

BOARD OF HEALTH MINUTES

May 4, 2016

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Present were Thomas Klem, Chair (TK), members John G. Schuler, M.D. (JS), Elizabeth Brewer, M. D. (EB). Also present, Julia Junghans (JJ) Director of Public Health.

7:00 Public Comment- there were none

7:05 p.m. **4 Shore Drive, Septic System repair/upgrade using a Presby system (passive Innovative/Alternative technology), Local upgrade for offset from the Street, David Schofield (DS), Registered Sanitarian**

The property is an existing 2 bedroom house adjacent to Sudbury River, the lot slopes towards the river, very limited lot, .23 acres located in a Septic Zone II with no option to expand. The cesspool failed the title 5 inspection and was located 35' from the river. Soil testing shows all sand and gravel. Shallow band to 56" on right, down to 53" on left. They tested 2 areas outside the 75' buffer zone.

Proposing to use a Presby system to be sized for 3 bedrooms per title 5 requirements, but Deed restricted for 2 bedrooms and will stay as 2 bedrooms. The Presby system helps with sloping lot (1'6") and allows 2' decrease from groundwater, allows for more compact leach size 60% and offset to unsuitable material (bedrock).

Variance request due to limited available area: variance to property for offset to street, 5.2' proposed to town ROW, 10' required. Staff has checked with Stephen Kadlik, DPW director and he says that is fine. The applicant is the proposed owner; the estate is handled by an attorney. New owners are going to try to keep the house as original as possible.

BVW (Boarding vegetation wetlands) (river bank) there has been one hearing with the Conservation Commission, they needed to make a modification and they will be going back to Conservation Commission. The next meeting is scheduled for May 5, 2016 for final approval.

TK: Motion to approve request for Septic system repair at 4 shore Drive for local upgrade- offset to road way 5'2" proposed, 10' required and for use of a Presby system as shown on per plans dated received April 27, 2016. JS: second all in favor vote 3-0

7:25 p.m. **52-60 Rice Rd, review and comment on proposed concept plans, owner Tom Greenaway (TG)**

The Greenaways own the properties at 54 and 60 Rice Road, they are in the process of purchasing the house at 52 Rice Rd. which will give them a total of 5.8 acres and they are now eligible to do a Conservation cluster. 3 existing houses, 5 homes proposed. The concept plan, (theoretical subdivision) requires that the owner show that they could design a standard subdivision. They have proposed a convention subdivision, which shows that 5 lots can be set up, so that sets the number of lots for the cluster development. Sullivan and Connors had done soil testing in area and Mike Sullivan has no concerns with the soils. Mr. Greenaway has met with the Conservation Commission, Planning Department, Building and now with BOH.

The property is not in a septic zone II and they do not expect any variance requests, so there is no restriction on the number of bedrooms or square footage of the houses.

Soil testing will determine the location of the septic systems including the reserve areas which will help set the size of the houses (#of bedrooms)

Conservation Commission says if you give 35% to town or SVT (Sudbury Valley Trustees) the town will give you a break, to cluster the development to reduce lot requirements (given the river front area (wetlands).

They are still figuring out the plan, maybe an upgrade of septic at 60 Rice Rd (keep the house?).

Frontage requirement would be reduced for a cluster development. The Planning Board prefers shared driveways

JJ: We will review the layout of the house footprints/septic system locations after soil testing is done. If the project proposed is a subdivision they would need to go through the BoH for approval with a Preliminary and Definitive plan. If they do a conservation cluster then they don't have to meet the subdivision regulation requirements. We would just need the detailed individual septic system designs for each lot. It will depend on the Planning Board's decision on how they want to see this development.

8:05 p.m. **10 Sunset Rd. Discuss conceptual building and septic system project, the homeowner is proposing an addition over 60% and the septic design does not meet new construction- Ted Doucette, (TD) Professional Engineer, owner Matthew Kosko (MK)**

The existing house is two bedrooms with approx. 1300 sq. ft. which included a second story addition from 1997. The current septic system consists of a converted cesspool and leach pit, there are no records on this system, the age is unknown. The new addition proposed would add 700 square feet to the house. The lot is very small (6k sq. ft.), the house is very small, and additions move over 60% quickly.

The proposed septic system using an Infiltrator system (passive general use) can get 165 g.p.d. (new construction design requirements) and use a smaller foot print. The proposed plan meets Title 5 requirements for a 2 bedroom house, but will need variances for local upgrade approvals. 1) Property line reduction from 10' to 5'. 2) reduction from a foundation to a septic tank, given the area available this will be necessary. 3) relief from the requirement to show a reserve area, with septic repairs a reserve area is not typically required (no addition in number of bedrooms/not a teardown). In this situation there is no additional area on the lot to provide a reserve area. 4) increase the depth of cover over the soil absorption system from three feet to no more than four feet with a vent this will prevent the need for a pump chamber.

There was discussion regarding why this is being required to be calculated at new construction numbers, as there is no request to add bedrooms. Wayland septic regulations require additions over 60% to meet new constructions requirements (calculations at 165 g.p.d. and a 100% reserve area for future septic repair.)

JJ: Have you considered alternative technology? TD: We would like to stay with a passive system or just do title 5 compliant system at 110 g.p.d. or work with 5' of lot line. There was a discussion regarding alternative locations for a reserve area; reconfigurations. JJ: we want the leaching area to be as large as possible

TK: since the project is over 60% is there any scenario where a reserve can be fit? JJ: what will the total sq. ft. of the house be after total project? As per the BoH Policy and the new septic not meeting new construction requirements (total additions over 60%) the 2 bedroom dwelling should be under 2000 sq. ft. total. MK: Construction plans have not yet been drawn up, but we do not expect there to be a problem of being under 2000 sq ft. JJ: is there an option to use the driveway area to put on a reserve area. This project will require a ZBA hearing.

TK: any pilot I/A that would be an option? JJ: A technology in the pilot program is not a good idea. We don't know if the technology is going to be effective. Testing with the state is still going on with pilot technologies. This could risk the possibility of premature failure. TD: pilot is an experimental system that may not work. TD: Looked at a number of options and they all either reduce ground water offset or the size of the leaching field. JS: every system will ultimately fail, what are the options when that happens? Re-dig and replace in same location. TD: I have done a number of systems without a reserve area, but had done a lot of cleaning out and reusing the primary leaching area location. JJ: having a reserve area is a more cost effective plan, it can be expensive to dig out the failed leach field and replacing with clean fill. Identifying a reserve area is for future

use, as it cannot be built on. TK: if no addition done and the cesspool fails, would there be room to put in a new septic with a reserve area? TD: a repair system would not require a reserve area and would be designed on 110 gallons per day, you might be able to get a reserve area.

Based on this discussion with the Board, the plans will be designed and submitted to the Health Department, notices to abutters will be sent out 10 days before the BOH meeting when the Variances will be heard at a future BoH meeting.

8:30 p.m. **Discuss Reciprocal Household Hazardous Waste Day**

This is a program from DEP to allow more availability to all residents of participating towns to dispose of Household Hazardous Waste Collections. Staff consulted with Carolyn Dann, coordinator for DEP, Dan Cabrel, Wayland D.P.W, and Jim White, Health Director for Natick (participating town). There are a number of towns looking to participate; Wayland participation will be the final piece they need to get the program up and running. Residents participating in programs not in their town will pay a fee to dispose of the products. As a participating town, the Town would receive points for this program, the DPW would be able to use these points to receive cash recycling bonus from the State.

TK: Motion to approve the Health Dept. and Wayland's involvement with the reciprocal Household Hazardous Waste Day arrangement as proposed by Mass DEP/ Carolyn Dann Second: EB vote All in favor 3-0

8:40 p.m. **Authorization of BoH Budget funds to pay for Food Inspector fees to cover through the end of this fiscal year (6/30/16)**

This past year, we had several events that required plan reviews and inspections, including the increasing number of vendors for the Winter and Summer Farmer's market at Russell's; 75 vendors at \$50.00 each is \$3,750.00. Russell's gets about \$150,000. The fire at the Coach Grill and the new restaurant being constructed at the previous JJ McKay's location will be requiring plan reviews, site visits and inspections. We have funds in our budget in the Health Nuisance Expense account that we could pay the bills out of that line item. The budget was \$11,350.00, we are over budget by approximately \$1,500.00, plus Coach Grill inspections to reopen. Also, the Lovelane event last fall.

JS: does the cost of the annual permits cover the inspections and other unexpected possible fees? EB: In the future we should look into the fees charged for the permits to be sure we can cover our fees. JJ: the numbers of the vendors at the Farmer's Market had grown.

TK: Motion to authorize the Health Dept. to pay for Food Inspection line item for shortages in the budget through the end of this Fiscal year. Second EB Vote 3-0 all in favor

8:50 p.m. **Appoint Animal Inspectors, Bruce S. Sweeney and Jennifer Condon**

Bruce Sweeney is the Inspector of Animals, he goes out to all homes keeping horses, chickens and other permitted animals to confirm health conditions and proper housing. Jennifer Condon would be the back up in situations that would call for more than one inspector. Ms. Condon also serves the town as the Dog officer, a position held by her father Les Boardman for many years.

TK: Motion to appoint Bruce S Sweeney and Jennifer Condon as Animal Control officers for the term of June 1, 2016 to May 31, 2017. Second JS vote 3-0 all in favor

9:00 p.m. **Minutes of March 9, 2016**

TK: Motion to accept minutes of March 9, 2016, as amended. Second JS vote 3-0 All in favor

9:15 p.m. Director's Report

The Board reviewed the director's report, with discussion regarding the fire at the Coach Grill, the commendation of Community Health Nurse Jennifer McLeod, the problem with septic design on Oak Hill Road and the Eversource right of way.

The bills have been signed.

9:30 p.m. Topics not reasonably anticipated by the chair 48 hours in advance of the meeting

JS: There was discussion at town meeting regarding installing a sentinel monitoring well at the High School field between the artificial fields and the Town wells. TK will look into this further and may invite Mike Lowery (BoPW) for a discussion in the future. EB is this a problem in other towns? The Recreation Commission would be involved.

9:40 p.m. TK: Motion to adjourn EB Second,

Respectfully submitted

Patti White

Department Assistant

(Transcribed from audio recording of meeting)

060416minutes

APPROVED 062916