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED:

The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield, owned by Estate of Blanche M. Kingsbury, dated June 19, 1987, and revised August 19, 1987, drawn by GLM Engineering Consultants, Holliston, showing lot line changes on the pond side of Spring Street.

VOTED: To sign the plan.

The plan was signed.

VINE BROOK ESTATES - NORTH MEADOWS ROAD:

The Board will hold a public hearing at 9:00 p.m., Monday, October 19, 1987, to determine if changes have been made to the plan so that it can go before the Board of Appeals before two years have elapsed.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES:

The Board is in receipt of a request from George Pyne to have the time within which a decision is due on LedgeWood Acres changed to October 27, 1987.

VOTED: To extend the date within which the Board will make a decision on the plan to October 27, 1987.

LIAISONS:

Margaret E. Bancroft
Selectmen, Warrant Committee, MPIC, Park & Recreation Committee.

Page 6
September 21, 1987

John K. Gagliani

Central Business District, School Committee, Board of Health.

Joseph D. Codispoti

Historical Commission, Sign Advisory Board, Housing Authority.

E. Lawrie Rhoads

Hazardous Waste Committee, Highway Department, Water & Sewerage Board, Industrial Authority.

Joseph R. Parker, Jr

Conservation Commission, Board of Appeals, Board of Assessors.

DOVER FARM ROAD:

VOTED: To sign release of Lot 1 Dover Farm Road/Farm Street.

The release was signed.

OCTOBER 13, 1987 will be set aside for a review of the Subdivision Rules & Zoning Bylaw in preparation for possible changes.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti,
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

October 5, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti and Parker. Mr. Gagliani at 9:30 p.m.

Others present: John Rhoads, Lou Ann and James Nickerson; Messrs. Sylvia, Ferullo and Smick for Citizens for Responsible Growth; Messrs. Ralph Costello and Donald Neilsen; Ken Backer and others re Medfield Shops.

Chairman Bancroft called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

NEBO STREET - PROPOSED SUBDIVISION: John Rhoads of Norwood Engineering and Lou Ann and James Nickerson, owners, met with the Board to discuss a 4-lot subdivision proposed off Nebo Street within an RT Zoning District. Mr. Rhoads said that all Subdivision Rules would be met, with the exception of a detention basin to slow down drainage as it leaves the site. As an 8-foot wide seasonal brook runs through the property, the project would need Conservation Commission approval. Mr. Rhoads told the Board he would like to present a definitive subdivision plan instead of first submitting a preliminary.

Mr. Parker said he would prefer to have a preliminary plan submitted as then the concept would be reviewed by the Board's consulting engineers.

Mr. Rhoads said that if the Board felt uncomfortable, he would present the plan to the Conservation Commission for their opinion. Mr. Rhoads said the Chairman of the Conservation Commission's philosophy is "we like detention basins."

LEDGEWOOD ACRES: Attorney Robert Sylvia, representing the Citizens for Responsible Growth, submitted a legal brief to the Board with a Court Case which gave the Planning Board the right to condition a subdivision because a waiver was allowed.

Attorney Sylvia also said that the Board should not require the developer to extend his proposed street all the way to the lot line because an eventual road through to Main Street would change the character of upper Pine Street and the funds would have to be appropriated by the Town for the improvement of Pine Street if it were more heavily travelled.

Mr. Ferullo asked that the Board put a restriction on the subdivision that no more than 12 house be built.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the number of house lots is controlled by the zoning.

Mr. Smick said he does not wish to have the road extended to the Kennedy land.

Mr. Kennedy requested that the Board follow Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations rules and requested that he be allowed to submit a memorandum to the Board within the next seven days.

PARKVIEW ESTATES; Chairman Bancroft called the continuation hearing to order at 9:30 p.m. and asked that the changes in the plan be explained.

Mr. Donald Neilsen, engineer, explained that the subsurface detention area has been redesigned to replace the galleys with septic tanks. Since the tanks have solid wall construction, there will be no impact on the groundwater. A 6-inch sump will be provided for the collection of silts and fines. A note has been added stating that any overflow from the system will flow into Curve Street.

Both the pre- and post-development times of concentration are less than six minutes so the minimum value was used.

A cover letter has been provided with the revised drainage analysis showing that it has been reviewed by a registered engineer.

Existing manholes and pipe work are now shown in dashed lines on the profile.

The existing utilities for the 1-1/2 story house have been shown and a note has been added to the plan regarding the new tie-ins.

The typical roadway profile and the "plan view" of the road have been revised to show the two-foot grass strip adjacent to the sidewalk.

The electric, telephone and cable lines have been added to the "plan view" of the plan.

The beginning and ending stations of the granite curb have been added and the curbing has been shaded. Curb inlets have been noted.

Whitman & Howard's report recommended that the catchbasins located at Station 0+20 be relocated to about Station 0+30 so that curb inlets will be located in the tangent portion of the granite curbing.

Mr. Neilsen said it appears that no ledge has to be cut for the road; however, some blasting will be necessary for the sewer, which in places will be 12 feet down. Mr. Neilsen said that six to seven feet of fill would be added in front of Lot 4 and about four feet in front of Lot 5. There will be a swale between the two houses.

Mr. Parker asked about possible alternatives to the underground detention system. Mr. Neilsen said that the alternatives would be (1) to revamp the entire Curve Street drainage system or (2) to put the drainage into Kingsbury's pond.

Mr. Neilsen said that the galleys were for a ten-year storm and that any surcharge would be in Curve Street. In order to provide for a 50-year storm two tanks would have to be added to the galleys.

Mr. Neilsen said that the drainage from the proposed subdivision would have no effect on the abutters.

Mr. Peksens, 123 South Street, asked if blasting is required would standard procedures be followed. Mr. Costello said that before any blasting takes place the abutters would be notified and standard procedures would be followed.

Mr. Bernardo, 23 Curve Street, inquired about perc testing and felt that the testing was being done on his land.

The Board asked Mr. Costello to check into this matter. Mr. Neilsen said that the test pit is in the middle of Mr. Costello's property.

Mr. Bernardo was concerned with the additional traffic on Curve Street.

Mrs. Leslie Weinstock, 25 Curve Street, is concerned as she feels that Curve Street has a water problem and apparently the Highway Department is not aware of it. She said that her driveway had eroded because of water from Curve Street.

Mrs. Bancroft said that once the street is built that water will flow into a catchbasin then into the galleys and then into the street system and it should improve the situation.

Mr. Neilsen said that they would present a tree-planting plan after it has been determined which trees would be kept on the site.

Mr. Fay asked if parking is allowed in the cul de sac.

Mrs. Bancroft said that two parking spaces must be provided for a single-family home. She said that the 28-foot wide street is to allow for temporary circumstances where people have to park on the street.

Mrs. Weinstock asked if the two-family will be rented or be owned.

Mr. Costello said he did not know yet. When asked about the houses to be constructed, Mr. Costello said that they will be traditional in style with 2200 feet of living space and a garage.

The hearing was closed at 9:45 p.m.

VOTED: To approve the Definitive Subdivision Plan entitled "Parkview Estates" dated July 15, 1987, and revised September 18, 1987, owned by Ralph Costello, concerning property off Curve Street showing five proposed lots with the following conditions:

1. Approval by all other Town Boards as require.
2. Catchbasins located at Station 0+20 be moved back to approximately 0+30 so that the curb inlets will be located in the tangent portion of the granite curbing.
3. A tree-planting plan be submitted to the Planning Board with species approved by the Tree Warden after the road has been roughed out and it has been determined which trees already in place on the site may be used, in accordance with Section 5.2.1.11 of the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Planning Board.
4. Endorsement of the approval is conditional upon the provision of a performance guarantee in the form of a Covenant duly executed and approved to be noted on the plan and recorded with the Norfolk County Registry of Deeds.

The following waivers have been allowed:

1. 25-foot radius for Parkview Drive.
2. Underground detention basin.

MEDFIELD SHOPS: Mr. Kenneth Backer met with the Board to express his concern with the proposed 30-foot high wall behind his house. Upon conferring with an engineer, Mr. Backer said he felt that the wall appears to be technically impossible to build as shown on the plan.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board had walked the site on Saturday and are concerned with the safety issue and felt that a planted buffer along the property line made a lot of sense.

Mr. Backer was also concerned that the new market would be open longer and that there would be additional noise from the trucks servicing the plaza.

He asked if the Board had any control over hours of operation. Mrs. Bancroft said that was a function of the Selectmen.

Mr. Parker said that the entryway into the site could be better designed.

Mr. McClure Ellsworth said he was concerned with the safety of the wall, noise pollution and blasting.

Mrs. Bancroft said the wall would have to be constructed properly. Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board has requested that the developer provide a traffic study for the project.

Mr. Backer will be notified when the traffic study has been received.

DEERFIELD DRIVE: The Board is in receipt of a report from Whitman & Howard, Inc., regarding surety for Deerfield Drive II.

VOTED: To set surety for the release of lots N1 & 18, N2 & 19, N3 & 20, and N4 & 21 at \$3,000 for a one-year period. This surety is for the curb inlet which needs to be repaired and the inlets which need to be changed and for the bounds to designate the right of way to the Town land.

GEORGETOWN ESTATES:

VOTED: To set surety on Copperfield Street and Bishop Lane at \$80,000 for completion in 1989.

BUTTERFIELD LANE:

VOTED: To set surety on Butterfield Lane at \$43,000 for release of lot.

VINE BROOK: The Board reviewed Site Plan of Land off North Meadows Road dated July 9, 1987, and

VOTED: To approve the plan with the following condition:
That approval is subject to approval of other Town Boards as required.

Page 6
October 5, 1987

The following change will be inscribed on the plan: "Twin box culverts 12" high and 24" wide barrels of Class V reinforced concrete, with a 6" gravel subbase, 4-1/2" bituminous concrete base course and 1-1/2" bituminous concrete top course."

The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
October 19, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gaglianti, Parker and Rhoads. Others attending: People of interest in Vine Brook Estates; Medfield Technology Park; William Nuttall; Messrs. DiGiacomo and Merrick; Messrs. Nyren, Lorett and Merrick; Messrs. Pyne and Baxter.

Chairman Bancroft called the meeting to order at 8:10 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

MINUTES: VOTED: To approve minutes of July 13, 27, August 10 and September 21, 1987.

PUBLIC HEARING - VINE BROOK ESTATES - MULTIFAMILY:
Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 8:30 p.m. Secretary Codispoti read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Attorney Mark Gladstone appeared before the Planning Board to establish the right to appear before the Board of Appeals under Section 16 of the Zoning Act before a two-year period had elapsed. He said that by changing the number of units in the original plan from 23 to 15 it would show that specific and material changes in the conditions upon which the previous unfavorable action on their special permits requests before the Board of Appeals were made. Fox Properties had appeared before the Board of Appeals and requested a special permit to work within the flood plain, the use of a construction trailer at the condominium site and a temporary structure for the storage of material or equipment.

Attorney Gladstone said that because 15 units were approved that only 30 parking spaces would have to be provided. The change amounted to a 50% decrease in units and parking spaces.

Attorney Gladstone said that the three requests were denied because the Board of Appeals did not feel that Vine Brook Estates had met its burden of proof of establishing facts sufficient to justify the award of the requested special permits. He said the Appeals Board's biggest concern was the wetland issue.

Mr. Parker asked if in the re-engineering it had been demonstrated that the drainage situation was improved.

Attorney Gladstone said that his engineer will present such information.

Mr. Rhoads asked if there is anything different regarding the storage structure or trailer.

Attorney Gladstone said that because the site had changed that this could also be considered as a substantial change.

VOTED: To grant the applicant permission to submit another application to the Board of Appeals before two years elapsed for special permit to work in the flood plain, the use of a construction trailer and a temporary structure for storage of materials or equipment at the condominium site.

The hearing was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

NUITLE 5 - 7 SPRING STREET: Mr. William Nuttle showed the Board a revised plan for 5-7 Spring Street. He said he had received a variance for a fourth unit in the building and that it was his intention to restore the dwelling. He said that the parking in the RS Zone is grandfathered. He will plant a buffer to hide the parking. The Board brought Mr. Nuttle's attention to Section 6.2.10 of the Zoning Bylaw regarding required buffers.

Mr. Nuttle will file an application for a Special Permit for Site Plan Approval before the Planning Board as more than 500 s.f. is proposed to be added to the building.

MEDFIELD TECHNOLOGY PARK: Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 9:00 p.m. Secretary Codispoti read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Chairman Bancroft said that the hearing on this subject which was held on September 14, 1987, had to be voided as there were not enough Board members present to act on a special permit.

Planning Board Member Rhoads, an abutter, did not participate in the hearing.

Claudette Caruso represented John Fresca and George Basile, applicants.

Mr. Richard McCullough, architect for the project, said that approval had been obtained for the industrial road named "Marvin Drive" in 1984. The 20-acre site will contain three buildings, totaling 250,000 s.f. of industrial space. The buildings will be of steel frame construction with brick exterior.

It is proposed that there will be parking in front of the building for the office support group and in the rear for service functions.

The plan under review at this time is one third of the project. The proposed structure will contain 59,000 s.f. of space. It will appear to be a two-story structure. The first floor will provide office space and the balance high bay industrial space. The building will have nine entrances allowing the structure to be subdivided for none different tenants. 97 parking spaces will be provided and the building will be enhanced by shrubbery and other plantings.

Francis Gabriel, engineer for the project, explained the drainage of the area. He also explained how the utilities would be installed. Basically the site is self-contained and is graded so that all drainage from the site will be carried into the drainage system. The drainage runoff from the site has been reduced by 60% from predevelopment runoff.

The Board reviewed the Whitman & Howard letter to September 14th, as follows:

No. 1. 14.11.21 & 14.13.3b - Bearings and distances on lot lines.

Mr. Gabriel said that these have been added; however, the record plan has not been formulated. An Approval Not Required Plan will be submitted when the lot lines have been decided.

Mr. McCullough asked if it is necessary for the three buildings to be on three separate lots.

The Board said that the plan would have to conform with zoning in every way. The only zoning district where more than one principal building is allowed on a lot is the RU Zoning District.

Mr. Gabriel said that the site for the first building can stand alone because the remainder of the drainage goes in a north/west direction.

Mr. Parker asked if traffic could go in and out of the site with no problem. Mr. Gabriel said that there is a good traffic pattern.

Mr. Parker asked if any water goes into the street drainage.

Mr. Gabriel said that drainage is picked up from the residential area. This retention basin flows into a manhole and goes from an 18" reinforced pipe to a 30" pipe. It is sized properly to direct water away from the site.

No. 2. 14.13.36. Representative cross sections of parking areas and driveways are not provided.

The cross sections have been added. The driveway will have 12" of gravel beneath the pavement and a 2-1/2" bituminous concrete with 1-1/2" top coat.

Mr. Parker asked if there are any special considerations in constructing a road over an easement.

Mr. McCullough said that you are allowed to put in a nonpermanent structure.

No. 3. 14.13.3K. Mr. Gabriel said that drainage calculations will be submitted this evening which will take into account the reduced area of runoff. Mr. Parker asked how postdevelopment runoff is reduced from predevelopment.

Mr. Gabriel said that their calculations showed that the quantity of water leaving the site piped will be 1.7 cfs and predevelopment it was 4.02 cfs, showing a reduction of 2.6 cfs.

No. 4. 14.13.3L. A plan of the complete contributory area is being submitted to the Board tonight.

No. 5. 14.13.3M. Haybales will be installed.

No. 6. regarding truck traffic. Mr. Gabriel said that truck traffic has been eliminated at one end of the building. Trucks can use one end; however, using standard truck charts, it is two-way traffic in either direction. Paths will be established by the users.

Mr. Gagliami suggested that a 24-foot wide lane be shown.

No. 7. Bearings and distances of the drainage easement are not shown.

It is an easement of record on a recorded plan.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that they review the lighting plan.

Mr. McCullough said that the poles would be 8 feet in height with a globe light and that photometrics are included. In the rear the lights are surface mounted over the truck docks. Building lighting is relied on for the back of the building. The lights will be on a dimmer system.

It was noted that snow storage will be in the parking area to the rear as 43 extra parking spaces are being constructed.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board's deadline to act on the Site Plan is December 11th.

Mr. McCullough said that it is necessary to have Marvin Drive bonded and a Plan Under Subdivision Control. Not Required must be signed by the Board.

Mrs. Bancroft said she would check with Town Counsel regarding the bonding and ANR plan.

The hearing was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

ROCKY ACRES: Messrs. Merrikin and DiGiacomo met with the Board to discuss a modification of the Rocky Acres Subdivision Plan to be in compliance with Conservation Commission and Board of Appeals requirements. The road has been moved 30 feet from the Watershed Protection District. The same number of lots has been shown; however, the lot lines have been altered and the road is shorter. A waiver is being requested to allow a 350-foot centerline radius. Other waivers being requested are the requirement on Vine Brook Road for granite curbing where there is a radius of 350 feet, a waiver from the requirement for a temporary turnaround on Vine Brook Road extension and a waiver to allow roadway section as shown on plan.

Mr. Merrikin asked what the fee would be for the modification. The cost of the previous hearing will be reviewed and the Board will require the difference between the charges from Whitman & Howard and the fee which has already been submitted.

The Board will schedule a public hearing for this subdivision for November 23rd if the revised plans are received by October 30th.

PRENTISS PLACE: Messrs. Merrikin, Lorett and Nyren appeared before the Board to discuss the Prentiss Place plan before it is submitted for Site Plan review. The truck turning radius is 50 feet as shown on the plan. It was explained that each unit has one garage and some have two. Twenty-four units are proposed with forty-eight parking spaces.

Mrs. Bancroft suggested that the plan be reviewed by the Fire and Police Chiefs. Mr. Nyren said he would do so. Mr. Parker brought Section 6.10 of the Zoning Bylaw to Mr. Merrikin's attention which requires a 10-foot planted buffer between multi-family use and a residential lot or use.

The plan will also be required to show trash storage or a note regarding same.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that construction standards for the driveway be shown on the plan.

Mr. Merrikin said that a section similar to a street will be a part of the submission.

Mr. Rhoads asked about snow removal. As this will be a private street, snow removal will not be a town responsibility.

LEDGEMOOD ACRES: Messrs. Fyne and Baxter met with the Board to review the Whitman & Howard Report of October 16th. Mr. Baxter said that the one outstanding issue was the catchbasin issue.

No. 1. ERRORS IN CONTOURING OF PROPOSED GRADING. Two errors in the grading were found and corrected.

Mr. Baxter requested a waiver from the sidewalk requirements for the cul de sac. A consensus of the Board was that a sidewalk would be required.

No. 2. RETAINING WALLS SHOWN WITHIN THE R.O.W. There was a consensus of the Board that the walls to approximately Station 2+85 could be placed in the right of way; however, they should be just as close to the edge as possible.

No. 3. DETAILS SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE PLANS TO EXPLAIN THE PROPOSED TEMPORARY BERMS AND EROSION CHECKS. A statement will be added to the plan on the grading sheet that "erosion control will comply with DEGE standards."

No. 4 EROSION PROTECTION. Siltation control at three headwalls and the catchbasin will be added.

No. 5 MINIMUM COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS OF DRAINAGE SYSTEM. Mr. Baxter said that the structure will be dropped down and they will build up around it so that the coverage requirements may be met.

No. 6 EXTRA MANHOLES AT STATION 7+00 AND STATION 14+00 TO KEEP DRAINAGE ON THE LEFT SIDE OF THE STREET. Another manhole could be added between Station 7+00 and 14+00. The Board will not require the extra manhole.

No. 7 BEARINGS ARE MISSING ON EASEMENTS. The water easement is still floating; however, all easements will be properly marked when they are determined.

No. 8 TYPE A BERM SHOULD BE REMOVED. The Board would like the berm as shown in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations.

No. 9. WAIVER FOR LENGTH OF STREET IS REQUESTED. The Board will consider this waiver. However, they do not wish the street to be constructed to the lot line.

No. 10. WAIVERS SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE PLANS. This will be done.

No. 11. TREES. This subdivision was submitted prior to the change in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations.

No. 12. DRIVEWAY OPENING. This is in the latest Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations and does not apply.

It was brought to Mr. Pyne's attention that "Tara Lane" did not meet the Board's street name guidelines. Several names were discussed and Hawthorne Road has been approved by the Police Chief.

The following waivers will be considered: Old Sub.

1. Drainage not located per cross section (Plate 3)
2. Wall within layout to Station 2+85 (Plate 3)
3. Slope change from 4:1 to 3:1 if requested (Plate 3 and Section 7.7)
4. Adjustment of grade at edges to Station 2+85 (Plate 3 and Section 7.62)
5. Maximum length of dead end (Table 1)
6. Extension into adjacent land (Section 5.211)

October 19, 1987
Page 8

VOTED: A consensus that the Board would prefer that the
cul de sac for Ledgewood Acres not be carried to the
property line.

The Board of Health did not reply within 45 days of the
July 27, 1987, plan and did not submit any information
at the Board's September 11th hearing and therefore this
plan is considered to be approved by them.

The Board will accept a draft copy of road and lot line
changes for review at the Planning Board meeting to be
held on October 26, 1987.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
October 26, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani, Parker and Rhoads.

Others attending: Messrs. Pyne and Baxter; Messrs. Tocci, Tocci, Poole, Dellorca; James O'Neil; Tim O'Neil.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Bancroft and the following business was transacted:

LEDGEWOOD ACRES: Messrs. Pyne and Baxter met with the Board and presented a plan showing Hawthorne Road to Station 11+03. This plan also showed a separate conforming lot for the proposed water pumping station. The plan showed sloping easements for constructing slopes and retaining walls as required. The plan must be in full compliance with the Zoning Bylaw of the Town of Medfield and with requirements of all other Boards. Full compliance with the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations except for the following waivers which have been allowed by the Planning Board:

1. Waiver from Plate 3 location of drainage structures in order to locate drainage as shown on plan.
2. Waiver from Plate 3 for location of wall from Station 0+0 to Station 2+85.
3. Waiver from Section 7.62 to allow adjustment of sidewalk location and grade at edges from Station 0+0 to Station 2+85.
4. Waiver from Table 1 to allow a dead end street approximately 1,323 feet long.
5. Waiver from Table 1 to permit 25-foot radii at intersection of Pine Street.
6. Waiver from Section 7.32 regarding granite curbing.

The street name is to be changed from Tara Lane to Hawthorne Road.

Mr. Parker moved that the subdivision be limited to 12 lots, plus Parcel A, in the public interest, as any additional lots could increase traffic and problems on Pine Street. The motion failed to carry.

VOTED: To approve Ledgewood Acres Subdivision Plan dated October 16, 1986, and revised to July 27, 1987, and to require that Whitman & Howard review the final plan with the changes agreed upon between the Board and the developer as follows:

1. Planning Board approval of plan detail from Station 11+03 to Station 13+43.58.

2. Provision of easements and/or separate lot for water pumping station satisfactory to the Planning Board and other town boards as required.

3. Provision of sloping easements for purpose of constructing slopes and retaining walls as shown on plan.

4. Full compliance of the plan with the Zoning Bylaw of the Town of Medfield.

5. Compliance with requirements of all other Boards.

6. Full compliance of the plan with the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Town of Medfield (1978), except as waived by vote of the Planning Board. The Board has voted to grant above-mentioned waivers.

VOTED: To approve Ledgewood Acres Subdivision Plan dated October 16, 1986, and revised to July 27, 1987, and to require that Whitman & Howard review the final plan with the changes agreed upon between the Board and the developer as above stated.

ACORN CIRCLE: Messrs. Tocchi, Tocchi, Poole and Dellorco met with the Board to discuss the questions raised in the Acorn Circle Subdivision review by Whitman & Howard.

Mr. Tocchi said that the Acorn Circle plan submitted October 5th was supposed to answer all questions on the plan. Mr. Tocchi was concerned because 18 points were listed by Whitman & Howard as needing to be corrected.

The first point, and also the most difficult to correct, was "the proposed drainage system has no measures to attenuate the peak rate of runoff to less than or equal to the existing conditions."

The changes required in items 2, 3, 4 and 5 will be taken care of by Mr. Tocchi's engineer. They will make proper provisions for the crossing of the water line

under the sewer line at Hickory Drive intersection, as required under item 6. Item 7 noted that lots 2, 3 and 4 are in the wetland and they plan to go before the Conservation Commission with these lots. The bearings will be shown on the plan for the proposed drainage easement in accordance with item 8. Item 9 requested that stationing and shading on the plans be shown where granite curbing is required. This will be done.

Item 10 requires a waiver as one radius is 40 feet and the other is 25 feet at the intersection of Hickory Drive. In accordance with item 11 the proposed grade elevations will be shown to the nearest 100th of a foot. Item 12 required that the word "penetrated" be removed from the description of the 12" gravel. Item 13 brought to Mr. Tocci's attention that additional notes and details should be provided on the plans to adequately provide the requirements of regulation 5.2.1.6 for driveway openings. Item 14 regarding the addition of trees to the plan. It was noted that Mr. Tocci should talk with the tree warden regarding the type and size trees to be planted.

Item 15 noted that all the waivers required should be shown on the plans. Item 16 regarding the connection of the drainage system through manholes requires a waiver. Item 17 requires a waiver for the size of the border of the plans and item 18 requires a waiver from the symbols for the left and right side line existing on the profile sheet.

The Board agreed that the cul de sac should extend to the lot line so that the rear land will not be landlocked.

Mr. Tocci submitted a letter requesting of time extension within which the Board must make a decision on the Acorn Estates Subdivision Plan to December 1, 1987.

VOTED: To allow an extension to December 1, 1987.

MEDFIELD SHOPS: Mr. James O'Neil met with the Board and presented a revised plan showing a 15-foot high wall 125 feet in length and a 16-foot wide driveway. There will be a six-foot green chain link fence at the top of the wall to prevent children from climbing on the wall and falling. He said he had discussed the updated plans with the abutters and they were in favor of the changes.

There will be plantings on both sides of the fence.

October 26, 1987

Page 4

The revised plan will be sent to Whitman & Howard for a final review.

NORFOLK CONNECTION WITH PENOBSCOT STREET: Messrs. Tim and John O'Neil and Tim Schlock met with the Board to discuss the possibility of a road from Norfolk connecting with Penobscot Street. The Board felt that the connection as shown on the plan brought in by the above-named gentlemen would make a very dangerous curve.

VOTED: To send a letter to Mr. Tim O'Neil, 8 Neponset Street, Norwood, stating that this connection would be creating a dangerous curve for both towns and is not in compliance with our minimal standards.

THE MEADOWS: The Board is in receipt of a letter from Paul Borrelli requesting an extension within which to make a decision on The Meadows Preliminary Plan to November 24, 1987.

VOTED: To allow the extension of time.

LIBERTY ROAD: In accordance with Whitman & Howard's report it was

VOTED: To set surety on Liberty Road at \$60,000 for a two-year period.

CRANMORE ROAD: The Planning Board

VOTED: To release surety in the amount of \$55,000, holding \$10,000 plus interest for work to be completed.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

November 2, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gaglianti and Parker. Others attending: Messrs. Charles Struck, Paul Valzania and Michael de Pierro; Messrs. Vaughan and Nye and Susan Thornton.

Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 8:00 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

ST. EDWARDS ADDITION: Messrs Struck, Valzania and de Pierro met with the Board to discuss their expansion plans for St. Edwards Church and to review parking and drainage.

Mr. de Pierro said that they were able to provide 171 parking spaces. They felt that would be more than adequate for the new facility. They said that the church and the new facility would not be in use at the same time and therefore parking for both units simultaneously would not have to be provided.

It was suggested that the handicap parking spaces should be closer to the front of the church. Mr. de Pierro said that they would review handicap parking, but it was noted that many handicapped people who come to church are dropped off in front of the Church and the driver of the car parks elsewhere.

Mr. de Pierro said that the wetland has not been identified to date. He said that there is a pipe to drain water from the green area. There is a 12" pipe which has been tripped. The Board suggested that they go to the Conservation Commission for a Notice of Intent hearing.

VOTED: The parking plan dated October 30, 1987, drawn by Pierce & Kramer has been reviewed and approved by the Board.

NYE PROPERTY: Messrs. Vaughan and Nye and Susan Thornton met with the Board to discuss a subdivision proposed for the Nye property on Main Street. Mr. Vaughan said that the only problem is that Mr. Nye doesn't own where the corner roundings on the East side of the proposed street where it would enter Main Street. A curbing and a handicap ramp could be installed.

The Board suggested that a preliminary plan be submitted for review.

Mr. Vaughan was concerned with drainage from the Wilkins Glen complex onto the Nye property. He did not feel that this area should receive additional drainage from the proposed subdivision. The Board suggested that Mr. Vaughan discuss drainage with Superintendent Feehey, as it was the Board's opinion that the drain pipes in Main Street are filled to capacity.

Mr. Vaughan said that he will submit a preliminary plan in the near future.

HICKORY DRIVE: The Board is in receipt of a letter from Charles Hasentus requesting the procedure to have surety released.

Mrs. Kelly, 1 Hickory Drive, has raised the question of whether her utility service, served by overhead wires instead of underground wires, is in compliance with requirements for underground utilities in subdivisions.

The Planning Board like to be assured by Mr. Hasentus that the utility pole serving that house is not located within the street layout for Hickory Drive.

The Board noted that the covenant requires the road construction to be completed within two years and that period has elapsed. The Board will urge Mr. Hasentus to have the final coat of asphalt applied during this road building season to avoid problems with puddling and snow removal such as occurred last winter.

VOTED: To send a letter to Mr. Hasentus containing the points which have been mentioned above.

NOTIFY DEVELOPERS RE STREET LAYOUT PROCEDURE: Developers will be notified of the procedure and the timeframe for the acceptance of streets by the Selectmen.

NOON HILL III:

VOTED: To release Needham Cooperative Bank Book #91-000337 in the amount of \$4,000 which has been held for the completion of Algonquin Road.

VOTED: To release Needham Cooperative Term Deposit Certificate No. 60-002417 in the amount of \$6,000 upon receipt of surety in the amount of \$2,000 to cover work to be completed on Wichita Road and Pennacook Street.

BUDGET - 1989 FISCAL YEAR: The Board voted the following budget for Fiscal 1989:

Postage	\$ 400
General Office Supplies	200
Consultant	11,200
Advertising	1,500
Outside Services	500
Travel & Meals	100
Membership, Dues	115
Total	\$14,015

WESTBRIDGE SUBDIVISION:

VOTED: To send a letter to A. J. Lane asking them to complete work on the Westbridge Subdivision streets so that they may be accepted by Town Meeting.

MINUTES: VOTED: To accept minutes of August 24, 1987.

ACORN CIRCLE: It was reported that Mr. Tocci had telephoned and asked if the Planning Board would prefer a preliminary plan or a revision of the Acorn Circle plan before them.

It was a consensus of the Board that a revision of the Acorn Circle plan would be sufficient. However, they will need to have Mr. Tocci ask for an extension to mid February.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoli
Secretary

1

2

3

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
November 9, 1987

Members present: Codispoti, Gagliani and Rhoads. Others attending: Messrs. Tocci, Hasenfus, Selectman Chairman Nourse, Superintendent of Streets Feeney; John Rhoads, Norwood Engineering, Mr. & Mrs. James Nickerson; Steve Johannssen; Mr. & Mrs. Robert Rowean.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Acting Chairman Gagliani and the following business was conducted:

HICKORY DRIVE: Messrs. Tocci and Hasenfus met with the Board to discuss the completion of Hickory Drive. The Board would like to see the road completed before the road construction season is ended and noted that the grates are up and it is impossible to plow.

Mr. Gagliani said that Mr. Tocci's letter of June 10th stated that he hoped to have the road completed in September 1987.

Mr. Tocci wanted to talk with the Board about reducing his bond. Whitman & Howard's report on the Harding Street section of Hickory Drive noted that the outlet pipe at the headwall was half under water because of flooding in the wetland to the south of the property. As this design is supposed to be open gravity flow, Whitman & Howard recommended that the bond not be reduced until the developer makes corrections for this problem.

Superintendent Feeney's concern is that this may cause surcharging in the street.

Mr. Tocci said that when the street is paved, the drainage would run into the basins.

Mr. Hasenfus asked for release of surety for his section of Hickory Drive.

The Board explained the procedure to have surety returned. The Board then asked Mr. Hasenfus if the utility pole at Hickory Drive was within the subdivision. He said that it was and will ask Edison to move the pole and install underground utilities to 1 Hickory Drive.

MEDFIELD FARMS SUBDIVISION: Mr. John Rhoads of Norwood Engineering and the Nickersons met with the Board to discuss the revised plan for the four-lot subdivision off Nebo Street comprised of 6.7 acres of land with a 380-foot cul de sac.

The drainage system showed two catchbasins which would drain to a pipe outside the wetland with a settling basin and a flow diffuser.

Mr. Gagliami requested that catchbasins be placed on the roundings of the proposed street to catch water and not allow sheeting onto Nebo Street.

Mr. John Rhoads asked for a waiver from the 4-to-1 sloping requirement in the area which abuts the wetlands. The allowance of this waiver would reduce the wetland fill area from 490 s.f. of fill to 160 s.f. This would be a combination of 4-to-1 and 3-to-1 at the wetlands. A small piece of compensated wetland would be required by the Conservation Commission.

Mr. John Rhoads said that they would like to proceed to a definitive plan as they feel that there are no major issues to discuss.

The Board said that they preferred a preliminary submission, but that it was no a requirement.

STEVE JOHANNSEN: Mr. Johannsen met with the Board to discuss the possibility of subdividing a piece of land off Camelot Lane and High Street. Mr. Johannsen would like to extend Camelot Lane far enough for the frontage of two additional houses on the lot.

This lot has been before the Board of Appeals first to divide it into three lots and then to divide it into two lots. Both times the Board of Appeals suggested that it could be subdivided through the Planning Board.

ROBERT ROWAN: Mr. & Mrs. Rowan met with the Board to discuss how Lot #13 Lawrence Circle could be made conforming with current zoning so that they could sell the property. The Board suggested that the lot be made to contain 40,000 s.f. and that a variance be requested from the Board of Appeals for the 142 frontage requirement.

MINUTES: To approve the minutes of October 13, 19, 26 and November 2, 1987.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
November 16, 1987

Members present: Codispoti, Gagliani and Rhoads. Others attending: Ronald T. Tocci.

Acting Chairman Gagliani called the meeting to order at 8:15 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

HICKORY DRIVE: Mr. Ronald T. Tocci met with the Board to discuss the problem with the outfall pipe as the drainage calculations for the pipe did not show it sitting in water.

Mr. Gagliani said he had inspected the area in the morning and he saw silt in the two pipes. He also noted that someone had dug out the stream to carry the flow better. He expressed concern that the town had no easement to do that in the future. The headwall as built has not been completed as required on the plan submitted and approved by the Board.

Mr. Gagliani said that the Board would like to be sure that the drainage works the way it is installed as the plan shows that the two outfall pipes showed water flowing out and not sitting in.

Mr. Tocci said that the drainage was constructed in accordance with the plan submitted.

Mr. Gagliani said that the calculations do not show the pipes resting in water.

Mr. Tocci said he would like to have surety returned so that he could put the final coat of paving on Hickory Drive.

VOTED: To reduce surety held for Harding Street end of Hickory Drive from \$45,000 to \$22,500.

Mr. Tocci said he would move the headwall and complete the paving within the next two weeks.

MEDFIELD SHOPS: The Board is in receipt of Whitman & Howard's Report on Medfield Shops dated November 9, 1987.

Concern #1 regarding the accessibility of the loading areas has been addressed.

Concern #2 a note has been added to the plans regarding the proposed fill area and the drainage swai has been included.

Concern #3 regarding the stability of the design of the slope has been answered.

Concern #4 regarding the bearings has been addressed.

A copy of Beals & Thomas's reply to the Whitman & Howard report will be forwarded to Whitman & Howard for a final review.

DOE ACRES SUBDIVISION: VOTED: to reduce surety held on the Farm Street end of Hickory Drive by \$90,000, leaving \$35,000 plus interest as surety.

NOON HILL ESTATES III: VOTED: To release \$1500 for Whichita Road as the street has been accepted by the Town of Medfield.

ACORN CIRCLE: VOTED: To extend the time within which to act on Acorn Circle to February 20, 1988, in accordance with Mr. Ronald Tocci's letter of November 16, 1987.

MINUTES: VOTED: To accept minutes of October 5, 1987.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES: The Board is in receipt of letter from the Board of Health regarding LedgeWOOD Acres Subdivision Plan.

VOTED: To send a letter to inquire if the Board of Health had reviewed the September 30, 1987, drainage plan and calculations.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
November 23, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Baglianti, Parker and Rhoads. Others present: Richard Merrikin, Ralph Digiacamo, and others interested in Rocky Acres Subdivision hearing; James O'Neil, Medfield Shops.

Chairman Bancroft called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

MEDFIELD SHOPS: Mr. James O'Neil of Flatley Company met with the Board to answer any questions regarding the Site Plan for Medfield Shops.

VOTED: To grant a special permit under Section 14.13 of Medfield's Zoning Bylaw to allow an addition to Medfield Shops. The approved plan consists of three sheets; namely, Sheet 1 "Proposed Site Improvements for Medfield Shops, Main Street," Sheet 2 "Site Details for Medfield Shops," Sheet 3 "Proposed Building Expansion and Renovation for Medfield Shops" dated August 24, 1987, and revised to 11/10/87.

THE MEADOWS: The Board is in receipt of a letter from Paul Borrelli requesting an extension to May 17, 1988, within which to make a decision.

VOTED: To allow an extension to May 17, 1988, within which to make a decision.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS' "JOB DESCRIPTION": The Board received a "job description" from Mr. Clarence Purvis. It was decided that this should be changed to be more in line with which the Board actually does.

ROCKY ACRES: The public hearing for the Rocky Acres Subdivision was called to order at 8:30 p.m. by Chairman Bancroft. Secretary Codispoti read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Chairman Bancroft explained the procedure to be followed for the hearing.

Mr. Merrikin, representing the applicant, said that the modification of the plan arose from the Conservation Commission's request to move the road out of the wetlands. The roadway was moved so that it is 25 feet, plus or minus, from the wetlands. The street will be 30 feet from the wetlands. We requested a waiver from the original plan to allow a 350-foot centerline radius and it was granted. The Board asked that a portion of Vine Brook Road be reconstructed. The two roads don't match and the grass strip has been enlarged on one side. A portion of the sidewalk will be removed and there will be a sidewalk on one side

only. Basically the road has been shortened by 30 feet. Both the drainage and grading will stay the same as there is no increase in the rate of runoff. For Planning Board purposes it will remain in tact. The plan which is being presented has been approved in concept by the Conservation Commission. The land area in the upland section has been corrected.

The drainline on lot #4 has been relocated to the lot line of lots #3 and #4. It does not change the amount of drainage but it provides a little protection for the neighbors downstream.

The other change is that the trees have been shown.

The entire modification plan is under the new Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if a street name had been proposed for the cul de sac.

Mr. DiGiacomo said he would like to have the street named "Lorraine" after his first wife, but as the Board's policy does not allow first names for streets, he suggested "Beaver Lane."

Vine Brook Road extension will be built right to the Kennedy property.

Dr. Lynch asked if the trees would be retained as a buffer zone. Mr. Merrikin said that would be up to the builder. Approximately two thirds of the lot needs to be cut. That could not be controlled.

Dr. Lynch thanked the developer for making an effort to please the abutters.

The hearing was closed at 9:30 p.m.

VILLAGE FARM ROAD: The Board is in receipt of a report from Whitman & Howard regarding surety required for Village Farm Road.

Mr. Parker said he did not think that the detention basin was complete as far as grading and seeding is concerned. Mr. Rhoads said that the swale which was to be around the outer edges of the subdivision were not all in place.

The Board will ask Dale Mackinnon to review the detention basin and set a figure for its completion.

LIBERTY ROAD SURETY: The \$60,000 bond which was provided for the release of lots on Liberty Road was reviewed by Town Counsel and he has approved it.

LIBERTY ROAD: A Plan of Land in Medfield, drawn by Norwood Engineering Company, dated November 13, 1987, owned by M&D Builders, showing Lots 33-A, 34-A and 35 was reviewed.

VOTED: To sign above-described plan.

The plan was signed.

ORIOLE ROAD: A Plan of Land in Medfield, drawn by Norwood Engineering Company, dated November 16, 1987, owned by Mandu, showing Lot 52C, Parcel "A-1" and "B" was reviewed.

VOTED: To sign above-described plan.

The plan was signed.

5-7 SPRING STREET: It has been brought to the Board's attention that construction is being done on the Spring Street site without a special permit for site plan approval.

VOTED: To send a letter to Building Inspector/Zoning Enforcing Officer O'Toole bringing to his attention that no site plan approval has been requested for the site.

MAYLAND VETERINARY CLINIC: The Board is in receipt of a letter from Mayland Veterinary Clinic requesting information regarding the placement of a Veterinary Clinic on Park Street.

VOTED: To send a letter advising the Clinic that the use which they propose is not allowed in a "B" Zoning District.

INVOICES: VOTED: To pay Whitman & Howard invoices in the amount of "

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

1

1

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
November 30, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gaglianti, Parker and Rhoads.
Others present: Robert Borrelli and others interested in Equestrian Park.

Chairman Bancroft called the meeting to order and the following business was transacted:

EQUESTRIAN PARK ESTATES - PUBLIC HEARING: Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order. Secretary Codispoti read the notice of the public hearing which appeared in the SUBURBAN PRESS.

Chairman Bancroft explained the procedure to be followed for the hearing. If all information has not been received, the Board will continue the public hearing.

Robert Callahan, RIM Engineering: The subdivision contains 16 house lots and is located off High Street, directly across the street from Barry Drive. The cul de sac will be 1400 feet long and will cross the wetlands in two places. The town wells and railroad tracks are in the rear. The wetlands have been shaded on the plan. There is an intermittent brook going through the middle of the site. As far as the slope question is concerned, a request was made that a 4-to-1 slope be allowed to minimize the filling of the wet lands.

Judy Brown, Carr Research, said that they had done the notice of intent. She explained that the brook goes under the high tension lines. The brook was flowing today, but it dries up in the summer. It has banks. It is proposed that a culvert be used to pipe water under the road. A 24" pipe will be able to take care of a 100-year storm.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that the drainage system be explained.

Mr. Callahan said that drainage flows into a retention pond which has an emergency outlet.

Mr. Borrelli said that the water will flow from the end of the cul de sac and from High Street.

The Board reviewed the Whitman & Howard Report with the applicant as follows:

1. Information regarding retention basin is not complete. Mrs. Bancroft noted that the drainage easement must be described with bearings and distances and all survey information. More detail is required. The engineer present did not have knowledge of the drainage.

2. Information should be obtained from the Water & Sewerage Board. The Board has not heard from them and will request input from them before a decision has been made as we want to be sure that the development will not cause any potential harm to the town's water supply since there is no sewer and the lots will be serviced by septic systems.

Mrs. Bancroft said that it must be demonstrated that this will not pose a threat to the town's water supply. This has not yet been proven by the developer's engineers. The town is having an aquifer study done by Walter Amory.

Ms. Brown said that in the Environmental Impact Statement we touched upon those concerns. We have discussed the possibility of the septic systems being designed so that they would have an impervious covering. The worst effects of septic systems comes in heavy rain.

Mr. Gaglianti asked how the town can be sure that pollutants will not reach the town wells.

Mr. Borrelli said he had met with the Conservation Commission last week. He said that Conservation Commission, Carr Research and the Board of Health will get together to discuss the problem and will work out a scheme to see if it can be done. Basically the septic systems will be hootopped over. This should prevent drainage of effluent overground to the town wells.

Mr. Gaglianti asked how close would the septic systems be?

Mr. Borrelli said that the septic system will be in the front of the houses. No alterations can be made to the 50-foot buffer. This could be made a permanent easement.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the general mandate of the Planning Board is that the Board would have to be sure that the systems would be workable without any threat to the water supply. There will be more information come in within the next few weeks which will make it easier to evaluate the plan.

3. The Conservation Commission will review the project.

4. The plan has been recontoured and the 50-foot buffer will not be filled.

5. A waiver will be requested for the street length.

Mr. Gaglianti asked when the road is built will it be constructed to the property line.

Mr. Borrelli said it would be constructed to the property line.

Mrs. Bancroft said that if this is a temporary cul de sac the frontage for the lots has to be determined on the straight line not on the curved section. The street layout must be shown going straight and it must be clearly identified as a temporary cul de sac.

6. 5.2.1.9. The drawings will be changed to reflect the change at the wetlands crossing.

Mr. Gaglianti said that a waiver from the Planning Board would be required if the sloping were different from that allowed in the Land Subdivision Rules & Regulations.

Mr. Parker said that an explanation of the roadway is needed which has not been heard tonight to allow the 2-to-1 slope, which is a much steeper slope than allowed. It is a wetter area and there is concern to have a street built there. An explanation would be helpful. It must be guaranteed that the slopes will not erode.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that the street is being built up ten feet over the stream and the Board needs more detail.

Mr. Parker asked how long an area is being talked about going over the wetland?

Ms. Brown said totally the filling would be for a length of 270 feet. The brook area would be 35 feet and a 24-foot culvert would be installed.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that the phasing from 4-to-1 to 2-to-1 be shown on the contour plan.

The lots which will be filled ten feet are adjacent to the well fields.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that it will be important for Mr. Borrelli to retain sloping easement on the lots in the future so that he will be able to have a right to grade the street.

Mr. Gaglianti asked about the drainage from the Palsion land with the filling as shown.

Mr. Borrelli said that the Palsion field floods in the spring. He did not feel that the fill which he is contemplating will cause any more flooding.

Mr. Palsion asked if the end of the proposed road corresponds with the opening in the stonewall.

Mr. Borrelli was of the opinion that it was closer to High Street. It is not going out where the wall was removed. The opening is

950 feet from High Street.

Mr. Palson said that it could have some effect on his property. The drainage is a vital issue. The area is proposed to be nine feet higher than existing. Any water that drains into my land now goes towards the town wells. He dsid not feel that any of that water would go into the detention pond.

Mr. Codispoti said the Board needs a good overview of the entire project.

Mr. Calloran said that the lots will be pitches toward the street so that the runoff will go into street drainage.

Mrs. Bancroft suggested that it may be necessary to have a swale around the whole property.

7. It is requested that limits of the granite curbing be shown.

8. 5.2.3.2.c.2. One catchbasin has been added at the end of the curbing.

9. No recreational open space has been provided.

10. 4.2.3.j The house number will be shown.

11. 4.2.3.0 The monuments have not been installed at the intersection with High Street. This error is a drafting error.

12. 4.2.3.1 The front setback and width at setback will be shown. The two lots abutting the rounding of the cul de sac will be redesigned.

13. 4.2.3.p The profile sheet is shown at 1" equals 8' instead of the required 1" equals 4'.

14. 4.2.3.v A list of all waivers must be shown on the plans.

Mrs. Bancroft said that two waivers have been mentioned so far; namely, the length of the road and the sloping to the wetlands.

15. 5.2.1.6 Driveway Openings. Driveways should be shown so that it can be determined that hydrants and catchbasins are not too close to the driveways.

16. 5.2.1.11 The plan has been changed to show tree locations; however, species have not been shown. Mr. Correlli should meet with the Tree Warden to obtain his approval for placement and species of trees to be planted.

Mrs. Bancroft said that we have no written submissions from Town Boards but we will solicit them. It is important for us to hear

5 9029
3 1000000

from the Water and Sewerage Board and the Board of Health.
Mr. Parker asked Mr. Borrelli to provide the Board with a guide
for a site visit of Equestrian Park.
Mr. Borrelli asked if the Board would like the centerline staked.
Mrs. Bancroft thought it would be helpful.
A site visit will be held on December 12th at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Codispoti asked how many cubic yards of fill would be used.

Mr. Borrelli or his engineer did not know, but will obtain the
information.

Mr. Rhoads asked what was to be done with the two big mountains of
rock.

Mr. Borrelli said that it came from Cranmore Road and he had no
place else to put it.

Mr. Gagliami asked about the right of way to the backland of lot
13.

Mr. Mykta asked if the traffic had been reviewed. He said the new
road is proposed at the bottom of a hill where numerous accidents
have occurred.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board would like to be sure that the
sight distances are safe. She further noted that the size of the
development is small enough so that there couldn't be any argument
to reduce the size of it because of the traffic impact. It is
important that there is good visibility and that the traffic laws
are being followed.

Candice Palsen asked the total number of acres being developed.

Mr. Borrelli said 25 acres were being developed into 16 lots. He
said that the house will be over 3,000 s.f. and will have
three-car garages. The houses will be introduced to the market in
the high \$400,000.

Mrs. Palsen asked the size of the smallest lot.

Mr. Borrelli said that all the lots are more than 40,000 s.f. All
of the catchbasins are designed like septic tanks so that it
collects oil and road salts on the bottom.

Mr. Gagliami asked how the pollutants were addressed.

Mrs. Brown said that she had run numbers on a site in Upton of

about the same size as Equestrian Park. The pollutants are based on the number of cars and the pollutants are given off when you have higher speeds. Also, according to Ms. Brown, you have to have a constant flow of traffic to accumulate pollutants on a highway. She said oil could be an issue if there was an accident.

Mrs. Bancroft asked what the steepest grade was.

Mr. Callahan said it is 5% coming off High Street.

Ms. Brown said that the road is in a north/south direction and that will help keep the ice off the road.

The hearing is now continued to December 14th at 9:00 p.m. and the Board suggested that Mr. Bottelli bring a letter requesting extension of the time within which the Board is to make its decision on the plan.

GRANITE STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED: The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land on Granite Street showing five house lots, dated November 10, 1987, drawn by Beals & Thomas, Inc., Westborough, owned by Sibbie Jolota Land Trust.

VOTED: To sign the plan.

The plan was signed.

ROCKY ACRES SUBDIVISION:

VOTED: To approve the modification of Rocky Acres Definitive Subdivision drawn by R. F. Merrikin Associates, East Walpole, dated November 19, 1987, with the following conditions:

1. The street name "Beaver Lane" shall be added to the plan.

2. The area of Lot 3 shown for the lot and uplands will be corrected.

3. Location and species of trees shall be shown for Vine Brook Road extension.

The following waivers have been approved:

1. Waiver to allow Vine Brook Extension to have a centerline radius of 350 feet.

2. Waiver of requirement for granite curb on Vine Brook Road section with 350-foot centerline radius.

3. Waiver of requirement for a temporary turnaround on Vine Brook Road extension.

4. Waiver to allow roadway section as shown on plans.

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES: The developer has requested a reduction in surety.

Messrs. Parker and Rhoads felt that the detention area and the swale were incomplete.

The Board will ask Whitman & Howard how much it will cost to complete the detention area, including loaming, seeding, etc. The developer should also be reminded of the swale which is to be all around his property.

5-7 SPRING STREET (OLIVER-CLIFFORD HOUSE):

VOTED: To send a letter to the Building Inspector requesting that a cease and desist be ordered until he has Site Plan Approval and to Mr. Nuttle bringing to his attention the necessity of Site Plan Approval for his project.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES: The Planning Board is in receipt of a letter from the Board of Appeals regarding the approval of the LedgeWood Acres Subdivision Plan.

VOTED: To reply to the Board of Health stating that the drainage problems had been addressed in their plan of September 30, 1987, with drainage calculations dated October 1, 1987. Whitman & Howard had reviewed the plan and calculations and did not feel that this would cause a hazard and, therefore, the Board approved the LedgeWood Acres plan.

ACORN CIRCLE: Chairman Bancroft brought the continued hearing on Acorn Circle Subdivision plan to order. Messrs. Tocci and Giunta met with the Board to discuss the revised Acorn Circle Subdivision Plan. The road would be extended to include all of the Bryant land. Mr. Giunta said that there is no change in the grading plan. There will be a 48" reinforced concrete storage pipe from Station 3+65 to 8+15 which would lead to a big underground storage tank. Peak runoff would be stored in the 48" pipe. The runoff coming from the pipe will be less than currently. He said that a supplemental plan for sedimentation and siltation control has been included. This plan has been drawn up for the Conservation Commission. The water is eventually released and stops short of the brook and runs into a stone-lined drainage channel. It stops short of the wetland and 140 feet from the brook. Work will be in the buffer zone, not the wetlands.

Mrs. Bancroft asked about maintenance of the big drum.

Mr. Giunta said it would be within an easement which will be granted to the town and is cleaned through manholes.

8 20-7
B 70-100-001

Mrs. Bancroft expressed concern about the 48" drain pipe as it would be sitting in water.

Whitman & Howard in their report expressed concern about the long-term maintenance of the proposed system.

Mr. Parker asked the developer to look into other ideas, like the gallery system outside of the layout.

Mr. Giunta said that a drainage specialist looked at the proposed system. It is possible to put in a gallery system.

He pointed out the low area where they did not hit any ground water.

Mr. Tocci said that the water table was nine feet below the surface which would allow an invert of 172 feet. This would be approximately five feet below the road.

Mr. Giunta said that every house would have a pump to the sewer pipe.

Mr. Giunta asked for the following waivers:

1. Size of plan borders.

2. Requiring that all drainage systems be connected to manholes. He would like have basin to basin to manhole in one section.

3. Require area at the intersection. It will be at 1% for 50 feet.

VOTED: To accept the revised plan with the understanding that the applicant will pay any fees charged by Whitman & Howard which exceeds the original fee taken in by the town.

Mr. Bryant said that he is pleased with the plan and thinks it is the best use of the land.

ROCKY ACRES: The Rocky Acres Subdivision approval was signed by the Board members.

LIBERTY ROAD:

VOTED: To release lots 32 through 37 on Liberty Road and accept bond approved by Town Counsel in the amount of \$60,000 and to sign the lot releases.

VILLAGE FARM ESTATES:

VOTED: To reduce surety from \$30,000 to \$3,000 in accordance with

Whitman & Howard's report.

MEDFIELD TECHNOLOGY PARK: The Board is in receipt of a report from Whitman & Howard suggesting that surety not be set on Marvin Drive until the drainage system is working adequately.

VOTED: To send a letter to Mr. Basile enclosing the Whitman & Howard Report.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoti
Secretary

1

2

3

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD

December 7, 1987

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Parker and Rhoads

Chairman Bancroft called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. and the following business was transacted:

LEDGEWOOD ACRES: The Board is in receipt of a letter dated November 25, 1987, from the Board of Health regarding the status of the Ledgewood Acres Subdivision plan. According to Mr. Toomey's letter the September 30, 1987, drainage plan and calculations had not been reviewed by the Board of Health.

As the Board of Health did not approve the plan because of public health reasons, Town Counsel recommended that the Planning Board rescind their approval of the plan.

VOTED: To start proceedings for rescission under Chapter 41 of the General Laws and notify all parties as soon as possible.

VOTED: To notify the developer by letter and explain that it has been brought to the Board's attention that we cannot approve a plan without prior approval by the Board of Health under Chapter 41.

VOTED: To hold a hearing on January 4, 1988, to rescind approval.

PONDVIEW II: VOTED: To set surety on Butterfield Lane at \$35,000 for a one-year period which would release lot 1.

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN 1988 ZONING BYLAW: Chairman Bancroft had drafted a list of possible changes in the Zoning Bylaw for the 1988 Annual Town Meeting.

Section 11.6 - It was suggested that line 4 be changed to read "provided that not more than (10% or 25%) of the minimum required lot area is within the Watershed Protection District or Flood Plain District" or change the sentence to read, "The portion of any lot in a Watershed Protection District or Flood Plain District in which the lot is situated." This statement would then be added to the bottom of 6.2 Table of Area and would put an asterisk after "Lots" column title.

There was a consensus to change the percentages to comply with lot size as follows: RE 40%, FT 20%, RS 10%, and RU 5% could be included as lot area.

Section 12.1.1.e: Insert "There shall be no excavation within ten feet of the normal high groundwater elevation on the site." This would be after the current "e".

Unless construction cannot be completed, loan could be allowed to be removed only by the Selectmen.

Section 12.1.1: Add "No such removal scheme shall result in health or other hazards."

Section 12.8.1.d, par. 2, to read as follows: "The Board of Selectmen shall grant no such permit except in conjunction with the construction of subdivision streets approved by the Planning Board; public works or municipal projects approved by a public authority; or private land development where the applicant can clearly demonstrate that no reasonable alternative contour plan is possible, and in this event, that minimal disruption of the natural contours of the site is proposed."

Chairman Bancroft said that under Chapter 40A special permit granting authorities can establish their own rules. It was proposed that sections specifying form and content of plans as shown in Section 14.13.2 and 3 be removed from the Zoning Bylaw and put into a separate sheet of rules for special permits for site plan approvals.

14.13.4 (new title) GRANT OF PERMIT: To read as follows: After the public hearing has been held, the Planning Board shall grant a special permit for Site Plan Approval if it concludes that a special permit is warranted by the application and the evidence produced at the public hearing and if it makes the following findings of fact:

a) For multifamily site plans for which more than one structure is proposed, placement of structures on the site is appropriate to the site and compatible with its surroundings.

b) The proposed use will not result in a public hazard due to substantially increase vehicular traffic or because of inadequacy in the structure of configuration of the road(s) directly serving the site.

c) The proposed use will not create any danger of pollution to public or private water facilities.

d) The methods of drainage at the site are adequate and meet the standards of the Subdivision Rules & Regulations of the Town of Medfield.

e) No excessive noise, light or odor shall be emitted.

f) The site plan and proposed use(s) conform to all requirements of the Zoning Bylaw of the Town of Medfield.

Renumber 14.13.6 to 14.13.5 and add title "Denial of Permit."

Cluster: _____

It was suggested that "Cluster" be changed to "Open Space Residential" which would better reflect its purpose and would avoid common confusion with "multifamily."

Multifamily: Clarify

6.2 Table of Area Regulations Example: 3 units 24,000 s.f.

RU Multi-family dwelling
(per additional unit)
Public Housing for the Elderly
(per additional unit)

Fast food parking requirements:

It was suggested to add to Section 8.1 (page 44) regarding "restaurant parking."

Three categories should be reviewed: seating, employees and takeout.

It was suggested that parking should be changed to read, "One space for each three seats or stools, and one space for each two employees, and three(?) spaces for each two linear feet of 'takeout service' counter." It was suggested that Whitman & Howard be contacted to determine if they are aware of any parking requirements for fastfood restaurants.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

E. Lawrie Rhoads
Secretary Pro-tem

100

100

100

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliardi, Parker and Rhoads. Others attending: Messrs. Paul Nyren, Mark Lorett, Richard Merrikin and Edward Beard representing Prentiss Place; Messrs. Ralph Maloon and Robert Borrell representing Equestrian Park and Mr. Nuttle on the Oliver-Clifford House.

PRENTISS PLACE SITE PLAN: Chairman Bancroft called the hearing to order at 8:00 p.m. Secretary Codispoti read the notice which appeared in the SUBURBAN WORLD. Mrs. Bancroft then explained the process which is required for a public hearing.

Attorney Beard appeared to speak for Prentiss Place Associates; Mark Lorett and Paul Nyren. Richard Merrikin is engineer for the project. Mr. Beard said that they will be preserving two historic buildings dating back to the 1800's - the Lowell Mason House and the Tavern. The architect for the area will be Royal Barry Wills Company. It will be first-class construction. Prentiss Place consists of 24 condominium units ranging from 1700 to 2700 s.f., the largest house being the colonial structure near North Street. Three and one-half acres of land allows 24 units in the area.

Engineer Richard Merrikin said that he had prepared the site plan for the area. It is within an R1 Zoning District and there is 160,199 s.f. of area within the project site. The intent is to have 24 units of multifamily housing. A landscape plan is part of the submission. The property has frontage and access on three streets - North Street, Lowell Mason Road and Meade Avenue. On the easterly side there are single family structures and on the southerly side there is a multifamily complex. The structures along North Street will be preserved. The one on Meade Avenue will be incorporated into the layout. The layout consists of colonial units and garages; the smallest being a single unit. Green space has been provided. There are 29 parking spaces under cover and 22 open spaces. This is to provide a minimum of two spaces per unit. In addition, there are also "driveway" spaces. The units are 30 feet from Lowell Mason Road, 41 feet from North Street and 41 feet from Meade Avenue. The rear of the property is towards Lowell Mason Road. The entrance drive is intended to provide access to the units as well as provide vehicle turnaround so that moving vans and emergency vehicles may be accommodated. There is an existing driveway off North Street which will be maintained and two driveways off Lowell Mason Road which will provide spaces. The driveway has a 24-foot entrance with a 50-foot radius circle. The zoning Bylaw requires that an entrance driveway for more than six cars be 150 feet from the centerline of an abutting street. By meeting this requirement it creates a little bit of a curve; however, the sight distance is excellent. There is a requirement for a vegetated buffer around the project. It is a buffer between single family and other units. The island in the middle of the turnaround will be planted. We have provided sufficient grading so

that the water will drain away from the buildings. The lawn areas will be very flat. At present very little water drains into the street except at Meade Avenue, where a small amount of drainage runs into the street. The rest goes to the back. All units will be sewer. There is town water available on North Street which will be connected to each unit. A hydrant will be provided for fire protection. Telephone and electricity will be underground and will be along the perimeter of the entrance drive. The onsite drainage would be collected into two galley systems with a depressed grass area.

Mr. Gagliami asked for a detail of the galley system.

Mr. Merrikin referred to Sheet 4 of 8 which detailed the galley system. He said it would work in the winter when the ground is frozen. Any spill over runs down the gutter and goes into the second set of catchbasins, etc. There is a spot about a foot lower than the street to prevent water from continuing out into North Street in the winter. There is an overflow pipe to be used when the capacity of the pipe has been exceeded. This water would overflow into an existing system in North Street. The normal rainfall would be handled in a percolation situation. This has been based on a ten-year storm design. There is a total of six galley systems onsite.

Mr. Merrikin presented a landscape plan to the Board which addressed the issue of the planted buffer, showing plantings along the perimeter. A screen fence will be provided with plantings along the front of the project. The plantings on the street will comply with sight distance requirements. A sidewalk will be provided in the town way on Lowell Mason Road as an amenity to the area way. An interior walk system will be provided on one side of the driveway. All units would have access to the sidewalk. The high points of the landscape plan are the screen plantings and the fence. The lighting is intended to be just sufficient for residential lighting.

Mr. Nyren said the lighting will be like the Boston street lamps.

The Whitman & Howard December 3, 1987, report was subject of the following discussion:

1. RECOMMENDATION THAT TWO PARKING SPACES BE CREATED IN THE AREA OF UNITS 10-13 PLUS 21.

Mr. Merrikin said that they could add one more space in this area without any problem; however, they don't wish to pave too much. A second space could be added if it were absolutely necessary. Mr. Merrikin reminded the Board that each garage has a parking space (which is not included in the count).

2. QUESTION REGARDING REAR SETBACK LINE.

Mr. Merrikin said that under Section 2.1.28 of the Zoning Bylaws, the owner may choose the front and rear lot line. All the other lot lines have a 20-foot setback.

3. PROPOSED GRADING HAS SOME CONTOURS MISSING AND SHOULD BE COMPLETED ON THE PERIMETER TO SHOW WHERE THE EXISTING AND PROPOSED GRADES MEET.

Mr. Merrikin said the missing contours have been added.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if any fill would be required on the site.

Mr. Merrikin said that there would be about one foot of fill in some areas; however, there will be a lot of material left over after excavating for foundations, etc.

Mr. Nyren felt that there would be sufficient soil on the lot for the fill required in some areas; however, he felt that there might be too much top soil as there are as much as 19" of loam in some places.

Mrs. Bancroft brought to the developer's attention that there is language in the zoning Bylaw that does not allow top soil to be removed from the site.

4. THE EXISTING DWELLING NO. 125 (proposed unit #1) AND THE PROPOSED ATTACHED GARAGE DO NOT MEET THE REQUIRED SIDE YARD SETBACK. WHITMAN & HOWARD FELT THAT A VARIANCE WOULD BE REQUIRED FOR THESE ITEMS.

Attorney Beard did not feel it was necessary to have a variance for a nonconforming, pre-existing structure under Chapter 40A, Section 6 of the Zoning Act and Sections 9.2.4 and 9.2.6 of the Medfield's Zoning Bylaw. Chapter 40A, Section 6, has a provision which exempts single-family and two-family structures under certain conditions. Any reasonable legal interpretation is that this could stand and be converted to a condominium use.

Mr. Gaglianti agreed that as far as the house is concerned a variance would not be required; however, the newly constructed garage would have to meet current setback requirements.

Section 6.2.11 was brought to the meeting's attention and Attorney Beard asked for an opportunity to submit a legal opinion.

5. INTERPRETATION OF ZONING REGULATIONS RE NUMBER OF UNITS ALLOWED.

The Board's interpretation is that 12,000 s.f. is required for the first unit and 6,000 s.f. for each unit thereafter.

6. HEIGHT OF ALL EXISTING AND PROPOSED BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES HAS NOT BEEN SHOWN.

The height has now been shown on the plan. There are no buildings higher than the 35-foot height allowed.

7. PEDESTRIAN WALKS HAVE NOT BEEN SHOWN.

The pedestrian walks have been shown on the landscape plan. This information is now on the plans. The sidewalks will be built to town specifications with a width of 3-1/2 to 4 feet.

8. PROPOSED LANDSCAPING DETAILS HAVE NOT BEEN SHOWN.

This information is now on the plans.

9. SITE LIGHTING INFORMATION HAS NOT BEEN SHOWN.

This will be shown.

10. FACILITIES FOR RUBBISH DISPOSAL HAVE NOT BEEN SHOWN.

The developer plans to have each unit contain and dispose of its own rubbish.

11. PROPOSED MAIN DRIVEWAY DOES NOT MEET NORTH STREET AT A 90 DEGREE ANGLE.

Mr. Merrikin said that this has been discussed previously with the Board. He said that they do not wish to be placed in a position where it is required to have a variance. The placement does not create a hazard. Mr. Merrikin does not think this layout is a problem with safety or highways.

Mr. Godispoti asked how many units were being served by the main driveway.

Mr. Merrikin said that 16 units will be served by the interior road. He said they do not wish to go to the Board of Appeals because if they did he did not feel that they would prevail.

Mr. Rhoads asked about sight distance.

Mr. Merrikin said that the sight distance is excellent as you can see a long way in both directions.

Mrs. Bancroft asked how residents would identify where they live.

Mr. Lorette said that they will all have an address of Prentiss Place. All fronts will face in towards Prentiss Place.

12. GARAGE ATTACHED TO UNIT 19 DOES NOT ALLOW GOOD LINE OF SIGHT FOR THE WESTERN GARAGE BEFORE BACKING INTO THE MAIN DRIVEWAY.

The garage setback will be reviewed.

13. RECOMMEND LEACHING CATCHBASINS BEHIND UNIT 3.

The proposed grades are 192 to 191.5. There is an existing spot grade of 190.5. This could provide drainage as it will be lawn and therefore good percolation.

Mr. Gaglianti asked where the drainage would go from the driveway to the right and where is the nearest catchbasin located.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if the drainage in North Street accept more water in storm conditions?

Mr. Merrikin said that in a 10-year storm water would flow down the gutter to the first available catchbasin.

14. RECOMMEND THAT PERCOLATION TESTS BE PERFORMED AT THE PROPOSED LOCATIONS OF THE LEACHING STRUCTURES.

Mr. Merrikin said that they had no problem with test pits. The systems can be made larger and more water can be accommodated if the Board feels that is necessary. If there is a big storm and it doesn't work, you are faced with temporary ponding.

Mrs. Bancroft asked how deep the ground water is on the site.

Mr. Nyren said that they went down 11 feet and didn't find water.

Mrs. Bancroft asked what would happen if you have ground water within the galleys.

Mr. Merrikin said that the bottom of the galley is about 184 and the top about 190.

Mr. Gaglianti asked what the water table is in this area. The Board needs some guarantee that the high water doesn't go over 182 feet.

15. INFORMATION REQUESTED TO SHOW THAT THE EXISTING 15-INCH PIPE CAN HANDLE THE ADDITIONAL 2.3 CFS FROM THE SITE.

Mr. Merrikin said that there is no problem with providing calculations. Most of the storms we get in the fall are small. The pipe is not discharging all the time. We will provide data on the existing system.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if they feel fairly certain that the existing system has the excess capacity.

Mr. Merrikin said that we are at the intersection of Dale and North Streets and it goes down hill quickly there. It may handle more water than the calculations show.

Mrs. Bancroft asked for comments from other town boards. There were none.

Mr. Gaglianti said he felt it would be safer if a backup area were provided for the driveway off Lowell Mason Road so that cars would not have to back out.

Attorney Beard said that the project would be done in phases. The right hand corner would be completed first. We would like to have that incorporated in the approval.

Mr. Parker stated that the first phase should include all drainage.

Mrs. Bancroft felt that the buffer for the entire site should be completed.

Mr. Parker asked that the issue of snow storage be addressed.

Mr. Merrikin said that there is a fair amount of green space which would be available for snow storage.

Mrs. Bancroft said that the Board would like to see something written in that they will plow themselves.

Mr. Parker said he was confused regarding the buffer issue. Is it your intent to plant a buffer in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Merrikin said that they intend to plant the entire buffer.

Mr. Nyren said that there are a lot of plantings on the premises which he would like to use for the buffer. He would also like to plant rhododendrons and other shrubs. The fence which they plan to put in meets the law. They would like to reconstruct the stonewall and extend it.

Norman Hall, Lowell Mason Road: How many extra parking spaces are required for a case like this?

Mrs. Bancroft: We require two for each unit.

Mr. Merrikin: We have 51 spaces.

Mr. Hall: I don't think they will have enough parking spaces. I wonder if some more should be added.

Attorney Beard said that his only experience with parking is for an 11-unit residential condominium complex. The parking has worked out well there.

Mr. Hall: Parking is always a problem in a condominium.

Mr. Merrikin said that in actuality there are three per unit. We have a garage, a space behind it and an additional space. The Board doesn't recognize the space in front of the garage.

Mr. Hall: I haven't heard them talk about what the historical preservation was.

Attorney Beard said that the old Tavern and the Thomas Prentiss House will be upgraded and preserved as single family houses.

Mrs. Bancroft asked if Unit #15 would be kept the way it is or if it will be modified.

Mr. Nyren said it will be modified.

Bill Faxon, Meade Avenue: Is there a drawing for Cluster #4?

Mr. Merrikin said that one is not available.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that this Board has no control over architectural style.

Mr. Faxon: As I understand it, the access from Meade Avenue is for two units. Are the units on Meade Avenue and where is the visitors' parking for the units?

Mr. Merrikin said that the front door of the Meade Avenue units will be facing Prentiss Place. The garages for units 10 and 11 are off Meade Avenue. There will be two spaces available for visitor parking.

Rebecca Gortley, Lowell Mason Road: What does the fence look like? What is the price of homes?

Mr. Nyren said that the fence would be six feet high stockade natural wood color. We expect the final phase to sell somewhere in the \$300,000's. The initial phase may be less.

Mrs. Bancroft asked in which direction would the face of the fence go.

Mr. Nyren said the rough side would be toward the project.

Wendy Faxon: Would that fence go all the way around Meade Avenue?

Mr. Gaglianti asked if units 10, 11, 22 and 23 are all 30 feet from the road?

Mr. Merrikin: The closest is 31 feet.

Mr. Palumbo, Lowell Mason Road: I would like to go on record as being in favor of the whole project. Knowing the two developers since they were knee high to a grasshopper, I would like to see that they go ahead as I know they will do the right thing.

Mr. Baglianti asked if one house on the left hand side of the site could be incorporated into the galley system. He suggested that the Board should consider this.

Mr. Merrikin said that a galley could be installed in that area. Mr. Rhoads is concerned about the galley system. There is nothing in the Whitman & Howard letter regarding it.

Mr. Codispoti asked how much of the original buildings will be preserved as they are.

Mr. Nyren said 95% of the Tavern and the parsonage will stay pretty much the way it is now and will look like it did 200 years ago. We will put on a new front foyer so that it would look like it did originally.

Mr. Hall: It is a good marketing tool to say "historic preservation".

One of the abutters asked how long will it take to construct the area and will the units be owner-occupied?

Mr. Beard said that it depends on how the sales go. 80% would have to be owner-occupied under Fannie Mae.

Mr. Faxon asked where the buffer fence would sit.

Mr. Merrikin said it will be set close to the lot line side.

The hearing was closed at 10:00 p.m.

OLIVER-CLIFFORD HOUSE - NUTTIE: Mr. Nuttite met with the Board to discuss the Site Plan for the Oliver-Clifford House. He had a question regarding the perimeter planting. He said he would prefer Canadian Hemlock to white pine. He also would like to plant rhododendrons, etc. His second question had to do with the buffer abutting business district. He would like to install a six- to eight-foot trellis with ivy.

The Board reminded Mr. Nuttite that it is necessary to follow the buffer requirements of the Zoning Bylaw or to obtain a variance from the Board of Appeals.

Mr. Nuttite said when completed there would be four units within the house and a four-car garage.

Mrs. Bancroft noted that the driveway is two-way and should be more than 12 feet in width.

Mr. Nuttle said that they had received a variance which would allow the 12-foot driveway width.

The Board will schedule a public hearing for site plan approval in January.

EQUESTRIAN PARK - CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: The continued hearing was called to order at 10:20 p.m. by Vice Chairman Gaglianti. (Chairman Bancroft did not participate in this hearing and left the room until the hearing was concluded.)

Ralph Maloon of RIM Engineering Company said that the plans had been updated in accordance with information required by Whitman & Howard. It is a 16-lot subdivision on the northerly side of High Street. The street is called "Shire Run." There is a small wetland through Lot 4. There is a depression in the rear of Lot 9. Generally the water runs northerly and easterly and out onto the Boston Edison property. The road is designed with a low point with all the drainage pitching from High Street down going back into a retention area which is actually a disk-shaped area large enough in size to contain a 100-year storm. With medium sand it would cleanse the water. We were concerned with the town wells and that was taken into consideration with our design.

The first sheet shows the entire site. There are two lot layout sheets. Drainage is shown on Sheet 4 of 7. Sheet 5 of 7 shows the detention basin. All the street water and all other drainage is taken out into the street drainage system - bringing it down to the middle of Lot 13 and dumping it into the depression in Lot 13. The detention basin is designed directly adjacent to a wetland but it is not within the wetland area. The drainage would filter into the ground. An additional 50-foot buffer has been shown.

Mr. Gaglianti asked if the buffer would be used.

Mr. Borrelli said that it would not be used at all. He said the Water & Sewer Board liked the idea of the 50-foot additional buffer. It was noted that he would give the town a covenant on the 50-foot buffer if it were required.

Mr. Maloon said that there was a 4-to-1 slope and they have changed it to 2-to-1 slope so that it would not go so far into the wetland. The swale will be graded to the existing depression. This would insure that the water would be kept on our own site. The cut de sac has been pulled back approximately five feet.

Mr. Codisotti asked what happens when you eventually extend this to the abutting property. What kind of a slope would you have?

Mr. Maloon said that the ground water is at elevation 154 in this area. When you put a leaching field in, the finished ground will be seven feet above that any way. Minimally it would be at elevation 161.

Mr. Codispoti noted that what is on the western side would have to be built up.

Mr. Maloon said it would have to be built up for ground water reasons. The ground water is only two feet down in the spring.

The Whitman & Howard report of October 20, 1987, was reviewed as follows:

1. QUESTIONS REGARDING RETENTION BASIN DESIGN.

This has not been resolved.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE WATER & SEWERAGE BOARD RE REQUIREMENTS TO PROTECT THE TOWN'S WELLS FROM POLLUTION.

The Board has a letter from the Water & Sewerage Board regarding above.

3. CONSERVATION COMMISSION SHOULD REVIEW PROJECT.

A notice of intent has been filed with the Conservation Commission according to Mr. Maloon.

4. SUGGEST THAT PLAN BE RECONTOURED TO ACCOMPLISH THE 50-foot BUFFER.

Mr. Maloon said that this has been done.

5. WAIVER FOR STREET LENGTH REQUIRED.

Mr. Maloon requested a waiver for a 1500+ foot cul de sac.

6. SLOPES AT WETLANDS CROSSING SLOPES DRAWN AT 4:1 SLOPE.

This has been changed on the plan and a waiver requested.

7. LIMITS OF GRANITE CURBING SHOULD BE SHOWN.

The plan has been changed to show this requirement.

8. DRAINAGE SHALL BE EXTENDED INTO EXISTING INTERSECTING STREETS WITH A CATCHBASIN AT THE UPSTREAM SIDE OF THE EXISTING STREET.

This has been extended.

9. RECREATIONAL OPEN SPACE.

This is a discretionary requirement.

10. HOUSE NUMBERS HAVE NOT BEEN SHOWN.

House numbers now have been shown on the plan.

11. MONUMENTS AT THE HIGH STREET INTERSECTION ARE SHOWN AS HAVING BEEN INSTALLED.

Drafting error. Will be corrected.

12. FRONT SETBACK AND WIDTH AT SETBACK HAVE NOT BEEN SHOWN ON THE PLANS.

Width at setback will be shown.

13. PROFILE AT INCORRECT SCALE.

This has been changed.

14. LIST OF WAIVERS REQUIRED.

Waivers have been requested from Section 5.2.4 - Length of road is more than 500 feet.

Section 5.2.19 Sideslope shall be 2-to-1 instead of 4-to-1 sloping.

15. DRIVEWAY OPENINGS NOT SHOWN.

These now have been shown on the profile sheet.

16. NO TREES SHOWN FOR THE SITE.

Trees are now shown and sugar maples and red oaks will be planted.

The Board read the Board of Health letter of December 14, 1987, regarding the plan. Mr. Parker noted that the Planning Board's approval of the Preliminary Plan indicated that the developer must demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that there will be no contamination of the Town's water supply. Additional information is required regarding the impact on the wells.

Mr. Gagliardi agreed with Mr. Parker regarding additional information on the impact of the wells. He noted that the Environmental Impact Statement is all based on assumptions and that is not enough.

Mr. Parker noted that the Water & Sewerage Board was not as concerned about salt as other chemicals which could enter the wells from someone's septic system. Mr. Parker noted that the low area is right on the aquifer.

Mr. Parker said that this hearing will be continued to February 1, 1988, at 8:00 p.m. and it was voted that if an extension were requested to March 2, 1988, it would be granted.

Mr. Parker noted that in our Subdivision Rules & Regulations we require protection of natural features. In thinking about the fill at the end of the cul de sac, this Board has been given a charge for the protection of natural features. My concern is that we would be changing the natural features drastically by adding as much fill as is proposed to the meadow. If the Board did not grant the requested waiver the road would end before the vegetated wetland area. This is one option to consider. The Board's big concern is the potential contamination of the wells.

Mr. Gaglianti again asked about the 50-foot buffer.

Mr. Borrelli said that no construction would be allowed within the 50-foot buffer on lots 7, 8 and 9. A note could be put on the plan or the restriction could be put on the lot layout.

Mr. Barry Palson, 80 High Street: At the beginning of the presentation it was stated that this road will line up with Barry Drive.

Mr. Gaglianti stated that it was determined by the Board that it was better to have one intersection than a series of streets.

Mr. Palson: In keeping with the matter that Mr. Parker brought up, I wonder how the ten or so feet of fill at the end of the cul de sac will look from my house. I know it is being built up so that septic systems will be above the ground water.

Mr. Maloon said that he has built up higher than necessary knowing there was a well to protect. According to Mr. Maloon, Dr. Carr, Biologist, felt that there should be a sand drainage system.

Mr. Palson asked what the existing and proposed contours were.

Mr. Maloon said that the existing contour is 158 and the proposed is 168 - ten feet of fill is required.

Mr. Palson noted that from where he lives he will be looking at a plateau. He is concerned that this would not have a very good effect on his property.

Mr. Parker said that the Board has no power to deal with visual considerations.

It was noted that on Sheet 5 of 7 there is a drafting error and the number should be changed to 166.

Mr. Palsen said that it was mentioned that the natural features were a charge of the Planning Board.

The meeting was adjourned to February 1st.

WHEELWRIGHT ROAD - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED: The Board reviewed Plan of Land 9393C and noted that three parcels; namely, lots 12C and parcels A1 and A2 do not have sufficient frontage on a public way.

VOTED: Not to sign the plan because of insufficient frontage on 3 lots and to notify Richard Merrick, the engineer and applicant.

NEBO STREET - PLAN UNDER SUBDIVISION CONTROL NOT REQUIRED: The Board is in receipt of "Subdivision" Plan of Land in Medfield, Massachusetts, dated December 9, 1987, drawn by Norwood Engineering Co., Norwood, Massachusetts containing two lots owned by the Nickersons.

VOTED: To sign the plan.

The plan was signed.

BUTTERFIELD LANE: At the request of the developer, Mr. Manganiello, the Board reduced surety required for the completion of the section of Butterfield Lane within Medfield to \$22,500 as the Board now has signed cards that the underground utilities have been installed.

VOTED: To set surety at \$22,500 for a two-year period for the release of lots on Butterfield Lane.

HICKORY DRIVE: The Board is in receipt of a Plan of Land in Medfield, Massachusetts, dated December 8, 1987, drawn by Needham Survey Associates, Needham, showing Lot 9 with 46,226 s.f.

VOTED: To sign the plan.

The plan was signed.

LEDGEWOOD ACRES: The Board decided to delay scheduling a resession hearing on Ledge Wood Acres until hearing from Mr. Pyne and the Board of Health whether the Board of Health could approve the final revision of Mr. Pyne's plan dated 9/30/87.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph D. Codispoli
Secretary

No minutes found for 1988

C

1

2

3

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
July 10, 1989
EXECUTIVE SESSION

Present: Members Bancroft, Codispoti, Nolan and Parker.
Town Counsel Fuller

OVERFIELD ESTATES - PINE STREET COVENANT: Mrs. Bancroft moved that an executive session be held to discuss litigation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Parker.

The Board was polled as follows: Mrs. Bancroft, aye; Mr. Parker, aye; and Mr. Codispoti, aye.

VOTED: To hold an executive session to discuss litigation.

Chairman Codispoti said that the open session would be convened after the executive session is completed.

Town Counsel reported that he and Joseph Codispoti met with Messrs. Bayer, Brazad and Burke to discuss the dollar amount for the upgrading of Pine Street from Station 0+0 to Station 39+20. Town Counsel said that a figure of \$275,000 plus an engineered plan of Pine Street was agreed upon by the developer. Two areas which the developer would not pay for is the cost of retaining walls in the area of the curve in the wetlands. It was noted that the filling would be within the 5000 s.f. which could be approved by the Conservation Commission. The developer would pay no incremental costs.

Mr. Fuller will call the applicant regarding changes which would be required in the covenant.

VOTED: To reopen the public meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret E. Bancroft
Secretary

]

]

]

Medfield Planning Board
Executive Session August 21, 1989

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani, Nolan and Parker. Others attending Executive Session - Town Counsel Fuller.

EXECUTIVE SESSION - PINE STREET COVENANT: Mr. Gagliani moved that the Pine Street Covenant business be discussed in Executive Session. Chairman Codispoti polled the Board as follows: Bancroft, aye; Codispoti, aye; Gagliani, aye; Nolan, aye; and Parker aye.

VOTED: To go into Executive Session to discuss litigation.

Following the Executive Session, the public meeting will be back in session.

Town Counsel said that a covenant is a contract and only applies to the people. He said that anybody could build Pine Street so that it is reasonably safe for travel.

Concern was expressed that the construction easements are still not on the plan.

Another concern of the Board is the disposition of land where Overfield Drive abuts the Dover line. The Board wants action to be taken so that Overfield Drive will not be connected to Dover. The reason for this is that Pine Street is being constructed as a substandard road and could not handle the additional traffic.

Mr. Nolan brought the following points to the attention of the Board: Page 6, Paragraph 8, should refer to paragraph 6.

He suggested that on page 7, Paragraph 11, the following should be added "and will also show on the Pine Street Improvements Plan and grant to the Town appropriate construction easements."

Town Counsel Fuller will discuss the following points with the applicant's attorney:

1. Slope easements during construction.
2. Why has a portion of paragraph 1 been changed?
3. The method of being sure that Overfield Drive will not be connected to Dover.

August 21, 1989

Page 7

4. Change reference on page 6 as above.
5. Paragraph 11 - can it include construction and slope easements?

Mr. Burke agreed that changes will be made to the Pine Street Plan to incorporate the information contained in Mr. Burke's letter to Superintendent Feeney.

The question was raised as to how to notify the Selectmen by letter, with copy of covenant, when the issues have been resolved.

The Executive Session was concluded at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret E. Bancroft
Secretary

MEDFIELD PLANNING BOARD
August 6, 1990

Members present: Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani, Nolan and Parker. Others attending: George Pyne, Sr., George Pyne, Jr.; Charles Breen; John Copeland.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Nolan and the following business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE SESSION - LEDGEWOOD ACRES: Mr. Codispoti moved that the Planning Board go into executive session to discuss a legal issue with George Pyne and that the public meeting be reconvened following the executive session.

The Chairman polled the Board and the voting was recorded Nolan, Parker, Bancroft and Codispoti in the affirmative to enter into executive session regarding George Pyne's financial/legal situation.

Mr. Pyne confided that he had gotten into a power struggle between the outgoing and incoming presidents of the Milford National Bank. They did not come through with the agreement which had been worked out. This stemmed from the fact that the Milford National Bank was in financial trouble and couldn't live up to its end of the bargain. The FDIC took the bank over. A participant bank (the Chestnut Hill Bank) was involved. Mr. Pyne said that the bottom line was that the people in the bank were not telling him the truth.

He said that today he has a tentative agreement from FDIC and the Chestnut Hill Bank to develop LedgeWood Acres with Mr. Pyne.

Mr. Nolan asked what bank will be involved?

Mr. Pyne said it will be the Chestnut Hill Bank.

Mr. Nolan asked if they will advance new funds.

Mr. Pyne said the Chestnut Hill Bank will advance construction mortgages under P&S and funds for completion of the site.

Mrs. Bancroft asked about the water pumping station.

Mr. Pyne said that the pumping station is "all well and fine." Half of it will be paid for by the Oxbow Corporation. He said that he has already put 1600 feet of 12" water pipe in Winter and Pine Streets which is fully alive and turned on. He said that the pumping station will be built. He reminded the Board that the pumping station was introduced for the 53-lot subdivision first proposed and not excluded for the 12 lots approved.

Mr. Codispoti said that the Board would like to see the road completed and houses built.

Mr. Pyne said that a verbal agreement had been made with S. Gruber of the Chestnut Hill Bank, B. Adams of the FDIC and himself. It is being put into writing and should be in place and approved within a week. He said he would have to put up a bond between the Town of Medfield and Chestnut Hill Bank for \$150,000.

Mrs. Bancroft said that what is being suggested is that the Board accept surety for a portion of the road - not the whole road.

Mr. Pyne said he would be willing to leave the \$150,000 with the Town until all the work is completed. He said that he had received a certificate of compliance from the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Parker had a question regarding the walls. It looked to him as though the rocks were stacked one on top of the other and would like proof that it is structurally sound.

Mr. Pyne said that the wall was built by a team of Portuguese stone masons who worked for him for ten years. He felt that if he were to construct the wall in accordance with the approved plan it would not be in the best interest of the town. He noted that the wall is not for support. He further said that he wasn't planning to discuss the wall tonight and will come to another meeting if necessary to resolve the wall construction.

Mr. Codispoti suggested that Superintendent Feeney and/or Dale MacKinnon look at the wall to determine whether it would work as well as the wall on the approved plan.

Mr. Nolan said that our engineer should review Hawthorne Drive and estimate the cost of completion and if the surety is more than the \$150,000, a partial lot release could be considered. Mr. Nolan asked that our engineer give an

August 6, 1990

Page 3

considered. Mr. Nolan asked that our engineer give an indication of which lots could be released without the pumping station being constructed. Superintendent Feeney will also be asked.

Mrs. Bancroft asked that Whitman & Howard evaluate the wall to determine whether it is constructed adequately engineeringwise.

VOTED: To close the Executive Session and reconvene the regular Planning Board meeting.

Members Bancroft, Codispoti, Gagliani, Nolan and Parker were polled and all voted in favor of reconvening the public session.

polls and all voted in favor of reconvening the public session.