

WAYLAND PLANNING BOARD FINAL MINUTES

FILED BY: Sarkis Sarkisian, Town Planner

DATE OF MEETING: **April 11, 2017**

TIME OF MEETING: **6:00 P.M.**

PLACE OF MEETING: Town Building, 41 Cochituate Road

AGENDA

6:00 P.M. Open Meeting Comment/Correspondence/ Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair 48 Hours In Advance Of the Meeting/Town Planner report

6:05 P.M. Continuation of Public Hearing Whittemore Place Amendment to the previously approved Definitive Subdivision plan in accordance with the provisions of the most recent Subdivision Modification Approval (with Condition) issued by the Planning Board in January 13,1998. The Approval requires that the owner of the subdivision re-apply to the Planning Board prior to construction. The Applicant is also requesting for release of Lot 1 with the associated Parcels 1A and 1B from the Subdivision. The Proposed Development is Whittemore Place Subdivision (Klempner) located at 209 and 213 Old Connecticut Path assessors map 44, lot 2, 3 and 4.

6:55 P.M. Wayland Real Assets Planning Committee update.

7:20 P.M. Mass Housing Certification process and update.

7:25 P.M. Approve minutes March 21, 2017, set meeting dates

7:30 P.M Adjourn

D. Hill called the meeting to order at 6:02 P.M. D. Hill, I. Montague, A. Reck, N. Riley and J. Steel in attendance in person, K. Murphy in attendance for the Continuation of Public Hearing Whittemore Place by telephone. Chair D. Hill stated that Kevin Murphy will be participating remotely because of geographic distance. D. Hill then stated the quorum of the Planning Board physically present at the meeting and Roll call votes were taken by members.

Continuation of Public Hearing Whittemore Place:

Report from Sean Reardon from Tetra Tech regarding the review of Whittemore Place. Several issues were discussed, including 1) the scope of work that was done by the Applicant was done well, 2) the fact that this is a sensitive site and that we are relying on an existing "system" for groundwater in terms of the topography, 3) that it is difficult

to tell where the septic is on two of the lots and how the septic interacts with setback requirements, 4) the data that is being relied on is very old, and that the information provided should be confirmed, and 5) that maintenance is a big issue – someone would clearly need to be responsible for the maintenance of the proposed system otherwise it would not function as necessary.

D. Hill – one of the biggest concerns is water. Concern about impervious surfaces. We need to be confident in the base line information going into the model. One major issue related to this concern is that the soil test pits and seasonal groundwater information was provided from 1987. There is a concern about reliability of the data with it being so old. Question for Mr. Reardon – compliance with the stormwater requirements is a requirement of our regulations so can we require confirmation on where the stormwater will go? Two infiltration systems have been proposed. Is it appropriate to ask for updated test pits to confirm the data?

Mr. Reardon believed it would be prudent to make sure the basis of the information being included in the model is accurate and 30 year old data is too old in this circumstance.

D. Hill – asked current owner, who was in attendance where the septic on 209 Old Connecticut Path was. Confirmed it is on the lawn area in front of garage and is a pump system from 2007.

J. Steel – asked for a short description on the proposed drainage system.

Mr. King for the Applicant discussed the systems being proposed, including a swale and stormwater treatment unit which will flow into the proposed basin. Bottom of basin will have topsoil removed and stone put in. Discussed infiltration rates and run off for site.

Mr. Reardon – confirmed the assumed infiltration rate.

S. Sarkisian – mentioned he went out seven times to the site the week prior to the meeting and no standing water was observed even with very heavy rain. Still a concern on access to the basin by the Town. He requested truck access to the basin through an enlarged easement.

D. Hill – recap on the discussion on the road and making the road a public road. Mr. Hill mentioned the road could be considered a road versus a common driveway but still be maintained privately.

J. Steel – asked if the grading of the site necessitated the adding of stone to the basin. Would a grassier surface be easier to maintain over time? Discussion ensued over the options between J. Steel, Mr. King and Mr. Reardon and the possibility for maintaining the basin as grass.

Mr. King – as discussed by Mr. Reardon and the Board, he agreed to add the location of the septic systems on the Plan.

D. Hill – Board of Health was meeting the day following the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Hill mentioned the Planning Board needs the recommendation of the Board of Health.

Dr. Klempner – comment on the data question from Mr. Reardon on whether he would be looking for evidence from Mr. King on seasonal high water reading.

Mr. Reardon – additional comment on the marking of the retention basin as it is important that the future homeowners/developer not do anything to impact that basin. Mr. King pointed out that the drainage easement runs in the entire area of the basin.

D. Hill – on the issue of the Plan not showing mature trees, he did confirm the requirement is in the Board's Regulations.

Mr. King – responded there could be 50 or 60 mature trees on this site, though it may make sense to locate specimen trees and include those on the Plan. The Board settled on locating hardwoods of 15" or more and pines of 24" or more. Mr. King agreed to provide on the Plan for the next hearing.

Comment from Dan Keating – 10 Cole Road – there are trees in the rear of the lot which provides for a visual break between the lots. Mr. Keating also later made the statement that Dr. Klempner was a great man and neighbor and wanted to show his support.

D. Hill – as pointed out in the Tetra Tech report, the cul de sac bulb at the end of the road is not in compliance with the Board's Regulations. Mr. King reported the size is the same as originally approved and that a waiver was included in original decision. D. Hill asked Mr. Reardon to weigh in on whether the smaller road ending would allow for a higher density than otherwise would be allowed if it was in compliance with the Board's Regulations. Mr. Reardon responded that it could allow for increased density.

D. Hill – recapped the discussion on sidewalks and the width of the road. N. Riley responded that her understanding of the prior discussions was that the neighbors did not want increased width in the road with the addition of sidewalks, nor did the Board support more impervious surface. There was also a confirmation by Mr. Sarkisian that the Fire Chief was satisfied by the access, which included two emails.

D. Hill – recommended that finish floor elevation be included in the Plan. Some grading shows water running back into the garages.

Mr. King – confirmed on the issue related to the old data that he would get groundwater readings and would provide the same to Mr. Reardon. Mr. Reardon reiterated that he would like to see both data and logic behind the application of the same to be able to better review the information for the next meeting. The next meeting was scheduled

around the timing on the receipt of data by Mr. King and being able to provide the same to Mr. Reardon.

D. Hill – asked if Mr. King could address the issue of development affecting the stormwater for different size houses. The Board had a discussion on the possibility of being able to limit impervious surfaces for the various lots and possible solutions, including an envelope for Lot 2a, including language in the drainage easement as to what can be done/not done to the basin, etc. Mr. King also pointed out that each of the lots has a leaching pit to account for development, though the issue is more the driveway, not necessarily the houses because of the leaching pit. Mr. King agreed to include in the model more room for development on the lots for impervious surfaces. As currently included in the Plan, the house sizes are much smaller than would be developable. D. Hill called the same a sensitivity test of sorts.

A. Reck – discussed the change to the driveway and garage location on Lot 2a as shown on the revised Plan. Creates a shorter driveway and minimizes impact on Lot 1.

Mr. Reardon – pointed out that the biggest concern is interaction of stormwater and septic systems. Since the property is in Zone 2, only 4 bedroom houses can be built. On the originally approved plan, the houses were 1,100 sf, not including the garage.

D. Hill – asked the interest of the Applicant for including actual house sizes as a condition. The Applicant did not wish to do so as he would not be the one doing the development of the site and did not wish to tie the hands of the developer, but did agree that for any enlargement there would be appropriate mitigation.

I. Montague – pointed out that the sites would be constrained by the setback and drainage easement, in particular on Lot 2a.

S. Sarkisian – would recommend a building envelope, at least for Lot 2a. Also, he mentioned the dogwood tree and lilac bushes that were agreed to be saved and that a restrictive covenant would be required on both sides for Lot 1 and Lot 2a.

J. Steel – any interest in having the drainage easement area as a no disturb zone, but allowing for maintenance? Mr. King responded he had seen language along those lines in a drainage easement.

S. Sarkisian – went through the Planner Memo distributed to the Board. The Board touched on 2, 3 and 4 so #1 was discussed, including the recommendation that the Board consider a restrictive covenant that the site not allow the development of a comprehensive permit.

There was a motion to continue the hearing on this matter to April 25, 2017 from A. Reck. I. Montague seconded. 4-0 in favor. Followed by roll call vote. K. Murphy was no longer available.

No public comment was presented.

Wayland Real Assets Planning Committee update:

N. Riley presented an update on the WRAP Committee, including the final report being compiled prior to the end of April as a culmination of two years' worth of efforts and data compilation by the members. G. Schuler was in attendance from the Committee as well. It was agreed that the draft report would be submitted to the Board for review and comment prior to the next meeting on April 25th. The goal was to have the report submitted to all Boards and Committees and available to the public by the end of April for comment. Forum for the draft report to be held May 17, 2017. An additional meeting to be scheduled if necessary depending on attendance.

Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair 48 Hours In Advance Of the Meeting:

D. Hill – spoke with D. Levine (new selectman) on School Street 40B development. The next step is filing the application with the Town as Mass Housing approved the initial application. The Board discussed the possibility for creating an ad hoc committee for guiding the ZBA on the process, consultants to hire for review, etc. D. Hill was floating the topic to see if there was support for the same. A. Reck responded that so long as the ZBA was receptive he thought the support was a good idea. Mr. Sarkisian pointed out that the Town has not received a 40B application in eight years.

S. Sarkisian also gave an update on the CVS project – meeting coming up with the appellant and the developer. Condition was included in prior decision where not all parking spaces needed to be built before it was determined they were needed.

S. Sarkisian – let the board know that on Rice Road the motion to dismiss from the Greenways was denied. We may need to do an executive session in the near future to determine the path forward for the Board.

General discussion on the need to recap the Spring Town Meeting and set goals for next year for the Board.

Mass Housing Certification process and update

D. Hill – four projects have been completed in Wayland for 40B. For completed projects there is supposed to be a cost certification and any profits above a certain level are to be reinvested in affordable housing. 3 projects are a priority for a cost certification being received and reviewed by the state. Board of Selectman sent a letter to Mass Housing in August and Mass Housing responded in September acknowledging the cost certification was outstanding at that they would follow up. No movement since. Next step is to escalate the letter.

A. Reck moved to adjourn the meeting. N. Riley seconded. 3-0 in favor.