

PLANNING BOARD

JANUARY 14, 2008

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

Approximately 8:04 p.m. Meeting convened by Chairman Franco

**BAKER ROAD**

Dan Merrikin, Merrikin Engineering, on behalf of Ellen Realty Trust, concerning the detention basin on end lot. BOH did approve the new design. Made changes to comply – tweaked the basin – required to keep the slope along the undeveloped lot at 4:1 but allowed 3:1 on McNulty property. BOH required a post and rail fence because of steeper slope about ½ way down the lawn – fence is at required ....bench. Would ask the Planning Board if accept – ask the if the Board of Health is willing to do away with the fence if the

Wright Dickinson – asked to address other letter Kevin Joyce

Elissa – letter delivered by Mr. Joyce – names listed but not sure all seen

Dan – road is more than half done – no street trees – issue is street trees and the bottom half (end of the culdesac) not completed – intend to complete the road – started but issue came up with the detention basin – taken a fair amount of time – now can go forward – would like to finish everything with one shot – can finish completion at end of March

Elissa – sidewalks – granite edging and trees

Dan – reviewed these

Elissa – is there a time frame

Dan & Ellen – would agree to have done by the end of the summer

Dan – could get done

Elissa – reviewed the surety

Ellen – thought we would be back in in a month – did not know that

WD – question done by June 1<sup>st</sup>.

Ellen – difficult – more work in the detention pond

Dan – putting in outlet structures & grading

WD – question if tie to a permit – when done – all have to live with it through the summer

Jon – plan to pull two foundations and get them and the pond done so not go over the new road

PLANNING BOARD  
JANUARY 14, 2008

Ellen – ready to do it all

Elissa – what happens first

Dan – curbing – top coat and sidewalks – basin – don't want to top coat the road with equipment

Elissa – get some work done first

Dan – can be doing the curbing, sidewalks and trees before the top coating

Jon – could put in one foundation tomorrow

Elissa – neighborhood deserves assurances –

Dan – could give an update by end of May

Elissa – can't do anything now

Dan – don't work on detention pond until grass growing

Keith – don't understand what is taking so long

Elissa – sidewalks and curbing in by June

WD – sidewalks should be in by June 1<sup>st</sup>

Keith – if weather good should be able to do that

Ellen – problem is if the weather is not good then back here as a liar

Elissa – yes

Ellen – sidewalks and curbing by June 30<sup>th</sup> – top coat by August

Dan – best time for trees is fall

Keith – could do –put a schedule together that works

Elissa – know if bad weather not going to work

Ellen – snow, mud – June – beginning

Elissa – have the letter from Bill domey

PLANNING BOARD

JANUARY 14, 2008

Atty David Mack – represent the McNulty's – came about because changes proposed to the – Mark Cerel was apposed to any structure on the McNulty's – BOH was to be consulted – never got any notice of info from regarding – don't know the length of the fence – have not been copied on - why can't change the nonbuilt lot – this is their subdivison – they were to build according to plan – should have to change the plan – the subdivison modification should not be approved – don't think McNulty's should be blamed for the delay in the subdiivisoon – don't know why a fence is required

Dan – that is not the way it is – the detention basin redesign was to accommodate the McNulty – went in to regrade to meet the plan – they asked that we redesign the detention basin – BOH mandated the fence go in so the area next to the – argued against the fence

Elissa – were not at BOH meeting – suggested – clients are not being blamed – should take care of the items before the big equipment – don't know if all have seen the letter – not blame but concern that the work be done – if takes a couple of month

Kevin Stoddard – 6 Baker Road – take exception that any portion of the Road is complete – none of the other houses have – take exception that can't plan – idea to tie the curfing etc to putting in the foundations – get work done before foundation

Elissa – some risk of bringing the equipment over the newly installed road

Mr. St – would not go up the full length of the road – curbing could be put in prior

Jon – can't do the work close to the surface because of freezing – can do foundation because it is dug – can't do asphalt

Mr. McNulty – a lot of earth was pushed into the basin and will be regraded – how will this work – moved earth into the basin so now how do

Dan – nothing has been put in the basin – on the slope above the basin on the unfinished lot –

Elissa – anyone else like to be heard

SB – see plan showing the fence

Dan – reviewed the plan – safety bench – all utilities are there – need to put a new outlet structure – 2 foot post and rail fence

Mr. McNulty – have windows

Dan – they need to help lobby the BOH to remove the fence

Elissa – we cannot take the fence out – need to go back to the BOH and ask that it change

George – what has changed

PLANNING BOARD  
JANUARY 14, 2008

Dan – was to leave – alternative was to dig out and that would have required a retaining wall - above the fence looks the same – below the fence take out some of the slope – less of a slope than what is there now

SB – not sure why putting a fence – how long has it been in the current status

Dan – some regarding – been there since 1994

Steve – decade without a fence

Mack – no one wanted a fence before – who is responsible

McNulty's –

SB – approve it without the fence

Dan – convey to BOH that residents do not want

George - ?will there be a steeper after safety bench

Dan – no

Steve – approve with the change

Keith – not holding the construction up

WD – need some kind of condition on getting it done

Dan – will work with the BOH

WD – willing to go along with that approval – get permits for foundations bu no framing – need something as incentive

Ellen – not happy with the restriction – been stopped

WD – more motivation

Ellen – don't need to be handcuffed – don't need more motivation – if see not getting done then come back

WD – this is the only opportunity to get it done

Ellen – have not done anything not get done

10 Baker Rod- like your proposal – alternative would be to get sidewalks done before foundation

PLANNING BOARD  
JANUARY 14, 2008

Elissa – need something put in place – do not see holding up the foundations – not want work done twice – neighbors need some closing here – summer

Ellen – what is the summer time – want the end of summer except for the trees

SB – pick a date in summer – do some of the trees in the spring – will give you your money back

Peter – 5 Baker Rd – want sidewalks, paving, and curbing more than trees – must be some time

Elissa – cannot do some work in the winter – agree there must be some closure – if set unreasonable deadline

George – foundations and detention basin (March) – so by end of March should be in a position to finish the road

WD – foundations should be done by March – do curbs in April and May – thus June 1<sup>st</sup> with sidewalks etc. – wait and do top coat and trees and do in Sept.

Ellen – June 1<sup>st</sup> – not going anywhere

Elissa – update May 1<sup>st</sup>

Could hold up the occupancy permit

Elissa – come back the first meeting

George – sidewalk and curbing in two months

Mack – position of board on detention

Steve – will approve without the fence – letter

Will need both McNulty's and Dan to BOH

Elissa – June 1<sup>st</sup> for curbing and sidewalk and detention basin – first meeting in May will be an update – need to give until Sept for topcoat and trees (late sept.)

WD – end of sept for overall completion

WD – move to approve revised detention basin plan as approved by BOH with the exception of the fence. Subject to the removal of the post and rail fence

Passed

PLANNING BOARD  
JANUARY 14, 2008

Steve – move accept a construction schedule curbing sidewalks detention basin by June 1<sup>st</sup> and update by first meeting in May and completion by September 30<sup>th</sup>.

50 Park Street

Reopen the public hearing at 9 p.m.- approved by BOH – go over the stormceptor Bill wanted –

Rick – addressed the engineering concepts – met with DPW which wanted to be able to (no drainage in Park St) – tie into their system – moved the upper infiltration out onto Park st – go down the street to the existing pipe – one size bigger – Ken will get his pipe he wants – bill is ok with it – most everything being infiltrated – worked out better – added some lights – two building lights on each end of the building and added a detail sheet for the lights – shielded lights so directional down –

George – question

Rick – before abutter suggested a pole by the corner (Mr. Comeau) – added sequence of construction – essentially – area where coal bins are do utilities and use that as parking and staging area – bill ok with the revised drainage – no regulations to waive

Keith – waiver for traffic study

Rick – no requirement for traffic – driveway – just calling it access – cannot get into with 24 feet with trailers – everybody want truck traffic to go back up Park – existing – buffer – added a fence so added – ok with fire department – building sprinkled

Ed Reiberg – land tech – spoke with the historic commission chair David Temple – sent procedure – seek demolition permit – must submit the whole application – explained to David Temple – copy for file – initial reaction probably not an issue – hoping for the informal two week review – don't believe any historical value.

Keith – question of the sign

Rick – will do a conforming sign – possibly a small sign also – will deal with it separately

WD – any large trees coming out?

Rick – yes – big old Pine trees – neighbors want down - if on street will have to do a tree hearing

Elissa – nice building – no opposition from the neighbors – questions etc.

Moved to close the public hearing and so voted

Move to approve the site plan before the board as presented and so voted.

PLANNING BOARD  
JANUARY 14, 2008

Articles for TM

Approve article - so voted

Closed at 9:30 pm.

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 11, 2008

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

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

ZONING BYLAW CHANGE

Town Counsel Cerel has proposed a zoning change that would require any non-residential use change to a substantially different, nonresidential use be subject to Site Plan review. The Planning Board shall make the determination whether a proposed nonresidential use is substantially different from the existing nonresidential use.

The spelling of nonresidential (non-residential) needs to be consistent. Take out hyphen.

76 WEST STREET – GODDARD DAY CARE

EF – legal notice in Medfield Press - -explanation of the procedure for the public hearing

Matt Borrelli – attorney for Norfolk Investment – Section 5.3.9 – day care – section 8 and 5.3.9. requirements - capacity 134 students – 4.3 acres , minimum yards satisfied, buffers provided – onsite dropoff is accommodated parking spaces along the sidewalk – similar drop – separate exit and entrance provided – parking met – have the floor plan – 4534 sf of class space 19 full and parttime employees –

John Glossa – Glossa Engineering – East Street, Walpole – existing conditions of site – corner of rte 27 and West St. – site contains an existing single-family house off the road and not visible – driveway along the property line on West St. – site completely wooded – second driveway comes in off rte 27 to near the house essentially dirt – small area around the house is maintained as lawn otherwise Pine trees – either an escar or terrace that looks like a ridge – top of ridge 182 and drops to about 150 sharply – eventually reaching 136 - Utilites – cesspool – there is sewer and drainage and water in West St – country/highway drainage in West St – swale present. Around the back side of the lot are houses that abut Brastow Drive – topod the lot, soil testing (6 test pit ) – hill of gravel – outwashed soil – hill that basically consists of sand and grave – lot 187,484 sf land court – plan by Mass Highway – proposal for 126.7 feet back from rte 27 ROW 137. feet from West St.- 178.1 feet ti houses on Brastow – access to create two driveway near West st and driveway on rte 27 – outlet onto rte 27 no left turn exiting – west either direction – both points can be accessed from either direction – existing house will be removed - broke down requirements verses what they have (as on plan) – Lot coverage 19.4% - providing 36 stalls for parking – provided 10 foot buffers as required – primary topo feature is flat in the front – rises slightly more than gental to the house and then quickly – generic school plan is ..... needs to be flat so not hazardous – enclosed with a fence – play area needs to encroach slighly into slope – 2:1 grade – building at e150 – material will be used to fill site to create the parking – no grading extends off site – drainage: catch in 3 low points – near the access road and 27, where driveway turns, where parking lot meets the landscaped - 3 stormceptor catchbasins - can meet the standards for stormwater management – also recharge the required amount back into the ground – landscaping – all access and parking boarder with cement concrete – White pines algon



PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 11, 2008

the edges – dumpster on site – azalea and rhodendrums – play area is specially treated area – hard surface – all the disturbed area will be covered with loam – detail sheets reviewed – building will be connected to the public sewer and water – FC is asking for a hydrant and that will be shown on – have Mr. Domey's letter which they will work on – should be a short period of time. – only easement of record shows middle line of old road – that does not come into play with this proposal – not in flood plain – are in Primary Aquifer zone – tied to bench mark on Charlesdale – lighting – 3 lights – 2 double headed – one single lite – all on 20 foot poles – watershed does not leave the site – house sit 30 feet below the top of the ridge – grading and drainage plan shows the erosion control proposals.

Matt Borrelli

J chan – Goddard School – (unable to hear or understand brief presentation

Matt Borrelli –

John – lot coverage 19.6%

Matt B – abutters in the back – have graded off – top of the building is at the top of the mound

John – floor of building 150 – top 178 – top of the hill 182 – physically impossible for neighbors to see top of the building.

Matt – traffic engineer will be present to address

Elissa – Earth Tech report – see sheet

John/Elissa - #2 – added another line to show the different

#3 added to the plan – 142.1 feet

#4 separate entrance and exit – John – two way traffic – have questioned what that means – can accommodate – did exchange messages with the Police Chief who would like to have 27 exit either way but West Street right turn only

Steve – concern for left turn off 27 into the site

John – prefer to have traffic engineer answer – just recently the PC left a message

Steve – require separate entrance and exit – provide 2 both ways – rte 27 high speed road – concern for people crossing traffic is less than optimal – can leave for traffic engineer

Wright – had discussion on the preliminary

Matt – ZBA in the appeal on North Street – Castle Hill has one driveway with an island in the middle so would be willing to add

Elissa – table that issue until the traffic experts get te Sign

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 11, 2008

John – added sign but probably will not be 76 West Street – sign

Elissa – drainage calcul #7

John – did redo the drainage calculus – doesn't change the calculations

Elissa - #8 –

John – added notes that the driveway will be abandoned and covered with loam and seed – existing driveway is gravel – some concrete slab near garage will be removed and covered over

Elissa - #9 – gallies – will you address with Mr. Domey

John – Mr Domey has seen his plans before – have added notes and a cross section of the gallies that show how they assemble together – 4x4x4

Elissa - #10 – maintenance of the galle system

John – added another set of inspection manholes – on the first set of gallies put filter fiber and line first galle and sediment cleared out – have added and OM – can remove the filter and replace with new

Elissa - #11 – manhole riser vs covers

John – impossible to have manholes over each galley – provide a large volume of pipes – this system has three places to access the gallies – 25-50 years before they need to be cleaned out

Elissa - #12

John – have added the filter fabric as suggested

Elissa – DEP Stormwater Management Standards read

John – standard 3 is minor as compared to what is provided here – infiltrating 4 inches for every square foot – More like 5 inches to satisfy Mr. Domey

Elissa – continued - #7 needs to be revised and shown -#9 have received – will hold the balance of traffic study until engineer.

Steve – comparing lots – comparing for the entire lot – no further build-out on the lot

John – unless there is some place that it does not apply

Wright – is the play surface area impervious

John – will go back and check but believe that it is impervious – will make a list

Steve – could not increase the play area – would like it nailed down at this time

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 11, 2008

Matt – if there are alternative such as pavers that would be come pervious

Wright – calculations again on employees – see 3 offices – 8 main classrooms – how many per classroom

...Goddard –two people per classroom

Wright – 2 people per classroom

....16

Matt – project building codes are on the Goddard plan show – below the national code

Steve – would make that part of the plan here

One person per office – no janitorial staff

Wright – no calculation in the crib area – what is being provided in that room

... will check this out

Wright – existing topography very steep – going to a 2:1 is extremely steep – talked about fence around the perimeter of play area

John – 3 feet outside the fence is flat for maintenance – no fencing at the top of the hill – only one spot will be altered – rest is all wooded

Wright – creating a vally going straight down – water runoff funneling down

John – better for water – will be grassed which hold the water back

Wright – plans to stablize the slope

Johnm – did not call for any – probably cover with straw – stabilizing the slope is getting seeded at the right time – loam and seed

Wright -?planting scheduled to go back

John – no – at top of hill in the buffer zone will be replanted with 12 6gft high white pines in two rows

Wright – would want that point flagged for a site walk plus the rear lot lines so can walk around

Steve – reconfigure the play area so not so great a problem

Joh – Goddard was specific about what they want

Steve – have to deal with specifics area – move area off to the right

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 11, 2008

John – will explore

Wright – safety – esthetics – would strongly suggest eliminating that cut

John – it is not steeper than the slope on- no less safe than what is on the other side

Steve – flag where the edges of the play area would be

Wright – no further subdivision of the lot anticipated

John – the entire lot is what is in front – there are two existing curb cuts for the property – West and 27 – did line up the curb cut with the ones that exist.

Wright – have you indicated what trees would remain

John – contractor would ask them to stake out

Wright – indicate where the tree line will be for the walk through

John – would flag the limit of work on both sides – plus property line – limit of the play area – different color flagst so can see

Matt – buldi elevation on plans

Wright – elevations 178 top – what are the grades on West street –

John – can only tell by going on the property –

Wright – give a grade flag on that stake for that property

John – drops significantly – can give some – will get an elevation

Wright – would like to see

Matt – there is a potential for two lots in addition – do not want to restrict

Steve – need 20% coverage on this lot and are at

Matt – would have to show that the requirement on this lot - do not want to say

George – cannot create a nonconforming lot

Matt – do not want this plan to say no future development

Steve – not sure have accepted that

Elissa – hear from traffic – primary aquifer – appears will need a special permit from zbz

John – yes

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 11, 2008

George – issue of grading – square peg in a round hole – dig out canyon – doesn't make sense can't round off corner – cutting it close – no factor of safety – other question is the buffer requirement and concern for the excavation if – shave from the corner and push back

John – would explore with Goddard and see

Keith – clarifying - ? of food preparation

Matt – none on site – kids bring their own – no overnight – 6-6 hours of operation

Keith – list of variances

Matt – not asking for any

Keith – lighting should be shining on site – noise standpoint – emergency generators

Matt – no – will provide a noise study from Goddard (submitted) for elementary school, but less for daycare – lot less than figure – 6mo to 6 yrs.

Jack – traffic - reviewed the report – people dropping off on their way to work etc. – would drop from level b to c – crash rate is above the state wide average – no fatalities but some personal injury – sight distance is sufficient –

Steve – calculations that exit only – Bank of America – less than 30 mph – “no left turn” allowed there – very difficult to allow left turn out or in because of the speed of traffic

John – not sure of PC – need to get clarification of the PC

Wright – commuter traffic on West St. – fairly aggressive - ?taking a left across

Teng – ques – concern for West St back up

Wright – if dis allowed left turn in in the morning

Teng – only people headed north on 27 that will need to turn left on West into – less than one car per cycle

Wright – if allowing people to come in from either side – commotion for people onsite and parking area

Engi – in the long run school will require people to go one way onsite

John – good idea – driveway from intersection on West st – 280 feet from middle of intersection from edge of road is 240 feet

Steve – green light is a little longer on west

Keith – would like to hear what the chief has to say –

PLANNING BOARD  
FEBRUARY 11, 2008

Elissa – not porposing any right now

Keith – will need some

John – did propose on restriction of no left turn onto 27

Eng – no a problem

Elissa – comment that traffic volumes are higher in July

Eng – statewide number – January less

Steve – not turn on our streets – previous reports were redone and proved our point

Eng – impact would be relative

John – will see if we can meet with the police chief

Wright – have chief come to meeting

Keith – fire department

Matt –read FC memo

George – will go out on his own

March 1<sup>st</sup> at 8 a.m. for site visit – no additional information during that walk – off of West Street

Continue hearing to March 10<sup>th</sup> at 8:15 pm.

Concluded at 10:20 pm

PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 10, 2008

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

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

**Zoning Hearing on proposed changes for the Annual Town Meeting**

Chairman Franco read the legal notice as it appeared in the Medfield Press on February 21 and 28, 2008. She then took each article individually.

Article 33: Site Plan Approval to include review for substantial changes of nonresidential uses. There were no questions.

Article 34: Floor Area, Net to change the wording to clarify that basements are to be counted in determining the FAR.

Bob Morrill, Warrant Committee member, questioned why the change included all basements and not just finished ones. He also referenced a recent ZBA decision regarding basements.

The Board replied:

- Basement space can be finished and thus should be counted
- Existing houses are grandfathered
- More a problem with multifamily lots where there is a greater attempt to maximize size
- Single-family homes would have to be very large before they reached maximum

Article 35: Allowing businesses in the Industrial Extensive zoning district. There were no questions.

Article 36: Reaffirming the zoning on Park Street. There were no questions.

There were no further questions on any of the articles.

VOTED unanimously to support the zoning changes in Articles 33 through and including Article 36.

VOTED unanimously to close the public hearing.

**Goddard School – 76 West Street continued public hearing**

The public hearing was reconvened at approximately 8:20 p.m. by Chairman Franco, who noted that four members of the Board had made a site visit on Saturday morning, March 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Lester went at a separate time.

John Glossa, Glossa Engineering, introduced various persons involved with the application.

Mr. Glossa offered explanations updating the Board:

PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 10, 2008

- explained that after further review that areas in blue on the plan reviewed at the last meeting are actually pervious areas specially designed for play.
- reviewed the revised plan explaining that they are pushing material into the depression.
- Noted that the closest point to the property of any abutter's property line is 25 feet, which includes lawn area.
- Flag designations: blue flags indicated the play area. Yellow flags designated the corners of the building.
- The neighbor's house on West Street is at elevation 154.
- indicated areas in which they would be able to save pine trees.
- Reviewed lighting: includes 3 cutoff lights that will shine down onto the pavement and not onto adjacent property.
- Reviewed two plans regarding traffic patterns onsite stating that neither Goddard or the Borrelli's had a preference for one plan over the other. Both plans have one way traffic around the center island.
  - On the first plan route 27 would have unrestricted access from either direction entering and exiting. There is plenty of site distance in both directions. Access off route 27 to West to turn left into the site was a little more difficult, thus they would control West Street with right turn in and right turn out only.
  - Under the second scenario based on a state highway layout with a right turn only onto route 27, with a standard island that would not allow a left turn, the West Street side would have unrestricted access in either direction in or out.
- Noted that the Fire Chief wanted a hydrant which they will do.
- Still working with Mr. Domey (BOH) who asked for mounding analysis, which they are in the process of doing now.

Traffic was reviewed:

- Board members acknowledged there is a greater sight distance on route 27 than previously thought
- Traffic patterns in and out of the site were reviewed by the traffic engineer Jack Gillon
- Mr. Gillon will review the percent of difference between summer and fall in traffic shown on the Main Street car wash and apply that percent to this site.

Police Chief Meaney spoke:

- Questioned the concept that volumes of traffic are highest in July and August when many people are away for the summer
- Observed that if there is a "No Left Turn" sign out of the site onto route 27 people will make the turn anyway to head north on 27
- Vehicles traveling from the center can easily turn left into the site while there is still room for cars to pass on the right. Add a left turning lane.
- The entrance/exit on the route 27 side is wide enough (50 foot radius) to allow for modification, if necessary, in the future
- The most concentrated traffic is eastbound in the morning. Thus, less crossing traffic on West Street would be best. Restrictive turning would be best.
- Evening commute is spread out more time wise
- Traffic lights at route 27 and West Street:



PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 10, 2008

- Mr. Dickinson suggested that rounding the two back corners would pull the contours down and improve the situation
- Attorney Borrelli said they have looked at it for several months and are happy with the way it lays out as presented
- Board is concerned with the steepness of the cut
- Mr. Glossa's reply
  - not any steeper than existing slopes
  - not a drainage issue once stabilized
  - every cubic yard must come from some other space
  - alternative to bring in fill which would be messy
  - no reason for anyone being on the slope – can post “no trespassing”
  - 14 foot cuts with 14 foot fills

Abutters' comments:

- Steve Rines, 9 Brastow Drive expressed concern for grading of the upper left corner of the property
  - Taking the number of large trees down will disturb the remaining trees
  - If designed like the one in Walpole (with one corner of the play area cut back) would they have to do as much excavation?
    - Mr. Glossa: If not there then somewhere else; trying to maintain the fill and at the same time stick with Goddard's plan
  - Board members expressed concern for trees at the top
  - Mr. Rines concern that important to keep as many trees as possible
  - Concern for the buffer of trees because lower areas of white pines are bare
    - Mr. Glossa: have other options to protect from the ground area
  - Asked that they look at the “little bump to the left” and consider a shift
- Steve Wietrecki, 7 Brastow Drive, considered that plans to be “a little deceiving.” The old growth trees are 50 – 60 feet tall
  - Mr. Glossa said the best gravel is in the escar. He does not want to go below elevation 150. The elevation of the building is based on the drainage system – must be a minimum of 2 feet above the ground water table.
  - Mr. Wietrecki questioned taking fill from the house area
  - Mr. Glossa replied they have to take out the volume of the house. His personal opinion is that keeping 25 feet from the property line works best overall.

Mr. Dickinson asked they bring a plan back to show how they are going to treat the treed areas – something with some variation.

Mr. Lester stated his reaction is negative to the cut – though he understood – and asked them to see if there is another area to get the fill that would preserve more of the bigger trees at the top.

At 10:05 p.m. the hearing was continued to Monday, April 14, 2008 at 8:15 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 10, 2008

**Medfield State Hospital**

The Board discussed briefly its upcoming meeting March 24<sup>th</sup> with DCAM and checking with Mark Bobrowski to see if he is available to continue assisting the Town with zoning for the site. It has been 1.5 years since last visiting the issue, thus, the Board will listen to what DCAM has to present and then consider how to best accomplish what is needed.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:20 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 24, 2008

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

Chairman Franco convened the meeting at approximately 7:38 p.m.

**MSH – DCAM**

Mary Beth Clancy, DCAM -

- Proposals dated 24 March 2008 and plan
- Legislation to be approved in April with an emergency preamble so that it can go into effect immediately
- MOA has not been signed
- Suppose to be 60 days – but set 120 days - can strike that agreement to do what we need to do
- MOA does not hold the same weight as the statute – will sign anyway if necessary – whatever makes more secure
- Funding of the 40R – covers the programs already in the que – additional money not available – a supplementary budget was passed
- Questioned bases for interest in 40R

Chairman Franco explained that some board members thought that the Town might get a better development. With 40B the developer can only price units at a certain level. With 40R there is not that limitation, thus there is more incentive for developers to do a better project.

Mr. Leff noted that the restriction is on the profitability. The percentage is overall.

Mr. Browne added that the 40R would allow a developer more money. That is one of the issues.

Ms. Clancy explained that under the land distribution agreement DCAM is required to put on safeguards, which it will do through the RFP. The statute put the Board of Selectmen on the review committee (they can weigh in on what the plan would look like). The local historic district still has a say on the plan.

Mr. Browne observed that, in his opinion, generally 40B is not properly controlled.

Ms. Clancy responded that this would be a not a friendly 40b project. In addition the Town would have the zoning in place with special permit in the process. She added that all the developers DCAM has worked with in the past have completed the projects.

Mr. Browne stated that the driver from PB issue is to deal with potential development in town – i.e. school costs. 40S could be an insurance policy for the town.

Mr. Leff responded that after looking at the 40R option, it appeared that town did not want to go forward with it. What goes there will be an overlay district and the housing would qualify. He continued stating he took the previous draft and adjusted it. (See “Proposed Zoning for the Medfield State Hospital Property” dated 24 March 2008 – both the overview and the complete

## PLANNING BOARD

MARCH 24, 2008

text – and “Medfield State Hospital Reuse Plan” dated December 2005) (See also, Judith Nitsch plans 2004/2005)

“Green” reuse plan – 340 unit plan is now 440 - added 2 buildings at Town’s request to satisfy its 40B requirements

- proposed – 4 sub-districts –
  - a – retained as agricultural
  - b – entry district – not development
  - c – village district – near front – single family homes
  - d - campus core district –
- change BI district
- uses as in the RU district – ( see draft)
- limited # of single-family dwellings (up to 35 – showing 32 on plan) because usually children age school
- small retail in the core

Ms. Clancy explained distribution of surrounding land area

- 150 foot area to the right of the core campus to be owned by DCR - workout an agreement with the town -
- Across street where the firing range is located will go to the Office of Public Safety
- DMH keeps the cemetery but developer does maintenance of the grounds – cannot convey cemetery to a private developer
- 37 acres would go to the developer, who would have to convey it to the town (in legislation) – higher monetary value given to the town over sum received by Dover and Sherborn

Mr. Leff –densities – (on handout) – have allowed assisted living etc. as an aggregate – still have about 50% senior housing.

Ms. Clancy observed they wanted to allow flexibility depending on the market.

Mr. Leff reviewed the parking requirements. He said he was of the understanding that the Selectmen did not want to do a 40R development.

Mr. Dickinson noted that table 6.3 – should be 2.5 stories in D if the height is 35 feet to be consistent with sub-district C. He questioned the height of the tallest building.

Mr. Leff replied that he would have it for next meeting.

Mr. Browne questioned the status of easements associated with the water tower and expressed concern that there would be unimpeded access to the water tower.

Ms. Clancy responded that it would be created as a lot. The plan would include language in the disposition documents and would be worked out with the developer. DCAM does require reserving that right of access. It is a matter of course in the disposition. The land cannot be conveyed until the developer is selected and has permits. That is the only way they are

PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 24, 2008

authorized to handle it. There is no flexibility. The developer would take care of the cemetery but not own it. DMH maintains it now.

Chairman Franco asked who would be responsible after the developer is gone.

Mr. Dickinson asked if the language could be changed so the town would maintain the cemetery.

Ms. Clancy replied that it could be accomplished. DCR had said they would take care of the restriction on the part of the area not being developed.

Mr. Dickinson questioned if there were other concerns that the statute does not allow for that have to be negotiated.

Mr. Browne said it is a benefit to the town to get mitigations.

Ms. Clancy stated that cannot be done prior.

Chairman Franco discussed the fact that the Board needs to be able to sell the project to the voters.

Ms. Clancy considered that the Board was asking to change what was codified with the Board of Selectmen.

Chairman Franco responded that the Board is asking for assurances regarding certain matters.

Ms. Clancy replied that she would look through the statute and see.

Mr. Browne explained that the Board needed some assurance in order to get the required 2/3 vote for zoning at a Town meeting.

Mr. Lester asked how the issue that held up the legislation before has changed.

Ms. Clancy explained that the legislation - was late in the session so it went to the rules committee and was held because he did not consider enough dmh housing - refilled in the new session so it did nto have to go therou rules committee - understanding with delegation that it is in senate ways and means to see that they are comfortable - passed the house without change - same plan

Mr. Dickinson - worry about DMH problems -

Mr. Leff - part of the legislation

Chairman Franco - when met with selectmen was some talk aobut relaxation of what is historic

MS. CLANCY - boiler plate language in terms of - kitchen area, Clarke building and east hall permission granted to be demolished - otherwise developer must prove in reasonable

PLANNING BOARD

MARCH 24, 2008

Mr. Dickinson – Mass Historic and Medfile MOAs need to be executed

MS. CLANCY – just need to be done – took pieces of the

Mr. Dickinson – could we have a copy of that agreement

Kristine – yes

MS. CLANCY – comments were not shared with DCAM when everything put on hold

Mr. Lester – concept of an actual survey so more defined

MS. CLANCY – developer does an in the ground survey when buys the area

Mr. Leff – have not put in the exact location of the subdistricts – areas shown on the plan – can draw up a plan

Mr. Lester – what is time line for DCR to take over

MS. CLANCY – when the developer is fully permitted

Mr. Lester – how long after town meeting

MS. CLANCY – tm – special RFP, BOS get to look at and review – advertised for 3 months minimum – selection process could take 3 to 6 months – DMH has a say on the client housing – MEPA process is usually 18 months - agricultural issues on

Mr. Lester – Medfield State Forest – is it going under their control –

MS. CLANCY – doesn't happen until the statute passed

Mr. Lester – then becomes public land

MS. CLANCY – it is restricted

Georgre – bike trails there

Mr. Leff – that does not change

Mr. Lester – any distinction between the land after than with DCR

MS. CLANCY/Mr. Leff – will check

Mr. Lester – need to sell that trails will expand – horse trails etc.

Mr. Dickinson – studies done back then on the 300 – will there be studies with the 440

PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 24, 2008

Mr. Leff – not very different – only 2 buildings – changed assisted living & skilled nursing to ... allow for more squ footage – didn't change the drainage significantly – will send calculations plan – 2005 reuse plan – will send another plan to Norma

MS. CLANCY – relooking at the traffic study – nuMs. Clancyer of concerns

Mr. Leff – look at the different mix

MS. CLANCY – school committee had their consultants review – seemed satisfied

Mr. Dickinson – 11/05 plan had water calculation

MS. CLANCY – 11/05 plan has the 440 units

MS. CLANCY – trying to get new commissioner of DEP to come out here to discuss water – either at a public meeting or come to the planning board meeting

Mr. Diggins – talked 40b and hitting the milestone – where will the control be of those dates – concern does not get done on time and gets pushed out

Mr. Leff – when 40b comes to the town – need to get it voted upon to get approved as a LIP plan

Mr. Browne – concern could not build all the houses and go away

Mr. Leff: 58,073 gallons with the 340 – and 63,742 with the 440 units

MS. CLANCY – have town counsel come up with language and will have someone from DHCD look at so it will meet their requirements

Mr. Dickinson – pg. 7 of conditions for approval – what does it mean – “substantial use” – clarify

Mr. Leff – need clarification

Mr. Dickinson – pg 8 revisions to an approved site plan – 5a – could be petitioning for a change from day one – approving nothing because approving

MS. CLANCY – how do you work with a local historic district when needs approval – they have final site plan approval

Chairman Franco – Board of Appeals is usually the sp granting authority

Mr. Leff – many cases – mimicking the existing language

PLANNING BOARD

MARCH 24, 2008

Mr. Dickinson/Mr. Browne – invites change – could be looking at

Mr. Browne – we should come back with certain language

Chairman Franco – coMs. Clancyine site plan approval and special permit

Mr. Dickinson – site parking - ?reasonable amount of parking to satisfy zoning

Mr. Browne – estimate of acreage in B C and D

Mr. Leff – all of it is 86.2 acres in ???? - will get back to the board

Mr. Dickinson - comment about the density bonus on pg 3 and table – don't like bonuses for 55 and older

Mr. Leff – these would have age restriction as a safe guard – rational to include senior housing – trying to mimic the plan – want to insure no greater density than planning on – do calculations

Mr. Dickinson –open question – proposal on the talbe – how segregated a community when all done?

MS. CLANCY – DMH units must be rental throughout

Mr. Leff – natural tha thave different kinds of housing – different neighborhoods because of the nature of the buildings there – condos along left side – rentals in the center exiting buildings – pretty nice – village cluster very much like Medfield – will have the historic character of the old hospital – sense of community – new units to the left around a boulevardard views out into the agricultre land

Ms. Clancy – send language that looking for

April 7<sup>th</sup> with the hope of having as much as possible

Mr. Dickinson –

need survey plan with the parcels correct – want to look at the phasing – height of the buildings (exiting) – adjustments for water – traffic study – recommendations for intersection to the south – wording – PB review the MOU and read the legislation

MS. CLANCY – many of the protections are in the statute are there – historic district commission and site approval – if they sign the MOU then it replaces the review – other issue is “what can be seen from the road”

Mr. Browne – planning board is not allowed to delegate its authority

MS. CLANCY – they might not delegate theirs – it's a legal question.



PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 24, 2008

Concluded at 9:20 p.m

Erik Road – signed

9:45 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 31, 2008

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

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

The Board met with Attorney Mark Bobrowski, consultant on the Medfield State Hospital property.

Mr. Bobrowski said that, since last meeting with the Board in 2006, he designed the North Hampton State Hospital reuse plan. He spoke with Don Schmidt at DHCD who thought there would be 55% chance that a 40R plan for Medfield would be approved. He added that he did 11 such plans recently.

Board members expressed concerns for available funding based on previous information. They also noted that the Board of Selectmen has, by a vote of 2:1, decided against going with a 40R plan.

Mr. Bobrowski said he would talk with Mr. Schmidt regarding the funding.

Mr. Browne noted what he perceived to be 3 areas of concern: the MOA, General Land Area, Friendly 40B option.

Mr. Dickinson added that an MOA between DCAM and Mass Historic Commission as well as any MOA with the town historic commission could affect how the property is used.

Mr. Bobrowski questioned a development agreement and asked if the Board knew the purchase price.

Mr. Browne replied \$3 million plus \$17-18 million to remediate the site.

Mr. Bobrowski questioned: a developer to build 440 units; who would that be. He then stated that 440 units are extreme.

Mr. Dickinson said the building needed to be done in phasing.

Regarding the general land area, Mr. Bobrowski said the 1.5% "doesn't happen." He cited that only 40+ towns have been able to satisfy the requirement and observed that he did not believe that this town could do so. He then discussed the value of putting the housing construction in a covenant so that it could not be reversed. The Housing Appeals Committee has the right to reverse decisions.

Board members expressed concern for obtaining approval at Town Meeting for zoning under the proposed plan. If the Town did not approval, what would the State be within its rights to do?

Mr. Bobrowski said the Town should be getting some amenities and went on to explain that the most development that could take place under 40B would be 200 units. However, that would be

PLANNING BOARD  
MARCH 31, 2008

over the course of one year. The project might have been realistic in 2005, but it is not realistic now.

Chairman Franco explained that the Town would be getting the water tower, open space, the hill across the street, and the cemetery. Surrounding land would go to other State agencies. The Town would not get any of the land until everything had been permitted – a process that would take several years.

Mr. Dickinson brought up the issue of water usage regulation by the State on the Town.

Mr. Bobrowski suggested the Town negotiate with the prospective developer.

Following discussion of the question of the option of the Town buying the property, Mr. Dickinson suggested that the Town could approach DCAM with a package deal that would include the following:

- Town would own the land
- Town would take over the cemetery
- Town would build all the DMH units (not just a portion of them)
- Town would develop 40B units as needed over a period of time
- DCR would keep the land proposed for them
- The firing range would go to Public Safety
- Remediation of the buildings would take place over X # of years

A discussion followed about how to bring the issue to the Selectmen for consideration. Chairman Franco will discuss with Town Counsel.

Meeting adjourned at 10 p.m.

## PLANNING BOARD

APRIL 14, 2008

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

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

Review of Baker Road letter to Board of Health, the McNulty's explanation of why their situation is unique and they should not be required to have the fence that the BOH asked for.

GODDARD SCHOOL public hearing continued at approximately 8:15 p.m.

John Glossa submitted 3 copies of the revised plan and explained the plan.

- West St.
  - opened the site road wider with an island
  - right turn in and right turn out only
  - Pavement markings showing direction
- Route 27
  - raised island to direct traffic
  - moved 100 feet up the road
  - pavement markings to show direction of traffic
- Existing driveway will be abandoned
- New exit and entrance – designed so can be switched if scenario does not work
- Grading and drainage plan revisions – ground water mounding test required one more row of leeching galleys to satisfy BOH
- Added a dry well at rear corner of the play area (sand and gravel- high permeability)
- 2<sup>nd</sup> sheet of grading and drainage – more of a cut and invert – culvert shown
- Landscaping plan – new island in front of the building replacing pavement (to offset additional pavement for new entrance)
- Area with no changes in grade that would not effect trees (“mature healthy trees shall remain”)
- Slope stabilization – trees/brush
- Area that is where the lawn is (sparse vegetation)
  - providing plants at field to locate
  - 20 plantings to enhance the visual barrier
- Last detail sheet now shows the typical dry well

John Gillon, traffic engineer, reviewed his previous report for possible changes:

- Compared the traffic counts
- undated report submitted
- Not all streets have the same seasonal fluctuation
- West and 27 heavy commuter roads
- Findings are valid – results are valid even though the question was also valid

Superintendent of Public Works Ken Feeney questioned what the north bound stacking would be.

PLANNING BOARD

APRIL 14, 2008

Mr. Gillon replied 7 cars.

Mr. Feeney stated that the applicant changed the driveway on route 27 as he requested. He was concerned that cars heading toward Sherborn might back up in front of the driveway as previously designed while waiting for the traffic light.

Mr. Gillon supported the change stating that the further away from the signal the better. The sight distance does not change.

Mr. Feeney observed that cars come down the street at 45 mph. If they catch a green light, then he is concerned for their stopping distance. This is a better location. He is satisfied with the change.

Mr. Lester verified that the applicant said would help pay for the improvement to the signals

John Glossa – yes, agreed with what the Chief has asked for – moved the entrance per Feeney – narrowed down

EF – run by FC –

Jglossa – did not change islands but will show to FC – no parking on the outside of the island – just a roadway

EF – prevent people from pulling over there

Jglossa – can put no parking signs – does not reduce the fill

SB –

J Glossa – have to fill in the swale – no substantial change – keep same cut on the other side

GL – aerial picture of Walpole of cut corner

EF - ? fill where old driveway was?

JGls – no treatment – will remove the asphalt – swapped – still under 20%

SB – disagreement about the exit/entrance off 27 – Chief said people will turn out of 27 – hard

Ken – agree with the chief and see how that works out – plenty of sight distance – big difference – will work out – similar to the transfer station

SB – peak volumes at transfer station

Ken – between 9 and 3

PLANNING BOARD

APRIL 14, 2008

J Glossa – did submit all of the requirements and was verbally ok

EF – will meet on 30<sup>th</sup> – question – private school ? school zone – slow down on West St.

Gillon – on state road – private school – children not walking – only allowed to do 20 in school zone – can't do on 27 and not enforceable – if later with kids crossing then change

EF – signage on 27 for the school

Matt – front side of the building visible from 27

J Glossa – blue informational signs can be placed “Goddard School Ahead”

Matt – when enter driveway will be address and on school

Glossa – in island

Gillon – will see as develop and open

EF – maintenance people etc who will need to go there

No further questions

Steve – 9 Brastow Drive – blue line same as pink stakes?

Glossa – yes behind your property – nothing has changed behind

Steve – concern for the natural buffer and retain as much as possible – one would be to design the play area similar to Walpole site which would move more – other would be to tilt building so parallel to West str which would bring point of contention – concern both the buffer and the slope – more grade into will lose additional trees due to root damage – grading will compromise some of the stability – know applicant not looking to cut down many trees – gravel where existing house is could be used for fill

EF – the additional 20 trees of planting area of concern??

Glossa – reviewed planting as before – enhance the existing visual barrier – outside of the blue line – on top of the esker – answer: clearly if the area gets smaller so does the slope – demonstrated how turning building gets closer to the property

9 Brastow –

Glossa – will regenerate

Matt – to change the rotation would have to change parking etc. – facing 27 is within the Goddard plan – fits in – gave buffer in the back – any type of change when the cuts and fills are

PLANNING BOARD  
APRIL 14, 2008

7 brastow – natural line already cut – will be a triangle of lawn that will - not changing anything with the parking lot – changing the existing tree line would change – putting the wedge of lawn in front of the building and not on the side

Geo – locate the large trees on the plan

EF – issue of stabilization – criss cross plantings

Glossa – will be low to the ground and stabilize and not a visual barrier

EF – will there be enough room to get those 20 plantings in - ? compromised because of the topography

Glossa – on top of the esker filling in area where not coverage – enhance the visual buffer with additional plantings – need to decide in the field

7 brastow – everything to the right is natural – what happens if do all the grading and the natural piece collapsed in and the roots and trees die - what happens?

Glossa – don't anticipate anything is going to happen –

7 bras – basically sand soil – could have an issue with taking down some trees

EF – plantings would be done after the grading - - not any deeper than what is there now – continues along line on the esker

Geo – excavated further

Glossa – blue line well beyond where strip – also have a level area behind the fence so could start a little below – yellow caution tape – do not anticipate any encroachment – somewhat short of the blue line

Matt – elevations – from their property will not see the building

Ef – seeing the building is not issue

WD – blue line – toward West St – distance to the property line

Glossa – 45 feet

WD – pulled top back to 30 feet – if make triangular play area could make 45 along the top

Matt – cut and fill and going back to Goddard to get permission

Glossa – can squeeze a little 8 feet

PLANNING BOARD  
APRIL 14, 2008

WD – from safety stand point would prefer the 8 feet – improvement -? Tweek just a little more to satisfy the abutters – not need

Paul – what increasing the buffer for

WD – just make all even – could lop off the fence in the bottom

Geo - economic sense not to have – marginal cost to get the flat in that corner

Glossa – even on soil on the site – balanced

Geo – if not standard design

Matt – kids have so much sq ft.

Geo – is it economical to round off this corner

WD – general dislike for this corner – good effort – is there room – trying to move things along

EF – but the corner

Glossa – will come back with 45

EF – last issue hung up on – resolve the issue for a more palatable project

No further

Continued to May 5<sup>th</sup> at 8:15 p.m.



PLANNING BOARD  
JULY 21, 2008

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

Absent: George N. Lester

North Meadows Estates Surety

Voted to reduce surety to \$55,000.

Mark Cerel on Zoning Changes

Adult entertainment district - not adequate, no one can actually go in there - find a realistic location - so many feet away from residential, school, church, etc. - could expand current location - look at parcels

Use Table - policy consideration - get Bobrowski's work and pass to the Board and Mark

Wright asked Mark to review and make suggestions and then have a follow up meeting.

Sign Bylaw - political signs - should be defined and have an exemption in the Bylaw - recommendation add a definition of political signs and exempt

Chpt 40a, sect. 6 - person still required to go to the ZBA because of nonconformity - not to include a tear down - addition to an existing structure - decide on how much you want to allow without going to the ZBA

General Bylaw - Scenic Road - need to look at tightening up - only regulate in the ROW

Master Plan Update - some aspects have been worked on - under DHCD Chpt 40b and Mass Housing guidelines - reasonable area for affordable - precondition of getting certain grants

Inclusionary Zoning - a portion of new development must be affordable - benefits to the town

Voted to endorse ANR

8/04/08

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

Absent: Elissa G. Franco,

Chairman Lester convened the meeting at approximately 8 p.m.

Richard DeSorgher brought list of proposed street names with an explanation of how these names were chosen. He asked the Board to review the list and check off any names that might never be used. Have the Police Chief and Fire Chief also review the list. He suggested that the Board advise developers to contact them for assistance for names.

Discussion of having student interns to help and learn how town government works. The Board was open to such an arrangement.

Sook and Young Jin regarding 32 R Spring Street

Sook explained that they came to find out information about what they need to do to operate a dry cleaning establishment at 32 R Spring Street . They are looking to purchase the property. Currently there is a machine shop at that location. They have a store in Walpole. They would like to buy the property and work out of there. They are not expecting walk in customers, but could do walk in customers. Retail is at another location. They could open it up to other cleaners. Today's dry cleaning is not like it used to be.

The Board suggested that they come back with a presentation of just what is going to happen. Include information regarding number of employees, size of building and parking. Provide the same information for the existing operation and the proposed. There is a question of whether they may need a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Norma will check with Town Counsel, Mark Cerel.

Chairman Lester explained the process of possible site plan review and/or a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Dickinson expressed the need for an existing profile and then one for the new business.

Mr. Diggans suggested they might want to get professional representation.

Mr. Browne explained that there is a question of whether they need to go through Zoning Board of Appeals approval and site plan review. They may just need to come with a mini site plan.

Soot said the do not need to change the building etc.

Mr. Diggans point out that the Board is open to supporting business in Medfield.

## NORTH STREET POCKET NEIGHBORHOOD

8:30 p.m. Chairman Lester read the legal notice as it appeared in the Medfield Press on July 17 and 24, 2008. He then invited the applicant to make a presentation.

Richard Merrikin, Merrikin Engineering, engineer on the project for 90-96 North Street, reviewed the location:

- a 1.6 acre parcel (two existing lots combined)
- presently 5 units on the property - Assessors classify one dwelling as a three family and the second as a two family
- 5 curb cuts -
- sheds in the back -
- Existing buildings are 100 years old

He then explained the project:

- utilize the existing buildings - upgrade
- add 4 more buildings to have a total of 10 units
- propose horseshoe shaped drive 18 ft. wide
- three curb cuts
- buildings conform to the current Zoning Bylaw
- landscape feature down the middle with planting
- rear of project green with grass and new trees
- fence around the entire property - anticipate it will remain fenced
- 10 units with 20 parking spaces
- New buildings have 2 car garages - existing buildings do not have garages but parking area -
- have up to 32 parking spaces on the property - Earth Tech review engineer stated some spaces are not 20 feet but he considered there is sufficient space
- property slopes toward the back with the high point on the street
- drainage facilities in the rear - underground storm water drainage system - 3 connected together in the rear
- catch basins in the low areas
- curbing on the low side of the driveway to direct drainage
- increase of traffic for 5 units (5 existing)
- within walking distance to the town thus fewer trips than anticipate.
- North Street is under design for upgrading
- already have sidewalks but no curbs.

Mr. Merrikin observed that the owners live there and are trying to create a project that fits in the neighborhood.

Colin P. Smith, architect for the project, noted the proximity to Medfield center. He said they are providing a village setting. They have placed the two single units along North St. with one duplex and 3 duplex units in the rear to keep the scale of the street thus masking some of the units in back with smaller structures in the front. They have placed a pedestrian way through the center. It is the entrance into the development which

includes a gazebo and public area. The units are 3-4 bedroom and average about 2200 square feet. The total Floor Area Ratio is about 90% of what is allowed by right. The character is a mix of Colonial and Victorian units.

The Board raised the question of whether they included the basements in the FAR of 2200 square feet. No they did not. They were reminded that they needed to do so per the most recent zoning changes of town meeting.

Tim Lee, landscape design architect, explained that their approach is to work with the existing site conditions, Landscape is what is around the perimeter. There are some significant trees. They are trying to save trees or increase the tree canopy. They will do some internal landscape around individual units. They want to establish some of the streetscape along North St. The idea is to have public and community components to the project. There are two ideas of space. One is more active including the gazebo area. The second is more passive with green area. The area is expected to be used by people of the community and surrounding neighborhood. They will be maintaining screening. Individual units have patios off the back or plantings. Each entry way will be modified. They will create paving strips to differentiate the way. There will be some street lighting for safety.

Chairman Lester observed that the Board is still waiting for a drainage report from the Board Of Health.

Mr. Merrikin explained that the design for the system is different as of January 1<sup>st</sup> under State guidelines. He used the new book. The comment from the Planning Board's engineer was with different methodology. He picked one that was the most economical to use. The other suggestions are underground. One has a lot of information. The other is to use the soils data from DEP. The third is "by the seat of you pants." He used the second method. There is nothing exotic, no overflows, water would not get into catch basin so would follow lawn down. Neighbors would see less water than now.

Mr. Dickinson noted that the abutters in the back would like to maintain privacy and asked if the underground structures would prevent planting trees.

Mr. Merrikin replied that trees could be an issue. He will look at this again. He noted that they can plant shrubbery over the system. He would look into a planting area for trees.

Mr. Dickinson asked that they represent the trees that will remain.

Mr. Merrikin said he will provide that information.

Mr. Browne asked how change in drainage regulations compared with what was done in the past. Is it bigger or less?

Mr. Merrikin answered that there is a bigger footprint but not as deep (shallower).

Mr. Dickinson questioned if they had seen the Earth Tech letter. (Yes)

Mr. Merrikin said he will calculate the FAR with the basements. Regarding the 18 foot driveway, he called the Fire Chief who would like to see 20 feet. They would like to keep the impervious surface down. They have room to do the 20 feet. They prefer to leave more open space. If they go to 20 ft. it would not effect the parking spaces. He said he has not counted those. He knows they have extra parking spaces. The engineer's concern was that people will park and stick out in the driveway. There is a long space on one side and shorter on the other side

Mr. Browne asked if they could use cobblestones on the short side to indicate the shorter space.

Mr. Merrikin replied that they could add to the deed that they cannot block the driveway. He continued that he does not think they have to comply with the Subdivision Rules and Regulations. He will give a report about driveway passage and backing out. Regarding Earth Tech's report concerning service vehicles having to back out into North Street, it is like any other residential drive where houses have a side entrance garage. UPS just parks in the street. Drivers will not usually pull in if they are going to have trouble getting back out. For the side entrance garages he has recommended using a single door instead of two with a column in the center. This allows for greater mobility.

Mr. Dickinson doubted that a traffic study would show a marked increase due to the development - and would certainly say traffic would not decrease the level of service. He questioned if the driveway was one way or two way.

Mr. Merrikin answered that they are proposing two way traffic. This is not a public road, but a driveway to serve the site. He will ask the police department.

Mr. Lester explained that the issue is whether cars can turn in or out on North Street. The bigger concern is creating a new situation on North Street.

Mr. Merrikin noted that the house next door is further back from the roadway with a single driveway. Most service people would not go down such a driveway.

Mr. Dickinson questioned whether the Fire Chief had an issue of getting into and around the units for fighting fire.

Mr. Merrikin said they look at hose lengths. He then pointed out the location of the additional hydrant requested by the Fire Chief.

Mr. Lester questioned what way unit 9 was facing. (Sideways toward the neighbor)

Mr. Smith said the units have a separation between. The Fire Chief said 20 feet between units, thus, no unit is less than 20 feet from another.

Mr. Merrikin addressed the question of infiltration area for the roof. He could talk with the Earth Tech engineer about that. He could engineer around the question of vulnerability. (charging the stone under the footing) They probably will add a rain barrel system. It would be a tank in ground so they could use the water for watering.

Mr. Smith noted that there are still two front structures with drywells that they would use.

Mr. Merrikin said he will talk with the engineer to explain and see if he is more comfortable. The project will be connected to sewer. The units in the middle will be low head pump system. They could incorporate a tank for a period when there is no power. They have filed with Water and Sewer.

Mr. Dickinson questioned number 4 on the Earth Tech report.

Mr. Merrikin said that the Board of Health Agent, Bill Domey, will require an operations and maintenance plan. He added that normally the town is given a little cash if need to go in in an emergency. They will draft a homeowners' agreement.

Mr. Browne asked if they could reduce the lighting pole mentioned in the Earth Tech report.

Mr. Lee explained that the post light fixture is 12-14 feet. The others are bollard (?) lights for along the walkway. They are low.

Mr. Browne asked if they would provide a lighting plan to show the direction of the lighting.

Mr. Merrikin replied that they would provide a lighting plan and added that they are not trying to light the parking.

Mr. Smith said there would be wall sconces identifying the main entrance for units.

Mr. Browne asked that there be some homeowner limitation about flood lighting in the future.

Mr. Dickinson questioned the stone wall in the front.

Mr. Merrikin said there would be a low stone wall.

Mr. Lee added that it would be approximately 24-30 inch high with plantings along the front.

Mr. Dickinson said he would want to see it designed so not impede any traffic.

Mr. Merrikin said the stone wall would be on their own property. There would not be a

sign. This is a neighborhood and not a project.

Mr. Smith added that there would need to be a placard identifying the street numbers.

Will check at Police and Fire about a system for numbering.

Mr. Dickinson questioned if there would be any other sidewalks.

Mr. Merrikin said they did not want to introduce more pavement.

Mr. Lee added that they wanted to reduce asphalt and visually reduce the scale of the roadway.

Mr. Browne asked if, as the Fire Chief asked, they increase the driveway width to 20 feet there would be a surface to drive over.

Mr. Dickinson asked if they would keep the existing fence.

Paolo Dematos, the applicant, said they would put up a newer fence, probably wood in the front and more natural in the back.

Mr. Smith said more plantings would be in the back.

Mr. Dickinson asked that they lay out a planting plan.

Karen Dematos said she doesn't like the fence, but people have gotten used to it.

Mr. Dickinson observed that adding units creates another scene.

Mr. Lester observed that the Board is waiting for Board of Health approval before making a decision. The Board could take questions.

Mr. Browne suggested that they hold off on questions until Mrs. Franco would be there.

Mr. Dickinson added that there is much information to obtain and later discuss that may answer some questions later.

Chairman Lester allowed for a few questions from the audience.

Susan Pope, 4 Crane Place, said she was feeling that discussion was too late and that it is a done deal. This has been a very quiet and uncontested neighborhood and it is being destroyed. She wanted to preserve the character of Medfield. She expressed concern for the impact on downtown Medfield. In future meetings the Board needs to talk about this. The idea of block parties etc. is not acceptable. The abutters have very little in the back of lots.

Mr. Lester noted that the Planning Board a few years ago tried to limit the FAR on lots but the towns' people voted it down.

Bill McAndrews, 3 Crane Place, objected because his living room is just 10 feet from the fence. He had to go to the ZBA to put up a fence. He will be looking at people. He asked about trees on the property lines. He said he felt the same way as Mrs. Pope. He acknowledged progress, but did not approve of the project.

Mr. Merrikin replied that he appreciated the comments and added that the Zoning Bylaw says they can put a house within 20 feet of the property line. (Side lot line.)

George Maley, 84 North Street, said he agreed with the comments. He added that it is an issue with safety. He questioned how an ambulance or other emergency vehicle could fit in the narrow driveway.

Chairman Lester announced that the Board would continue the public hearing to September 22<sup>nd</sup> at 8:15 p.m.

Mr. Merrikin will have the information to the Board at least one week in advance of the meeting.

Chairman Lester raised the question of drainage.

Mr. Merrikin said he would check. He added that Mr. Domey would not care. It is just different systems.

The Board decided it will set up a time for a site visit when Mrs. Franco is able to attend.

Items for September 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting:

- calculate the FAR with the basements
- report about driveway passage and backing out
- ask the police department about two way traffic vs. one way in the driveway
- Report of talk with the Earth Tech engineer about infiltration of roof drainage and dry wells
- a homeowners' draft agreement
- provide a lighting plan
- Provide limitation about flood lighting in the future.
- check at Police and Fire about a system for street numbering
- Provide a planting plan

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:40 p.m.



PLANNING BOARD  
SEPTEMBER 15, 2008

This is a joint meeting of the Planning Board and the Board of Selectmen regarding Medfield State Hospital.

Present: Michael J. Sullivan, Town Administrator; Mark G. Cerel, Town Counsel  
Planning Board members: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, Keith R. Diggans, Elissa G. Franco, and George N. Lester (Chairman)  
Selectmen: Mark Fisher, Osler L. Peterson (Chairman), and Ann B. Thompson

Chairman Lester convened the Planning Board at approximately 7:30 p.m. and Ann Thompson, Clerk of the Board of Selectmen, convened the Selectmen at the same time.

The Planning Board conducted the following business prior to discussion of the State Hospital with the Selectmen:

1. Baker Road trees – developer (Rosenfeld) should either plant the trees per subdivision approval or meet with the Board.
2. Listing of Street Names – board members will submit comments
3. Vinebrook Village Site Plan public hearing to start anew October 6, 2008 due to a glitch in the Assessor's computer system.

The Selectmen did not discuss business during the above Planning Board business.

Mr. Sullivan explained he had asked for this meeting to determine how the boards wished to proceed regarding the Medfield State Hospital property now that the legislation has been passed.

- Indicated chairman Peterson wanted Mark Bobrowski review possible 40R plan
- Selectmen leave zoning to the Planning Board
- MOA to be signed between Mass Historic and DCAM – needs sign off from Medfield Historic District Commission and Medfield Historical Commission
- Selectmen wish to discuss how to proceed
- Possible need for someone to review Mr. Bobrowski's work
- Selectmen's responsibility to hold educational hearing

9/22/08

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

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

### **BAKER ROAD STREET TREES**

Ellen Rosenfeld - ready to plant trees on Baker Road according to SubRules - marked - bond for 53 trees without driveway cuts - 36 trees - ready to plant - last met about the sidewalk owners expressed concern that they do not want trees - knew there would be controversy - requested quick meeting - notified abutters on all three street.

George Lester - letter that do not want trees

Sean Collins, 9 Baker Rd., subdivision in process long time - have landscaping to make street look good - concern for safety issues - mature plantings - pictures showing the landscaping - everyone represented (except the two lots)

Wright - everyone? (yes)

Elissa - tree easement on private property - not as concerned

Stephen - developer not asking to escape

Elissa - landscaping to the two houses

George - streetscape with trees - bothers when a developer puts off doing things - alternative

Elissa - do not have the authority - residents are asking, not the developer

Stephen - in future planting schedule

Wright - in light of the circumstances  
Voted for no trees.

### **90-96 NORTH STREET**

GL - opened hearing at 8:15 p.m.

Rmerrikin - discussion of one way traffic on widened 20 ft "road" - street name recommended by police and fire - North Street major road, connector to Dover and Walpole - close enough to walk to many places - noncommuter type traffic trips will be less - sidewalks both sides - worked with the landscape plan - lighting plan - slight revisions to units 8 and 9 (small plan shown)- changed the garage location and driveway a little longer

Colin Smith - recalculated the numbers with the basements in - turned 2/3 of the basements into crawl space (six feet high - storage space)

RM - O&M plan will be included - homeowners association will include lighting - condominium association document - have made changes to satisfy W&S and will finish prior to endorsement - have a letter from Bill Domey and will work with him - rain barrels in each unit - in ground to water gardens - will be included in the drain report - consultant about calculation - simplified method is larger - using dynatm

EF - onsite parking

RM - two parking spaces per unit minimum plus two car garage - no extra on the driveway -

EF - where does company park

RM - on driveway, but one way will help - 6 of 10 have 2 car garage - consultant concern about cars sticking out - condominium association would govern

EF - if people overflowing onto North St. question of safety - no definition between sidewalk and the street

RM - 2012 rebuild the entire street

KD - pavers to delineate the street - question 20 ft request from fc cars parked - park on one side only

Tim - minimize the amount of asphalt visually - boarder could be any width

Smith -

RM - most of the condos are not cars parked

Tim - brick paver - concrete paver - staying away from asphalt - unit type pavers easier to maintain - in the back would be crushed stone but may use pavers all around - explained the landscape plan - try to maintain the look of neighborhood - more traditional - stone wall in front - transition areas to reduce appearance of asphalt - one way driveway - pedestrian entrance to small park space leading to a second space - space for community activities - open to the public as well - passive and quiet area - will put back more appropriate screening material - existing trees in back build under to add thicker screening - ornamental plantings around the units - some patio space larger than others - small private space but all connected

RM - plant list

GL - screening along back and side very important

EF - fencing

Tim - yes - existing and will replace with new - wooden stockade around 3 sides

KD - inventory the trees?

Tim - survey indicated all trees 6" size - saving 26 and removing 23 - mostly for roadway and actual structures - predominately Norway maple - proposing to add 71 trees plus shrubs - difficult to save a tree during construction if affecting roots

RM - in back are a lot of drainage

Tim - tree protection during construction - left two large trees for canopy

GL - material of the walkway - in JP originally crushed stone and people complained of noise of people walking on crushed stone and got changed to brick pavers so just start with brick - in additional problems with snow removal

Tim - tripping hazard

EF - snow removal - trash pick up etc. arrangements

RM - can go to the dump or association could decide

Tim - snow removal - left lawn space and a few areas

KD - question of ballard lights

Tim - short along the path (not pole lights)

RM - sunken yard behind unit 10

Tim - making a larger deck space there - that is all room space - not really yard

WD - question of standing water in back of yard

RM - no (abutters agree)

WD - side and back buffers are very important - thought of putting the drainage fields elsewhere to maintain the buffer zone in the back - open spots elsewhere

RM - everything slopes down from the street - shallow in the street - no outfall from the fields

WD - could be up by the street

RM - could put something under the road

WD - all area in back is going to be charging - concern for the damage from the nature of construction - look at consider way to preserve more of the buffer in the back - can't imagine who will use the pedestrian walkway - do we want to foster public gathering in the green buffer

zone -

RM - private property

Paolo - for the neighbors - not for everyone - not everyone

WD - good intentions as to whether it will do what want to do

Tim - installation of the drain system - prune the trees first - based on percentage - not touching half - with proper planning

RM - must make a concerted effort

WD- not seen anyone prune - impervious surface still - crawl space - basement space would be 5 foot or less - forced main

RM - 4,5,6,7,8,9 - homeowners assoc. - rain barrels - overflow goes into a small "beehive" - small pump in

GL - how does fit

WD - architectural elevations?

CS - street elevation - existing and new units - section cut through the common way - all units in the back will be similar to unit 6 shown

KD - fire hydrant

RM - have added for the

KD - sewer pumping and backup power?

RM - low head common sewer system - 5/6 houses on one forced main - have a generator in the unit or a tank for one day's flow

SB - ? Energy - street - go in and out counter clockwise -

WD - someone stopped waiting to go out could see better

RM - will do counter clockwise

Board - should be consistent along road

GL - like the pedestrian walk area

EF - break up street scape (walkway)

WD - what about the back half?

GL - only people who live there would use the pedestrian way - urban planting -

RM - nobody would walk behind the units

Wd - is it good for the abutters? - attracting more traffic

GL - condo project - common area typical

KD - become accustomed to settings

GL - change in driveway and square footage??

RM - changed the orientation of the unit 9 - better turning for the garage -

EF - two units from separate drive

RM - no just one unit - others from 16 foot

KD - just a street sign

Tim - numbers per fire department - no other signs

SB - consider eliminate

RM -

GL - question of site visit - what time

WD - stake where general road - idea on exiting trees that would stay

RM - mark the trees to go - show 50 foot rear line staked

Sunday the 28<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 a.m. site visit

Voted to continue the public hearing to October 20<sup>th</sup> at 8:15 p.m.

EF - anyone can come to site visit but no additional inform or q&a -

GL - questions or comments

George Malley - 3 concerns - 1 - directly related to intersection- question of adding 20 cars to that intersection - concerns 2- drainage during construction - concern for water coming in their direction 3- privacy - aging trees along their side beautiful trees concern for them coming down

RM - traffic talked about - plan during construction of an open basin in the back

KD - temporary grading?

RM - it all goes that way now

GL - traffic engineer opinion on optimizing the

WD - could talk with chief

Ask chief for accident report (which would be included in traffic engineer report)

RM - net increase of 10 spaces

... 3 Crane Place - house 10 feet from the property line - concern 3 large canopy trees - concern like permanent midnight - concern for lack of light - would actually prefer those trees gone

Tim - Norway Maples as get older get worse - sometimes smaller trees are better

3 - trees are big - branches hitting

Tim - max height would be 35 feet

3 crane - trees gone would give light

Tim - first objective was to preserve what was there

GL - something to talk about between abutters and applicant

3 crane - drainage in back - 6 inches of water in the basement in winter - concern pushing more into his lot

RM - putting water into the ground

3 crane - concerned for the narrow area

Malloy Erin - concern about snow piles melting into other property

RM - could put something to prevent water from going

KD - concern could get worse

RM - won't get worse but will get better

GL - catch basin at the snow pile

KD - final grade?

RM - pretty much existing - same grade

KD - look to see if way to deal with

RM - could grade the grass so it goes back

WD - catch basin between 4 and 5

RM - would need to add one and could -

WD - obvious space for snow collection so add catch basin - maybe unit 7 changed to a grate so catch -

BOH might not due -

Malley - parking a big issue - can't park on North St - critical that there be parking spaces for visitors - concern for people parking along the side - a lot of units with not enough parking

RM - town does not have require beyond

WD - make permanent no parking along front of North Street

Discussion of parking - two behind each garage

RM - 2 in the garage and 2 behind - 2 existing buildings do not have additional space  
2000 sf to 2200 sf

Bill Pope - 4 crane place - house only 10 feet from the corner - grove of trees - construction cutting into root system - concerned about visual impact - sound - lighting - less impact the better - deeper the border and trees - design of the actual houses fitting into the neighborhood - more tolerable - walkway - not encourage people to walk down - not sure gazebo needed.

GL - need to look at trees on the site

Continued at 9:50 pm.

### Shining Valley

Concern for

Vote reduce surety to nothing upon receipt of letter from KPF



Signed Goddard School plans

10:15 p.m.

10/06/08

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

Meeting convened at approximately 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Lester.

Medfield State Hospital MOU

Discussion of what MOU should cover

- SB    Need to include the open space and easements  
      Need to delineate where spaces(easements) are and their uses  
      Time line for easements
- WD    Easements shown on Judith N plan
- SB    No easement to Dover Sherborn  
      Easement across the back
- WD    had plan that showed parcels  
      Find the full size plan (Keith had one)
- EF    Different easements
- WD    Final plan should be included in the MOA
- EF    One plan with all would be helpful
- SB    What is the accurate plan?  
      What is parcel H? (formerly Cronin property)  
      Was there an actual survey?
- WD    If this is the actual plan, then have an issue?  
      Lacking easements  
      Not a field survey
- EF    Conceptual plans ok but not for building
- WD    Where is the five acres? Is it usable? Where and what can be done there?  
      Get plan cleaned up to be part of MOU  
      Access road to Longmeadow - need clear Emergency Only and how constructed-  
      get info from both Chiefs  
      How trails should be constructed - starting and ending point - reference trails  
      requirements  
      Local Historic Committee
- SB    Town has veto authority over final plan

- EF Should reference ..
- WD Need more say than review & comments - need stronger language (Section II B and C)  
What are the limitations for the affordable
- All Mental health units (44) need clarity  
Legislation states 24 set aside and 20 elsewhere  
  
Affordable Units - section IIDX - who establishes the plan -
- SB Plan should have as a town - don't need in the MOU
- WD needs work - only if it will protect us every year - need iron clad
- SB phased program - need more definition - can have interim plan
- EF need to consider what is going on outside of this in the town - need to show how we get to that 10%
- WD do we need note that development agreement cannot trump MOA  
Concern for site cleanup and traffic mitigation - if developer says cannot complete
- SB concern deve want to get out of obligations because of unforeseen costs - offsite work
- WD do we want draft agreement?
- SB put this together first
- EF one thing at a time
- WD phasing for infrastructure and roads get done first  
Bonding issues
- SB construction plan
- GL time line -
- SB DCAM agreed to no deadline - if do not do then they would go back to legislature
- GL recalculate the # for affordable  
SB Need a baseline calculation

Pass on to Kristine and the Selectmen after planning board review

## VINEBROOK VILLAGE

GL read legal notice and recused himself because of an association with one of the applicants and left

SB took over meeting and explained the process

Scott Richardson, architect, overview- met with the Historic Commission and reviewed concept of 12 units - two story units 2 car garage, living room, bedroom - etc. - traditional NE architecture - feedback on site access and visibility and saving the trees - modified design and reduced to 11 units and eliminated one driveway and created one driveway for access to the majority of the units - did get feedback on 9/8 - elevations shown - basic concept (with some adaptation) - reviewed plan - 2 bedrooms and loft over garage - 1800 s.f. living area

Walter Lewinsky - engineer - 1.9 acres - 2 buildings existing - 11 units - main drive with offset driveway - 20' wide drive - 2 units access off sep have 18 ft drive- rain garden in back - high point of driveway flows both direction - roof flow to back - slightly less flow toward brook st because issue of puddling - not the catch basins but the utility trench there not properly graded - roof drainage into the ground - redesigned to miss two large trees - rain garden treats pollutants off the driveway - reviewed plantings scattered throughout the green areas - lot of plants at the entrance - traffic report in process will be ready prior to the next meeting - not quite complete with the drainage calcs so will submit new plans after that - end of week

SB - rain garden in place of the detention basin?

WL - yes - can use for recharge but not counting - CC concern about structure - looking to overflow berms - not flow out until the 50 year storm - spread out so not as deep - DEP requirements like rain gardens - lights on the back of buildings will be shielded - Earth Tech response to be submitted with the plans: traffic study in progress; dpw aware will be coming in for connection; submitted EIS tonight; scales on plan larger to view; will be driveways and not roadways; no curbing proposed; runoff down the gutters to the driveways into rain garden; centerline for laying out the ways; added electric cable etc, labeled the 50 foot buffer more clearly; sizes on roof leaders will be based on the surface area of the roof - covered under plumbing code; under review of the FC; north arrows added to the plan; added more siltation barriers; backs of back units (right) runoff into the wetlands to maintain what is going there now; indicated driveways across the street; added the neighbors house - 182 feet from the deck on unit 4; aerial views showing the existing site and reviewing property lines on the aerial view. FAR need to bring calcs - do meet the requirements - will

DMacC - 1800 does not include basements - way under the allowed because of the wetland areas

WL - still ironing out with BOH and CC and then will submit new plans of the drainage-

talked with Bill around 4 p.m. and needs more calculations - meeting with Con Agent on Wed - hope to be done by Friday

WD - are you still taking one big tree out

WL - taking one out but leaving others - saving 4 - proposing more trees - underground infiltration will go around so no disturb

EF - what is proposed on the side?

WL - fence on the right side; wall on the left side 3 feet high - fieldstone wall - abutter wanted field stone

DMCC - designed so water not go onto his property and helps his drain better - work with DPW to get it to the catch basins - berm east side of Brook ST to get the water to the catch basin

WL - located the catch basins

D<CC - puddle on west side of brook st.

WL - existing utility trench on east side of street blocks flow

KD - how fix

WL - repave

WD - drainage sensitive issue - sketch out what doing in the roadway - existing and proposed to understand

DMCC - going out in the next rain and see where go - tear up and recrown road - need to figure out what the need actually is and then put on the plan

WD - not streets but driveway

Norma - name change needed to satisfy PC and FC

DMCC - will change to brook village - haven't thought of sign - will look to naming the driveway

WD - elevations from the new driveway side - what will the abutters see?

WL - top elevations from the west side and middle from the east side

WD - location of lights

WL - small entry lights at front door - down light on deck

SB - incorporate restriction in the homeowners agreement

DMCC - may include at driveway

WL - can fit two cars in the driveway plus 2 in garage - 20 foot wide driveway - turaround

DMCC - Dale st cars usually go inside

WD - any maintenance of rain garden?

WL - plants are those recommended by DEP - they keep down the weeds - needs to be cleaned out if debris falls in - included and OM in the drainage report which will go with the association - have modified to CC concern - paragraph about plowing snow where cannot plow - earth berm on side where trees - green areas of front yards

KD - much snow and little parking

SB - concern for the amount of area for snow

DMCC - push into area back right

WD - will this be covered by CC because of wetland - concern for snow - more removal of snow than plowing

EF - 2 bedroom

WD - roadway is the walk way

KD - schedule/buildout plan

DMCC - do foundations all at once - left buildings as the first phase then ones on right - vinyl fence - flexible if abutters do not want - woods not very maintenance

WL - retaining wall and fence back to 3<sup>rd</sup> (?) - fence on right at garage

DMCC - met with Historic and met with abutters and then will go back - both over 50 years old but not significant

WD - traffic study being prepared? -

WL - existing sidewalk on opposite side of road

WD - any input direct of Chief Meany

Chief Meaney - Brook and Main is busy with or without development - need to look at possible light there - light in center with turning should help - this will not put over edge - several accidents at Main - need to work on Green St also - explained Main St light - Montrose using for Lueders parking

WD - plans for sidewalk? For safety

CM - would be better - sidewalk on west side

Greg Meister --- traffic center for recreation center

CM - would increase the traffic - will do what want

Give Chief copy of traffic study

WL - have staked the decks and patios - stake the corners of the buildings

SB - need someone there for site walk

Sunday the 19<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 a.m. for site walk

SB - explained that not taking info - just viewing

Voted to continue to November 3<sup>rd</sup> at 8:15 p.m.

-- 61 Brook St - attended several meetings - changes - row of houses down the left side - was agreed that there would be a row of trees also so neighbors would not have to see - concern for decks - agreed no patios because use to store - discussed no parking for visitors - roadway does not afford room for visitors - no sidewalk on that side so cars park up on the lawns - concerns about the water table in that area and flooding in the basements - also snow - concerns for the brook flooding - type of limitation of people having animals in that tight area - very densely populated as is - trucks at Lueders - many children heading to school - no crosswalks (diagonal across from where the project)

WL - patios - decks are beyond the woodline - patio would be so far down from the 1<sup>st</sup> floor - decks are in the back - do have fence and proposing trees - can add trees - pointed out parking - meets the board's requirement

DMCC - have not restricted pets in other developments

WL - designed 2 feet above ground water

WD - water in basement

3 hands raised

WL - designed infiltration basins to take DEP requirements which is too equal what exists

WD - BOH and DEP have very strict requirements regarding ground water - that is being done now - requires their approval first - parking on Brook Street must go through the PC

Meister - 43 Brook Street - how board regulates lofts that can be turned into bedrooms

Can't regulate interior of home.

Discussion of how to limit lofts

WD - have the FAR listed

Sarah Hamilton - 43 brook street - cramming density into the site - bigger than the houses on the street - other multifamily see possibilities in the area - like to be in the downtown - too big for this street - 10m housing units on the street now - traffic and access - pedestrian path is over her driveway and difficult to get out of - parking for two cars in the garage and 2 spaces outside - look at the asphalt - height of foundation above grade - crown up towards the back of the site

Scott Richardson - relationship of grade to concrete - 4 feet foundation - 9 foot ceilings in the first floor and 8 foot on the second floor - representation to grade - total is 28- 32 feet above grade

SH - grade higher than street

DMCC - houses across the street and condos are all elevated

WD - Bylaw restrictions on height and above water table

SH - density - one unit in the 50 foot buffer

WD - that is conservation

(Tape side b @ 246) Patricia Patt, 39 Green Street, the abutter on the backside of the units. (Pointed out on plan where she lives.) "My house sits in the wetlands." (stated twice). Have a couple of questions about the runoff. Apparently there will be runoff to the north and to the south. The south going to the street and the roof tops going to the wetlands to the north.

Mr. Lewinsky explained that the roof top runoff is going straight into the ground. The backs of 3 units runoff into the wetlands.

Ms. Patt explained that the reason she is asking has to do with snow removal in the back of the project. The snow removal in the front is by the sidewalk. The Bylaws are clear



about not putting snow in the street. What will happen to the front of these units when the snow accumulates on the sidewalk? There will be snow piled in front of the units. What will happen to that then? Is the Town going to responsible for removing it? Where are they going to put it?

Mr. Lewinsky sought clarification as to where the snow was.

Ms. Patt - in the front of the project on Brook Street. Everyone is concerned about pushing the snow off here (along the new road) What will happen to the front? The snow that might actually accumulate there?

Mr. Lewinsky the development will be pushing it all back onto the side yards.

Ms. Patt's next question was regarding fencing. Concerned about the type of fencing to use because it is a wetland area where there is a lot of wildlife. We need to let them pass through. There is something in the books about that - the type of material that you would use, which plastic would not work.

Mr. Lewinsky said they are not putting fencing along the back.

Ms. Patt questioned not even along wetlands where she is. The animals do cross over. She continued that many people are here in a spirit of abutters who were notified that the project is going to alter the wetland. It is important to understand the spirit of why we are here in addition to the traffic and the runoffs and everything else that goes along with this. This is also part of our (?) confirmation. In terms of the notice and the application filed by this gentleman. It is important that we take a serious look. Will have more questions for the commission later. (@ 265)

Close the hearing for this evening.

10:05 p.m.

Present: All

Baker Road - withdrew request for return of surety to address BOH concerns

Shinning Valley - get letter from Ken that says "satisfactory"

**NORTH STREET SITE PLAN - continued public hearing**

Rick Merrikin - revised plan - location of "everything" has not changed - revised plan for the Board of Health - approval letter from BOH - condo docs - traffic study

- Raised the drainage infiltration system up - thus raised the back portion up - catch basins are same except for low point of the driveway to aid in snow removal - raised 2 feet above existing grade - all happens behind the fence thus neighbors will not be looking at - need to bring in fill
- Infiltration systems larger to satisfy Domey mounding calculations - same location
- Location of the road is the same
- Hired traffic engineer who did not do any counts (non available from engineer redesigning North Street)
  - 5 additional cars in am hours
  - 6 additional cars in pm hours
  - Spoke with PC - fender benders - 9 accidents - would not add more than stop signs at the intersection - not busy enough for redesign BOH on November 12<sup>th</sup> and received approval letter
  - Traffic should be counterclockwise
- Documents
  - Trust documents
  - Condo
- Revised plan should not have an effect on trees
- Reason for raised up - normally do borings - could not actually see the dirt - water table appeared to be about 14 feet down - left pipes in and rechecked and water table appeared to be about 5 feet down thus, high water table about 5 feet down thus needed to raise everything
- Now can do a gravity sewer system out to North Street for all units
- Landscape drawing not changed - sloped down 188 to 185 - six foot fence will appear shorter - could relocate the fence onto the fill portion - not necessary to screen from inside but outside - could adjust fence to be on top of the raised plan - keep plantings on locus (Wright - 10 feet from fence to top of mound, putting fence there would be at the bottom) Would put fence about half way - could have plantings over drainage, just not big trees
- Did not redo landscape plan because looking for screening

George - planting diagram does not show new plants

Rick - correct

George - bigger trees marked to remain

PLANNING BOARD  
NOVEMBER 17, 2008

Rick - can well around the trees - well them with crushed stones so air get in --- tree count remains the same - could go into 10 foot area depending on the size of the tree - would leave up to the landscaper who is doing it

Wright - would like clarification of what will look like in the end

Rick - all the vegetation is inside - neighbors will be looking at tops of trees and bushes - if raise the fence to 8 feet would require ZBA approval

Wright - if people in raised developed area will be more visible -- better to move fence up the slope - more maintenance problem

Rick - could move it 4 feet in and would go up two feet

Keith - if go up to the top of the hill then

Elissa - who maintains what is left outside

George - move fence four feet then trees - question talk with neighbors?

Rick - no particular discussion - there was a multitude of ideas - could be worked out between the developer and neighbors - cut down or trim - request applicant work with the neighbors

Keith - will the fence have a jog in it

Rick - the whole yard is fenced - part in the back is raised

Wright - units in the back are raised 5 feet regardless of where the fence

Rick - will not be as high as North Street (191) - back is 188

George - what is the grade of the houses going up

Rick - 3 - 4 feet above before - will have partial basements

Wright - grading plan - cobblestones for esthetics

Keith - parking on one side only of driveway to maintain traffic flow

Rick - postmaster determines mailbox location - will add parking on one side of the street - no parking on North St is an enforcing issue for the units only

Wright - clarification of basement space vs. crawl space

PLANNING BOARD  
NOVEMBER 17, 2008

Rick - architect worked out % crawl space vs. basement

Elissa - walkway just the same (yes) - probably not a retaining wall

Rick - retaining walls have become stone walls

Wright - Street name

Glover Place - less likely to traffic

Rick - manholes will blend in with the grass

Sheet 6 - in front --- RM - each building will have an infiltration system for roof drainage so all water goes back into the ground

Mrs Dematos - some of the fence will need to be replaced - more than likely they would replace

George - any other questions

Bill Pope - 4 Crane Place - nice fencings around - his house is right up against there - tallest fencing allowed and nice fence and natural shrubbery - concern for the lighting as well, be downward

George - question of which prefer for fencing

Bill - raised up would be better

Wright - plan showing

George could be obstructed by tree -

Could put fence up to tree and then continue after the tree

Mr. 3 Crane Place - three trees right on the fence are concern and may be dead - would like removed because dark area increased with the buildings - fine with fence raised up the slope

Elissa - not at top but maybe half way up

Rick - will look at trees that are there

Steve - no support for retaining the trees there

Mally - 84 North - number of trees next to his house coming down - trees very beneficial with shade etc. - will need to get - fencing, landscaping, lighting - where along this

PLANNING BOARD  
NOVEMBER 17, 2008

line will get sured that what is approved is in there

Steve - example of Ben Franklin - if have restriction in place then they can enforce

Elissa - site plan approval - regulations call for the lighting remain on site

Wright - landscaping - have gone more along the lines of working out with the neighborhood -

Steve - only case can remember coming back

Discussion of trees - Rick need to put in sewer etc.

Mr. Malley - ones closer to the street are less of an issue

Keith - not much grade change on this side

George - branches into your window

Keith - actually improving his drainage - taking the drainage in the other direction - coordinate leaving as many trees

Rick - coordination with the abutters regarding trees prior to cutting - prefer to decide fencing ---- not be

Bob Hinden - 83 North Street - shocked by putting 15.000 sf of living space across the street - water situation that occurs - a lot of housing put into one spot - busy area, which enjoy -- driveway that comes out that is pitched from North Street - concerned for the car lights shinning into his windows - driveway directly across from the development driveway - his house is zoned as a three family - what is to stop

Wright - game of monopoly - people

George - tried to change the zoning but people would not vote the change

Rick - theory of where zoning is

Mr. Hinden - one house once - going to strip the two acres and develop whatever way - could be 2 acres of striped land

Mrs. - have live 11 years - when moved in only her child - dangerous on sidewalk - don't have a little driveway - children excited - now there will be a place where can ride bike - place for people can walk

Mr. H - this is suburban - no reason to do things just because - town has responsibly

PLANNING BOARD  
NOVEMBER 17, 2008

Wright - have zoning bylaws and site plan - here to enforce those rules - tried to make changes - got shot down - what they have proposed conforms to what is allowed - cannot stop someone from buying up tracts of land

George - go a ways up - this type of zoning would allow brick apartment building - keeping two houses

Mr. H - why not just put 3 units

Elissa - must

Wright - going from 5 units to 10 units

Pope - neighbors growing up played in this yard all the time - could take down the fence

Mrs. D - understand the concerns - personally invested in the design - worked on so not an eyesore

Pope - helps case that a neighbor - understand within the rights of zoning laws - concerns maximizing property as opposed to putting fewer - so many units packed in there - one question - area - if push over house a few more feet and driveway moved over a few feet and have a natural barrier

Rick - architect laid out the units - probably avoid having two houses next to each other - does not do anything for the neighbors living there

George - how many feet moved to keep the one extra tree

Rick - could aim the driveway but would be more in window - rather not slow the process - want to close the hearing

3 crane Place - ?talking about raising the grade - confusing

Rick - level would be high - if property is higher than hers now it will be more level from your perspective

George - ?close the public hearing or

Elissa - move to close public hearing

Steve - seconded

Voted to close the public hearing - unanimous.

Wright - would like to organize thoughts before going into but could take a shot at

PLANNING BOARD  
NOVEMBER 17, 2008

Elissa - draft and circulate

December 1<sup>st</sup> steve would not be there

Move to approve site plan - subject to

- Developer shall provide homeowners association
- Maintenance plan - trust
- All conditions will be listed on the plan
- That the Applicant/Developer shall minimize tree cutting/clear cutting and shall have a coordination meeting prior to the cutting of any trees with the abutters to review their concerns with trees, landscaping and fencing
- No additional exterior lights shall be added to units with regard not to be shining into abutters' property
- Any existing older trees along the edge of the site be prepared properly if they are going to be cut into their root ball (root combing) – prepare those existing trees to the best of their ability so they can survive the construction
- Material trucked in or off site is done in accordance with the Town's ordinance
- Trenching - new safety for open trenching
- Parking is limited to one side of Glovers Place
- Crawl space is limited in height per the definition of crawl space of uninhabitable space per the building code
- Adding a construction sequence with items such as job site working hours, dust control, work in streets, approval by the Department of Public Works, restrictions on heavy trucking vehicles allowed to part or stand on side streets, construction people park on the site during the construction as opposed to on North Street, a 6 foot high construction fence be in place around the area or the existing fence maintained around the site to protect the site during construction, (using standard items – will “toon” up)
- Incorporate the BOH approval
- Approval from all other board's and commissions
- Include standard conditions

So voted

Closed at 9:45 pm.

12/01/08

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

Meeting convened at 8:05 p.m.

Voted to reappoint Matt McCormick to the Sign Advisory Board

### **BROOK VILLAGE SITE PLAN REVIEW**

Walter Lew -- changed detention basin in back - 2 spill overs - ConCom approved - added small rain garden out front - all buildings outside the 50 foot -- 4 decks within the 50 foot buffer - BOH approved (copy received) - submitted traffic report (last Monday)

Bill Scully - MS Transportation Systems - traffic engineer - replacing two houses with 11 units - one house had business - concentrated on Brook St. - collected data on Brook St - extended crash research out to Main Street - focused on the morning and afternoon peak hours - accessibility in and out of the site - collected data in November -- 3700 vehicles per - avg speed 33mph - max at 39 - no crash history on Brook but some at Main - important connector street - way around signal - used guidelines of ITE - projecting 9 trips in the morning exiting and afternoon 10 vehicle trips entering - considered both drives - oriented more towards 109 - 5-6 vehic tow Main in am - small delay - quality of - level of service A entering and B exiting - did not take away existing uses - minimum sight distance would be 200 feet - thickly settled 30 mph - analysis with 30 and 40 and satisfied distance - couple of trees coming down - check visibility, entrance and exit - street that is going to carry a fair amount of traffic - speed management is important and a recommendation such as "thickly settled" signs - stop signs at both ends - have good sight distances and more

EF - any other recommendations

BS - speed management - add center line down Brook St narrows the lane - signs as reminders - passively get people more sensitive - have sidewalk along the west side so pedestrians can get down

WD - complaint of long stack of cars backed up getting out onto Main St - some had said that stack up to this entrance - question throw off

BS - can't say I've seen ques that long - projecting

EF - wonder since changed the signal on North ST

Chief - new signal North ST seems emptier than before - BOS not always want to put up signs - can ask them - question how much sign works - prefer highway trailer - put the message trailer up around to encourage people to think - busy street - now light is better will come here more often than going through Brook - sometime looking at signaling



WD - one person from neighborhood

Nancy - 50 Brook St - no - sat backed up on Brook for school time

WD - restricting people from going down Green Street for certain hours of the day

Chief - been asked to consider certain streets one-way - it just displaces people to another location and causes problems else where -- if couldn't take a left turn for certain hours, but will just extend the line - some expert would need to take a look at it -- signs are a consideration which would be BOS - usually accident when someone lets someone out of Brook

----- they do not stop very long on Green Street - way to slow down would be good - 3 way stop

WD - trips per day

BS - 100 trips over the course of the day - comes from trip models - did not take away the existing 2 units away - could have taken 20 trips away - -- data collected by traffic engineers - not broken out on number of bedrooms, etc. info - don't see much difference in the developments - have collected large sample point (ITE has collected)

WD - unit can vary (yes)

Dave - two bedroom with a loft area - two car garage - similar to what Dale St (24 units) produces

BS - took the high side of figures - weighted average would have given less - stayed conservative given the size of the project -- passive attempts - if institute then need to enforce immediately - some change geometry on street (speed bumps) - if signal timing on North ST helps then that is good

KD - snow removal to be written into the

Walter - put into ConCom plan

EF - homeowners - include in

Dave - done Homeowner draft

Norma - Mark is reviewing it at the present time

WD - agreement and trust

KD - roadway repairs

Walter - taking care of area in front of the project - resurfaced and fine graded as shown on the plans

KD - trees

Walter - redesigned the drainage so tree could stay

WD - on a recent site plan they were putting underground drainage and using underground prep of trees - take steps possible to protect trees

Dave - will get input on trees/prep

WD - how did you get unit 4 out of 50 ft buffer

Walter - moved forward

WD - fieldstone wall on the abutter's property with a fence on top --- buffers zones and trees that will stay - particularly east side

Nancy Coakley - have work done - survey - tree at the end is actually on her property

WD - trees along side

Dave - talked about

WD - condition deve get together and coordinate work that needs to get done

Nancy - want to leave the shrubs there

EF - preconstruction meeting - fewer abutters

WD - landscape plan - ton of mulch

Dave - if seed it then grass people throw nitrogen - made to go back to more natural state

EF - part of the Conservation approval

WD - basement space - FAR must be satisfied - full basements on all of the units

Dave - took out 20-25% for furnace area - counts came out much lower because of the wetlands

Dave - including the basement space in calculations - 2300 sf total - reviewed the space

WD - have 31% where 35% is allowed -- concern about phasing and getting parts done -

Dave - where working in a tight area - want to get all utilities and basements done so only bringing in - need to protect the foundations

WD - construction sequence to protect - Jackie's law regarding trenching - fence the whole site in

EF - conservation has

WD - site needs to be protected at the same as wild life -- discussion about the name of the driveway

Dave - will look at

WD - lights not shining off property and no additional lights - closing garage doors -

EF - most face into the development

Homeowners

WD - parking - haven't seen a traffic

EF - onsite parking - two garages plus two spaces

Walter - no parking in the main drive - 20 ft except last couple of units

KD - new information - questions on hold

Sara Hamilton - 43 Brook St - traffic report on first page calls 11 units rental -

Bill Scully - reference was an early draft - some confusion with the garage - was looked at as an 11 unit condo development

SH - is there really only 11 units

BS - should have read 11 attached unit

SH - ITE - different numbers for different kinds of housing - how did you decide - what is the difference in trip generation

BS - project is an 11 unit condo - with the models and guides could have forecast traffic - townhouse condos tend to be smaller which tend to be smaller population to household vs. single family house (11 per house) condo (5-6) - in forecast did not use the weighted average - project more trips - used the greater number - single family would have been more - used correct land use and conservative - if look at the net then take away the two that are there - using a conservative force that is close to the single family

SH - page 6 - asked if pb was contacted -

EF - have to deal with what is there - cannot project out what might be in future years - did identify the north st project

BS - increased the analysis by 5%

SH - Site Plan - asked the developer to describe the width of the pavement from garage to garage and were told that width was 65 feet wide - question if the pb will require permanent landscaping - 6 lanes of traffic equivalent to - permanent landscaping necessary - evergreen landscaping --- comment - look at traffic 66% going to Main - clearly said need another roadway to connect into 109 - look at such a possibility

KD - regard tp screening

Dave - most driveways are considerably longer - Dale St e.g. - will be shrubs across the front of the units - don't want along the driveway

Walter - do have shrubs out in front - elevation 182 and by street 180 - back of pavement is 184

Dave - went along the garages - put along back from house dive - also along electrical transformer

WD - continue arch around to get rid of the T effect and still allow view - continuing band of shrubs

SH - concerned if they are short - should have something that comes up to at least the door of a car

WD - bushes are 3-4 foot high - get together and discuss

Dave - absolutely - plan to invite everyone back to the historical for approval

..... 61 Brook Street - no consideration to people having visitors - no place for anyone on Brook Street to park --- said no accidents on Brook St but her son's car was totaled from Green St onto Brook St. - impact of visitor parking - no turn around space

Miester - 43 Brook St - science of traffic study - have difficulty accepting Brook St is a level A or B - reiterate the point - look at the zoning again - issue on the phasing - if all foundations put in what is the recourse to the town with foundations half finished

WD - could have gone as a 40b and a lot more than 16 units even

KD - hear what you are saying - have to go with the zoning before us now - were some attempts before

Wd - recourse ? -

KD - talked about

WD - could build as go

EF - could be more disruptive if separated

Dave - trying not to do it while someone is living there - put up first buildings which would be a shield to abutters

WD - he is ultimately responsible for the site

Nancy - do not want to be looking a basement holes covered or uncovered for a long period of time

Dave - should prepare phasing plan

WD - know want to get utilites and foundations - safety issue - not have a row of concrete - is this a spring start

Dave - yes - put in foundations and some units and landscape - will be governed by the building department to keep it safe

EF - how long take for project

Dave -finishing up fall, spring and summer

KD - one condition - construction sequ - safety plan

40 Green St - will be looking at the north view - leaves are down - view from her window - now look at houses - now decks unattractive - not a clear picture of what is going up for screening

Walter - woods - not any decks in the open space

40 green - will be looking at row houses

Walter - will be a wall with a fence

40 Green - looking for evergreen screening

Dave - three units and two decks

KD - can't provide much more screening - in addition concom

Walter - green areas have placed bounds where concom has asked so nothing go beyond

WD - have 8 white pines and one red maple - reviewed

Dave - at the Historical meeting made a lot of changes - worked and want to go back and want their approval - have influence - landscaping on plan is what required to do - did not come to an agreement - prefer patios but where grade

Maria Bayler (an abutter) - Historical Comm - imposed a demolition delay - can lift if come back - confusion with neighbors - that was the first place people got to express - only have the right to delay or not -- more a general meeting about esthetics - do not have power

Dave - do not have the ability to change decks - important that

KD - have the gist of the last of the concerns - some are out of our jurisdiction - getting late - any additional new information

Meiser .... Stand point of procedure - best way to handle go to Historica - do you have control over landscape

KD - can ask builder to do some

Sara - developer can go in and put drainage ditch - can't someone

EF - approval from ConCom -

Sara - heard no one do any traffic

EF - go to the Bo of Sel - with the support

Sara - your jurisdiction to review the traffic study - consider the traffic study

KD - know the issues

WD - not see taking any new info

EF - moved to close public hearing

WD - seconded

So voted

KD - Concom and BOH approved

WD - move to approve tohe site plan with condition = given BOH and ConCom conditions

- Standard conditions will apply plus
- Construction sequence plan - hours etc.
- Homeowners asso/declora of trust etc.
- Record with the registry of deeds
- Conditions on the plan
- Mimin tree cutting
- Exitin oldr trees prepared
- Open trench requirement
- Conduct preconts cood meeting land fencing etc. with - allowing for other board conditions
- No exter light - none on butter property
- Name for the driveway
- Lot Coverage and FAR
- Conditions sub to
- People that live in the devel must park within the dev but not in the driveway - and visitor - all parking on site and not within the driveway
- If revised resubmit to pb

EF seconded

WD - liability is his

EF - building inspector has control

So voted

Motion adjourned at 10:15 ppm