

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 5, 2007

This meeting was held in the High School Auditorium.

Present: Wright Dickinson, Keith Diggans, Elissa Franco, and George Lester  
Stephen Browne recused himself for the Quarry Road public hearing as he is an abutter.

Woodcliff Estates – Quarry Road (continued public hearing)

Chairman Wright Dickinson convened the public hearing at 7:30 p.m.

Scott Colwell (developer) reviewed the plan showing the grades necessary for a road through to Morse Drive. He said they could meet the K value and reviewed the calculations re Earth Tech report of today. He said they can adjust to 300 feet if it were necessary. He then continued with the second issue of drainage. He said they have done permeability tests and could add a second infiltration basin in the highlighted area shown on the plans. He explained that there is already a drainage easement next to the area. He could shrink the proposed basin and add the second in order to satisfy the requirement for a buffer around the basin. The new basin would be right in the middle of all the trails. He explained that they would have to reroute the trails around it. At the request of board members he pointed out what land/roadway is within the 100 foot buffer zone. He said that they have done calculations for the existing basin and are doing more for the Board of Health. The existing basin is more than adequate. They are assuming that the Board of Health will approve the plan. The proposed area will come off. They will not have to touch anything in the buffer zone. Lot 10. They meet with BOH on February 14<sup>th</sup> and hopefully will finalize it. BOH wanted 2 more calculations, which they done. If the Planning Board decides not to grant the waiver they would have to reduce the basin and create the new one. Either way it is the same calculations. If the road goes through then there area couple of areas down below for drainage.

George Lester questioned if it could be accomplished by lengthening the basin within the lot.

Mr. Colwell said they would have to get a waiver to build on the lot. What is there is well established. It is vegetated. It would be best served to leave it. What happened is that the BOH agent suggested some different engineering tests which are a little bit more extensive than what were done 10 years ago. They have done that. They found that the soil is much better than they originally thought because they went deeper in the tests. The water goes right through it. It does not hold any water. With the cul-de-sac plan there is no change to what is there. It stays the way it is. It does not have to be altered at all. If he had to do a cut through plan they would add drainage down the end.

Mr. Colwell continued with his list stating that they also submitted an updated traffic study. There was the question of providing emergency access to Erik Road. He said he does have a letter signed by Mr. Musto agreeing to the connection to Erik Road, which he submitted. He pointed out the proposed emergency access as discussed at the previous meeting which was a straight shot to Erik Road that would be 20 feet wide. There is plenty of turning room.

Keith Diggans raised the issue of the end of the cul-de-sac at Erik Road.

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 5, 2007

Elissa Franco stated that it is a wrap around piece of land that Mr. Musto owns.

Mr. Colwell said that the road does not go right to the property line.

Mr. Lester explained that the Board had required that the land wrap around the end of the cul-de-sac.

Chairman Dickinson said the Board would need something a little more official than what was given this evening.

Mr. Colwell said he realized that. He just wanted to bring something to show that Mr. Musto agreed that it could be done.

Mr. Lester said that it should state that it shall be for emergency access only and not available to the general public. He assumed that people could ride bicycles through it.

Mr. Colwell said they can write up however the Board wants it. He added that he talked to the fire chief about a gate and he will look into that. The Fire Chief would be talking with the Police Chief to come up with something that would work. He will added it when gets the information.

Mrs. Franco questioned if there would be a gate on each end

Mr. Colwell said he could see one there, probably at the top of the hill nearer to Erik Road.

Chairman Dickinson observed that while the new location for the emergency access is a straighter shot, it is also a steeper grade.

Mr. Colwell replied that they will have to level it out to make the grade. They would have to cut off a knoll that is in the path.

Keith – how do we deal with that erik is not built

Elissa and Scott – he is building now

Scott – that is the issues – will meet with the water and sewer on looping – built Hawthorne water pumping station – town likes to loop into another neighborhood – plan to finish forced main sewer

Wright – letter of Gilogy – paragraph on bottom - “No certificate of occupancy etc. ...”

Scott – if musto did not get his road in then Scott would pave a strip so that there would be access – if he were to stop then would pave

Wright – need to have that in writing

Scott – would get that

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 5, 2007

Wright – concern about certificate of occupancy – would be preferred with building permit –

Scott – if tied to having the access road I will build the access road

Elissa – until there is a need to service those houses – Scotts problem – concern for the emergency access is to get to them if people living in them – perhaps a

Wright – have town counsel review tying to occupancy permit

Scott – Mr. Musto planning on building the road this spring – want to build the road – if end up late in the year will give him additional time to pave – his property issue

Wright – any questions from the board

George – still waiting for the BIH – correct

Scott – don't anticipate

Wright – need of both to get

Keith – any new items

Wright – want opinions from board members about a cut through with Morse –

Elissa – do not favor a cut through – have reservations about the subdivision plans – not in line with the prior decision – not in the best interest – still issues with the sub divide

Keith – concern is the emergency – not in favor of providing a road – looking at what can build – not the intent before and not the solution to what trying to accomplish

George – maybe if it were a blank slate – town had the opportunity before – at least two times before the town said no to both of those times – no conditions now that were not foreseeable at that time – area – mistake to go back and put a through connect – way through to Morse and blasting through all that ledge – no in favor of road through to Morse – favor of emergency access connect – would be good to connect pedestrian to join together – bike ride between

Wright – do not think a cut through to Morse is good – would be very disruptive - needed to see that no-waiver plan – seen the information – earth tech has confirmed – not in favor of connecting – not in favor of emergency access road – more details to work out

George – nothing saying - have not made a determination on the statements of the prior sub divide approval in light of the language

Wright – opinions have no bearing on whether to approve or disapprove]

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 5, 2007

Elissa – would not favor a cut through to Morse drive

Scott – if dis approve – then have to tell go through

Wright – have spent so much time on this issue – now need to focus on that culdesac – focusing our energy addressing the issues on the culdesa

.....what is emergency vehicles

Elissa – that part of any approval of – will include an emergency access to erik road

Scott – issues with the plan

Petition submitted

Scott – give me something written that clarifies the issues with Musto

Wright – will get something from Mark

Scott - what else

Keith – slope – suspect that some of these lots do not make it - lot 10 and 7 and 6 - explained for the audience – may need to reconfigure to get more level area – another question on depth of lot 4

George – want to remain as trail – the existing would continue to be a trail (30 ft.) –

Wright – letter from Muffy regarding trails in the area – have touched on length of culdesac before – list of waivers

Scto – length of culdesac – relocating sidewalk to other side – light

George – appropriat buffers

Keith – length – may get more be shortening due to slope – not sure of the numbers

Elissa – needs to look at the lots to see if he can resolve the issues

Wright – questions from the Board – other town's board re culdesac

Mike Sullivan – have not changed his position –

Chief Meany – position of all three was need for road – position remains the same

Wright – other boards – open to questions regarding the culdesac only

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 5, 2007

John Posivak – 14 Partridge Rd – what is the pb require for minimum turning radiuw

George – Mr. Musto has approved plan with the spec to build a road – do not have a regulation for width and grade of such access

Kathy – 22 Vinebrook Rd – what protection that some future board take gates down

George – to be spect in legal – have requirements for road – nvever meet spec for a road

Kathy – road is designed to not meet

Sctot – would end up with eminent domain case to make it a road that conforms – town would have to take lots to make it happen – not likely to happen

George – not setting a precident to be uses and ready to be a road – just submet to getting fire trucks

4 Flinte Lock Lane – what are emgerency vehicle

Elissa – police, fire , ambulane

6 Partrideg Rd – if you do not – he can build the cut through

George – prior approval said he oucld not build to another subdiviion – if not for that languarge – he would be showing a plan with cut rht

52 Cypress St – at the end of the January meetin g – looking for clarification – pieces were missing – plan at last meeting

Elissa – had questions on no waiver

Wright – cannot make a decision without BOH approval

Elissa – have issues with some lots

Keith – he needed to work on road

92 Dohner – follow up

Meany – would not want to define – not want to defend every time use the road

George – easement – tom for emergency purposes – need to look at everything

Elissa – have discussed with Chief K – gated acces – so private vehicle cannot use – get maintenacce traffic – not restrict – only certain people able to activate gate

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 5, 2007

6 Minute Man – why open to others

Elissa – also utility

George – also bike and trails across

Elissa – conditions on the trail so connects through

31 part road – gate – where will be located

Wright – up for further discussion etc. – logistics still out there with the chiefs as to what is appropriate for their needs – power etc. - - prefer more towards Erik rd.

22 Minute Man – access rd – creating back up – main access for emergency –

Meany – cannot promise what would happen – 10 past 5 would use the access – other times would not make sense – in the morning when traffic is backed up -t then may use – depends on traffic – cannot promise –

52 Brook St – cars on street – if town ad – pc – fc – seeking a complete road – is there a plan to look at other access and traffic

Wright – is

Mike – there is no alternate plan

Huffnagel –

George – did not say should have – said could have – town rejected the two times prior in Wood cliff – not appropriate to go back on that decision – that is when

Wright – other question

30 Cypress St – talked about the leng of cul – talking about a road would be built

Wright – discussed what the length of this culdesac would bbe – expressed wish to have it shorter

Keith – more going on – access rod – length –looking at package – still a little bit fluid – intent is to find a workable plan - still looking at what waivers

30 Cylr

Elissa – he would have to submit a new subdivision approval

Wright – would determine if duable at that hearing

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 5, 2007

George – he has the leverage if we decide – the legal issue is the prior sub with language that we differ on – legal dispute – yes could come

Elissa – he would have to come back in much greater detail

Scott – if we can resolve the slope issues and depth of one lot would the board consider the waivers

Wright – not in a position to do that tonight – you are asking for a decision before the decision – it is a public hearing – not going to make a kinda count

Gerge – legal issue – keep in perspective – urge to make a decision before ready

35 Vine Brook – what is the down side

Elissa – hae subdivision rules – must follow those rules – must look at reasons why and balance with the public good – need to balance with what is the public good – including prior subdivisoin or any other - need to apply to any proposal

Keith – if allowed culd – could have 100's of houses – someday you will not want a culdesac – need to be enforced – taking time to do the right thing – not to force any issue here

Elissa – this process is not any more protracted than any other that has come before us

38 Cypress St – information from consultant

Scott – reviewed that earlier

19 Partridge rd – to implement the culdesac – need to

Sctoo – proposed access point to the proposed erik rd – no change to the length of culdesac

19 – could you approve a smaller culdesac and get the access

Wright – would have approve a waiver on the length of the o – Quarry rd already exceeds

19 – is this a yes or no

Wright – yea or ney with conditions

George – can he come back

Scott – giving up lots if don't do the cut through – proposing

Wright – questions on the u

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 5, 2007

18 Part rd – could add 3 more lots – hae 10 wouldn't not be that valualb

24 Emerson Rd – explain the 2 sides on the legal question

George – previous sub approval said “no event etc. “ – was a written condition – at the time he did not own land to cut through other than erik road – one side say that in that approval that precluded ever coming back to any cut through – he since aquired the piece on Morse and his position is that he has the right to connect

Flint Lock Lane – who will make that final decision about whether – who make the decision

Wirht – will decide on this first

George – the cut through plan was leveralge

Wright – his

4 Minute man – some extension would be granted

Wright – some access will ge granted

4 minuteman – what makes it lenth

Wright – one foot even turns it into a waiver plan

4 minute man – measured from where

George – another legal issue

4 minute man – what is the best interest of the town – 4 extra houses

Elissa - looking at the whole package that he has proposed – cann eith approve with conditions or deny

4 minute – why difficult to decide 4 lots

Elissa – fact is already going beyond what sub div

128 Haring – testimony 2 meetings – intent was to prevent joining the deve – my opinion is that Mr. Cerel cannot represent – release Mr. Cerel

Brook St. – if cul is approved – are th house situated so there would never be a cut through

Scott – yes – it would have to be through an eminent domain

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 5, 2007

Keith – can we engage language that would not – tighter language

Wright –

Should be written to prevent a cut through to other streets

Kahty Leham – plans before this board – what president set – how many

Wright – did do

Sctoo – 80% approved

Wright – since on the board has been a general consensus that the days of approving long culdesac

Elissa – each sub is different – each needs to look at what is valuable to the town – recent received land that thown had wanted – need to be in the public interest

George – in all of those cases there was an ability to show that it could be done without wiaver – brings us back to the issue – have not been approving these longer culde

31 Vine Brook – different factors for each deve – wter pressure – what is the driving factor – managing development

George – good planning design practice – think of it as a five story building without a second exiht from an ability – not to just manage development –

31 vine brook – what are the reasons driving it in this one

George – safety issue (maybe no waiver would be less safe ) – donations of land – road inprovement – land

Wright

Elissa – Fegb 26<sup>th</sup> at 8 pm at the town

Elissa – extend to March 6<sup>th</sup>

Slope requirement – depth – trails – buffers -

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 26, 2007

Present: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, Keith R. Diggans, Elissa G. Franco, and George N. Lester

Meeting was convened at approximately 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Dickinson.

Quarry Road Subdivision

VOTED unanimously to continue the Quarry Road Subdivision public hearing to March 12, 2007 at 8:15 p.m.

Discussion of possibly subdividing land on Philip Street

Cheryl Moreland met with the board to discuss the possibility of subdividing 61 Philip Street. The Board explained the process of subdivision approval and the requirements of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations as well as the Zoning Bylaw. It also explained that the plan would need to receive Board of Health and Conservation Commission approval particularly regarding drainage. The possibility of acquiring additional land from the abutter was also discussed. The Board also explained that the existing house cannot be made nonconforming.

North Meadows Estates

Attorney David Mack spoke on behalf of his clients, Jim and Tina McNulty, stating their concern regarding the detention basin, some of which is on their property and some of which is on the property next door. There is a variation between the plans and what is on the ground. It is not clear if what is on the ground will work. They are here to see if this is satisfactory to the Planning Board; will it work. They have heard that one idea to bring it into compliance was a 7 foot wall 5 feet from the house. The Rosenfelds and their engineer are looking at what they can do. He submitted pictures of the property.

Dan Merrikin, Merrikin Engineering, representing the Rosenfelds, explained the basin was built 10 years ago. It was designed higher near the easement line (5 feet) and drops off to a 4:1 slope. In reply to Planning Board member Browne's question of standing water Mr. Merrikin said there is little to none.

Mr. McNulty reviewed the pictures for the board.

Mr. Merrikin said the issue of compliance was raised by the Building Inspector when they began to develop lot 13 next door where a portion of the basin is located. At that time they discovered it did not meet grade. To conform they must transition a retaining wall. They need to do a more detailed survey. They could use a 3:1 slope.

Town Counsel Mark Cerel expressed concern for the extreme drops in elevation and for maintenance of the retaining walls. Natural ground would be better.

Wright Dickinson noted that it is a 20 foot drop.

PLANNING BOARD  
APRIL 9, 2007

Present: Wright C. Dickinson, Keith R. Diggans, Elissa G. Franco, and George N. Lester  
Absent: Stephen J. Browne

Chairman Dickinson convened the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.

**HAMMANT FARM SUBDIVISION**

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Robert MacCready, Open Space Builders, regarding the abandonment of an easement at subject subdivision. Based on further discussions of David MacCready with the Planning Board Administrator, the Board tabled discussion until further notice from the developer, Mr. David MacCready.

**ROBINSON ROAD**

Robinson Road is up for acceptance at the Annual Town Meeting beginning April 30, 2007. The Board is currently holding an \$80,000 bond as surety. The bond is due to be renewed April 15<sup>th</sup>, and since the work appears completed, the Board VOTED unanimously to reduce surety at Robinson Road Subdivision to \$10,000 until the street is accepted at Town Meeting.

**QUARRY ROAD EXTENSION SUBDIVISION**

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Scott W. Colwell requesting an extension of time for the subdivision. The Board of Health is still reviewing the drainage.

VOTED unanimously to continue the public hearing to April 23, 2007 at 8:15 p.m.

VOTED unanimously to grant an extension of time in which the Board has to render its decision to April 30, 2007.

At 8:17 p.m. the Board VOTED unanimously to adjourn.

Respectfully,

George N. Lester, Clerk  
Medfield Planning Board

PLANNING BOARD  
JUNE 25, 2007

Present: Wright C. Dickinson, Keith R. Diggans, Elissa G. Franco, and George N. Lester  
Absent: Stephen J. Browne

Meeting was convened at approximately 8 p.m. by Chairman Franco following reorganization.

ANR Plan – Boiling Springs Avenue

VOTED to endorse an ANR plan entitled “Plan of Land in Medfield, MA” dated May 31, 2007 drawn by Merrikin Engineering, LLP, Millis, MA creating Parcel A with 297.8 s.f.± to be combined with land of Robinetter and Taubenheim at #4 Boiling Spring Ave.

PLANNING BOARD  
JULY 9, 2007

Present: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, Elissa G. Franco and George N. Lester  
Absent: Keith R. Diggans

Meeting convened at approximately 8:00 p.m. by Chairman Franco.

**BROOKSIDE SUBDIVISION SURETY**

The Board is in receipt of a letter from Superintendent of Public Works Kenneth P. Feeney that stated all work at subject subdivision was completed to his satisfaction.

VOTED unanimously to release all surety being held for Brookside subdivision.

**HAMMANT FARM SUBDIVISION SURETY**

The Board is in receipt of a letter dated July 9, 2007, from its engineer at Earth Tech, Inc. suggesting that surety may be reduced to \$45,000 at subject subdivision.

VOTED unanimously to reduce surety at Hammant Farm Subdivision to \$45,000 per the Earth Tech letter of July 9, 2007.

**CHILD CARE FACILITY (Goddard) – WEST ST AND ROUTE 27 – DISCUSSION**

Presenter: Matthew Borrelli, Attorney for Needham Investment Company  
Engineer: John Glossa, Glossa Engineering, 45 East Street, Walpole, MA 02081

The project as presented by Mr. Borrelli and Mr. Glossa

- Materials presented for discussion purposes
  - Conceptual Site Plan of the daycare facility
  - ANR plan showing 5 lots
  - Plan of existing conditions
  - Photo of the Goddard School parking lot in Bellingham, MA
- The subject lot
  - the largest of 5 ANR lots to be created at this location
  - Located at the southwest corner of the intersection of West Street and Route 27
  - 107,311 s.f. with 96 ft of frontage on West Street and a width of 120 ft
  - slopes from the rear of the lot down toward West Street and Route 27 from elevation 182 ft down to elevation 136 ft
- The other lots
  - 4 ANR with frontage on Route 27 – all for single family homes
  - sizes range from 20,010 s.f. to 20,095 s.f.
  - level with Route 27 and then climbs upward

PLANNING BOARD  
JULY 9, 2007

**BAKER ROAD DETENTION BASIN (cont.)**

Dan Merrikin, engineer for the subdivision, advised the Planning Board office earlier in the day that the revised plans of the detention basin have been reviewed by the Board of Health engineer and will require approval from the Board of Health.

Discussion was postponed to the July 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting at 8:15 p.m.

Meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD  
DECEMBER 3, 2007

Present: Elissa G. Franco, George N. Lester, Keith R. Dickinson, Wright C. Dickinson  
Absent: Stephen J. Browne

Discussion of the duties of the Planning Board with student from Political Science class.

50 PARK STREET

Chairman Franco convened the public hearing at 8:15 p.m.

EF – read the legal notice 11/15 and 22/2007

Richard Merrikin – engineer – 50 Park Street – little over an acre of land – presently occupied by a collection of buildings that become one building – coal yards at the end of the property - propose to replace the existing building with a new building in 2 phases – will build addition first with atrium then remove old building and build new – parking facility with loading area – open along park street – limit the area to two driveway openings with a walkway with 2 landscaping – leave the finished floor about the same as the existing facility at grade – property slopes downhill toward the end so will do some filling – filling the old coal yard area – drainage is available from Oak Street – will run drainage overflow down to another infiltration system – put a new sewer connection – possible new water connection – green space to the house on that side of the street – back has a paved drive along the back which is on the railroad property and it will stay – make the business operation more efficient – want to keep the business in the same location

EF – Earth Tech letter

RM – have made the changes – showed 2 foot contours – and where needed put “spot shots” – adjusted the inverts

Ed Lyons – architect – put plantings in space in front of building – atrium is the two story space entrance – manufacturing on one side – distribution on the other side - picture of the proposed building – modeled after rr station – 315 feet long – brick on the two sides – block stone for the center – cement type of shingle on the roof – green window frames and glazing – flushed (not corrugated)

EF – existing building

....11,000 feet

EF – parking

....have about 32 parking now and will have the same

RM – have provided 31 - only 22 required for the whole area

WD – will you connect the phases

PLANNING BOARD  
DECEMBER 3, 2007

RM – can add some plantings

WD – will make a site visit

.... Mrs. Mann wanted the tree taken down between the property

Matt – couple of trucks a day – unloading drive up – do not have other tenants - been there since July 1980

WD – deliveries

Matt – like this to get trucks off park street – currently unload on Park st. with fork lift – now will be able to get off the road – designed so would go back down park st.

WD – maintain that all traffic comes and goes Park

WD – drainage structures look different

RM – underground infiltration systems – round perforated pipes – need to put them under pavement – corrugated plastic – manholes at each end so can look into pipes and maintain

WD – roof drain on both end -?middle

RM – drain line runs along the front – back side just run in both ways with gutters and downspouts – roof water does not have to be treated because it is clean – running into the drainage – there is a leaching catchbasin on the railroad property in back

WD – traffic study

RM – exiting business that is not changing so asking for a waiver – driveway ways are wider than the 24 foot - about 30 feet loading area

EF – this eliminates cars from parking on the street

RM – can get a trailer in

WD – any feed back from Ken Feeney or Chief Kingsbury - ? Hydrants etc.

Norma – have not received any information

RM – appear to have many hydrants

WD – sign

PLANNING BOARD  
DECEMBER 3, 2007

Ed Lyons – little panels – no good location for a monument sign – will go to the sign board – will have a number and name

KD – schedule

Matt – get going this spring so finish first phase by October and move over so possibly done by the end of the year

KD – interim parking during construction – walk through the site to get to work

....parking behind on the railroad property

KD – attention to where people are – need parking

WD – possible construction management plan

RM – would go over with Ed Ryberg

WD – hours of construction? Dumpsters

Matt – at the end parking space

GL – like the building and the effort to fit and – favor of supporting economical development in the downtown area

EF – everyone just drive by

GL – how long since rail access to the property

Matt – must have been way back – old metal building

RM – should look into the demolition permit

WD – BOH, site lighting – waivers – construction plan – fire and dpw

WD – moved to continue to Jan 14<sup>th</sup> at 8:15 p.m.

Meeting concluded at 9:20 p.m.