

PB mtg 1/31/05

Present: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, and George N. Lester
Absent: Elissa G. Franco and Timothy P. Sullivan

PB mtg 3-7-05

Present: All Board members

John Levin – West Street development

Dan Merrikin – CP for West Street – final design – quick overview – 38 units – Potpourri off page – residential across the street – 2 way drive around – parking and garages – 3.9 per unit parking 0 1700 to 2200 Condo style – colonial design – 3 bedroom – looking for comments as designing – mostly 2 car but some are single garage – one has 2 (one behind other) – 114 total bedrooms – looking at possibly going to 2 bedroom units if salable – 25% solid as affordable – spread through out

Levin – mix of styles within the affordable units

Lester – what impact will it have on Medfield's ?

Levin – last year 0.5%

Lester – would there be more benefits if more affordable units

Levin – no – must sell at what the state allows

Dan – Concom has approved some area – wetland boundary is clear – driveways all around – taking out the foundation wall

Lester – will it leave the remainder out of conformance with zoning?

Dan – no

Lester – length of culdesac –

Dan – 500 feet. – measured at 425

Steve – reason on driveways

Dan – cut down on curbcuts

Steve – provide emergency access

Dan – created 3 lots and will remove the middle lot – middle will go to the commercial site – parcel that will be cleaned up and go to the commercial site

Levin – left open the object so that ZBA can decide where they would want it best – one condo parcel

Dan – Dale street with subdivision – one condo association for the whole place

Tim – over view concern about high amount of impermeable surfaces – narrow cuts into driveway – a lot of pavement – only at 33% impervious substance – 22 feet for 2 way traffic

Dan – Fire chief – 22 – would like to see a sidewalk (police and fire) – 25-26 feet width – don't know how much visitor parking required

Tim – fewer bedrooms – look at Bridlefield development which sold exceedingly well

Levin – on going process – have heard town would like lower bedrooms

Concluded

Signed plan and covenant for Erik Road

OLDE VILLAGE SQUARE

Hearing convened at 8 p.m with a reading of the legal notice previously read at the opening on February 14, 2005 when the hearing was continued without discussion.

Tom Connery, representing Unique Homes, provided a slide presentation. He indicated that they had also done the Preserve at Kingsbury, the “Barn Home,” Orchard Street Estate House, traditional houses, and the Boston Magazine 2002 Design Home. The property that is the subject of this application includes 88 – 108 Spring Street, seven acres south of the village. It is located in an RU zoning district. No waivers are asked for. The FAR and Lot coverage are in compliance. The project is intended for “empty nesters.” The typical buyer would be downsizing. The units range from 1700 s.f. to 2700 s.f. and have 2 bedrooms, 2 ½ bath, a 2 car garage, and special indoor/door living space.

Ralph Costello, developer, explained that the design was his main goal. He wanted it to look and feel like a neighborhood.

- Townhouses front on a street
- Tree lined street & sidewalks connecting homes, streets & center – encourage walking
- Open village green in center of the site
- Auto free streetscape – auto, garages & driveways are located behind – all garages are back loaded
- Autos replace with front porches – unbroken line of grass – village green – don't see asphalt and car from street
- Security & privacy – fences surround – secure path from car to the residence – an alternative would be a parking lot
- Visual privacy between each townhouse – windows on only one side
- Vista Privacy – landscape buffer surrounding as well as a 6-8 foot fence – Village Green is the centerpiece 75% have a view of the Green
- Home designs that fit into the neighborhood – average 2300 sq ft. size – distinctive design feature (front & side porches)

- Home designs that offer a sense of place and identity – often built all alike, but not here - varied designs and floor plans and front elevations as well as the size
- Exterior Living Opportunities – front porches, patios/decks, private gardens ; private decks on the 5 unit condos
- Sense of community – positive interaction of neighbors

George Matarazzo – Land Planning Associates – Landscape Architect – more specifics – 44 homes in a townhouse setting – several types of home – four 5unit buildings – others townhomes Design a site that reflected arch along Spring Street. – leave sidewalk and then a second sidewalk within the development – trying to save some of the trees along Spring Street - elevations and buildings that reflect streetscape – at end looks like a single family home (24) around – same elevation reflects the park – 5 units parking into garage – put cars in the back – one way street so can narrow pavement, plus helps with pervious surfaces – guests will park on the street – brick pavement that allows percolation through the site – simple stonewall with a sign on it – traditional houses – landscaped to block sight of garage doors – 8 foot sidewalk around the green – raised the houses 3 feet above grade – above the sidewalk – motor court side of unit will have a deck looking onto the motorcourt – RR tracks sunk down about 10 feet – fencing the entire property plus additional landscaping (dark color on plan indicates existing tree) – garages are faced so could have Village green – also did not want to put up against rear lot line – anywhere from 45-50 feet to rear lot line – gardens well over 50 ft from surrounding area – propose to save trees either by site plan or will also move some trees – existing old plants to be saved – think about scale of the neighborhood – everyone wants a sense of ownership of space – people love these gardens – sense of a real home – illustrates there is enough room to do much – not just a straight townhouse – north-facing walls are solid – south-facing windows – meant to be an Olde village – landscaping wise – eventually the trees will grow (start 2 – 2 ½ in.)

Rob Truax, GLM Engineering, – unique in some areas – location of site – current single family homes – relatively flat – railroad in rear – Curve Street to east – site runoff toward Spring Street – needed to mitigate the increases in flow – done testings on the site – sands and gravel soils – looped road system – roadways to the rear of the buildings – 22 foot width front and 18 feet behind houses – Town of Medfield water and sewer - hydrants (4) will reconfigure – challenge for drainage – area in yellow is drainage system – leeching pits – underground leeching pits – 18 feet diameter 16 in courtyard – half dozen in site and then at entrance – able to recharge in the site – no increase – can handle 100 year storm – small storms recharged into the ground – does satisfy Board of Health requirements and Subdivision Rules and Regulations. Working with Board of Health and will critique again and will satisfy their requirement. Lamp posts throughout the site and doors - no floods or spots – Fire Chief has looked at – has access to the entire site and his truck can get around.

Jeb Santacruz, traffic engineer: development with Spring and Main Streets – looked other developments in the area - used standard study - evaluated proposed site driveway – yes, there are ques and delays getting through the intersection – development will have a minor impact at the intersection – am/pm increase by one car each way prime times – 4-8 seconds difference – did not reduce the level of service of that intersection – evaluated left turns into the site – do not meet any warrants to allow left turn – all exit one driveway – there are acceptable sight distances – overall impact exiting the site in terms of volume - 0.5% increase of the total traffic – one car

every five minutes – submitted to review (Earth Tech) – do agree – have prepared a response – nothing has changed the level of service

Chairman Lester asked for questions from the Board members.

Wright Dickinson asked why Curve Street was not part of the review.

The traffic engineer replied that when he looked at the directions of traffic in the area he did not consider enough there was enough traffic there.

Wright Dickinson said he drives through it and it is difficult.

The traffic engineer replied that during the peak hour 7 cars would be coming or going in the southerly direction.

Mr. Dickinson questioned that 88 parking spaces would generate only 27 trips.

The engineer replied that the Institute of Traffic Engineers looks at these and generates a graph with a proposal – when talking about a project – not everybody leaves at the same time of day or work – during the peak hour there will be 27 but less at other hours.

Mr. Dickinson/Chairman Lester: What are the peak hours?

Reply: 7-9 a.m. and 6-8 p.m.

Lawyer – followed what was in the book

Mr. Dickinson questioned why a study was not done for weekends.

Reply: normally weekends have less traffic because fewer people are working

Mr. Dickinson noted that it has been his experience that it is tough on weekends. He asked for accident information.

The traffic engineer replied that he did contact the local police but it was not on computer – may have some additional – can only give what has been reported.

Mr. Dickinson ISD not met at the desirable speeds of 40 & 45.

The engineer said must provide constant eye sight for the posted speed limit; then looked at what the average – the intersection was 55 feet short at the posted 45 mph; do meet it at the 40 mph south of the intersection – Earth Tech did not consider the 5 mph difference important

Mrs. Franco questioned how many occasions did they do counts.

The traffic engineer replied normally they do a one day count and then use the Mass highway information.

Mrs. Franco questioned what day the count was done.

Reply: On a Wednesday or Thursday. This was in October.

Mrs. Franco said she drives Curve Street daily. There is a backup when approaching Curve Street. She also expressed concern for speed. In addition she considered that there must be some impact at route 109.

Reply: There is a 4-8 second delay on that intersection; an increase of one car – split cars among the 3 approaches

Mrs. Franco observed that the split is very close to the intersection and often she cannot get into the split. She would like to lessen the impact on the Curve Street neighborhood. Any additional traffic in the area will impact Curve Street.

Mr. Sullivan agreed. It is a most used “pressure valve” – it goes no where, but every where when things are backed up - get the sense that fully maxed out – all is obviously permitted – all at the minimum- 34.9% FAR and coverage – wondering how it is going to look – nothing built this dense and of this character – remarkable design but wondering if everything thought through – eg. snow removal – how is it going to be handled from a community – also garbage removal – how does it get picked up? – concerned about fire and ambulance access – effort to max out the property could be a detriment to all living there – Gardens re space could be quite lovely – wonder if enough sunlight down between the buildings – 35 feet height and 30ft. width – permitted, fits, but does it work?? – troubled by the density of the project.

Mr. Costello replied that there is a plan for the snow removal – green could serve to store snow – association may have to take snow off site

Mr. Matarazzo, Land Planning Consultant, replied that they met with snow consulting removers – have done these communities and it works out – sometime people do not go to work that day – some of the snow will be stored in town – garden thing is a great question – cannot max every courtyard – summer sun at 72 degrees – will get morning sun and some afternoon – not pure sunlight but charming spaces – have worked with spaces like this – charming spaces in the country like this – Luisburg square gardens in an interior courtyard which is totally enclosed – would not do unless thought would be positive.

Chairman Lester questioned the density asking what the trade off was - smaller units and more compact – if zoning allows 49 units

Mr. Costello replied. He decided he did not want to do 49 units – looking at the market and what could do and what made for the best site – acquired site by getting more property – could have negotiated down from 49

Mr. Matarazzo said the sqft made a big difference. They could build 1200 s.f. units but that is not what the buyer wants – appears to be more dense

Mr. Sullivan said he had no doubt there is a market, but expressed concern that the project is maxed out 34.9% - understand a commercial interest in this – wonder if hurt self by pushing – more problems in getting that last sqft in - He questioned a plan for an association.

Richard Gallogly, attorney, said it would be a typical condo association – exclusive of the court yard, but the rest is common space

Mr. Sullivan noted that trees in streets would be public space.

Mrs. Franco observed that units 6 and 7 and 18 and 19 back up on one another.

Mr. Matarazzo explained that when reach end were having all the units face south so connect – one court yard facing north which would have a special garden – also adds variety to the architecture.

Mr. Lester questioned how many existing homes would be removed.

Mr. Truax replied 7.

Mr. Matarazzo added that at least one is of interest to the Historical Commission.

Mr. Connery said that would be #100.

Mr. Costello added that they have a history of trying to preserve and maintain – eg. Kingsbury Pond site – this is a structure that if they could save it they would – did go through the process of and applied for the Historical – if someone has a plan other than including it, he is open to hear the plan – it requires land – very creative if answer – answer not to save it on this site

Mr. Dickinson again questioned density – need to determine is placement appropriate and compatible with the surrounding – look at what is in the rest of the neighborhood – there is nothing like what you are proposing.

Mr. Gallogly replied that the site is zoned multifamily. The existing houses will be gone. These are not massive structures and are consistent with the size and architecture in Medfield.

Mr. Dickinson questioned the density.

Mr. Gallogly replied that it meets the zoning.

Mr. Matarazzo explained that it is the allowable use. They tried to pickup a scale from the neighborhood – take end units so looks like a house on the street – 5 units could not be so, so incorporated gables and architectural changes – height of buildings – will be different colors (a mix of soft earth tones) - try to save some trees here – landscaping important pushing the

buildings back with the landscaping – picked this entrance (exit?) because across the street is a home with a hedge row – headlights will not shine into the house.

Chairman Lester asked about Board of Health's agent Mr. Domey's, concern about underground drainage.

Mr. Truax replied that they have placed them around and they have proven not to fail. Lag leeching beds fail. The pits fill progressively. This is much better for the site. Treatment before water goes into the site, did spread out (were in more compact) – could have just put a pond in there but would not have looked as well

Chairman Lester question if they are the same devices used at the Ben Franklin Bank.

Mr. Truax replied that those are plastic and that he would be giving more calculations to the agent.

Chairman Lester reminded him that they also need to satisfy the Planning Board engineer.

Mr. Truax said he has addressed his concerns.

Chairman Lester discussed the lighting proposal and question two sets of lights on the perimeter shining in the neighbors' yards.

Mr. Connery replied that they are at the corners and are critically placed.

Mr. Truax said there would be no lighting on the back of any of the units.

Mr. Matarazzo and Mr. Truax said they could make adjustments.

Chairman Lester noted that the Board has always been conscious of lights into the neighbors property.

Mr. Truax said he would take a look at it.

Chairman Lester then opened the meeting to comments from the public.

William Hajjar, 78 Spring Street, commented that the lights from Medfield Gardens are a bother to the neighborhood and cautioned that they should be careful with this site.

Chairman Lester question the light pole spec on the plan.

Mr. Matarazzo answered 12 foot.

Carol Wallace, 105 Spring Street, said she had issues with the designs which do not fit into neighborhood which consists of small capes and ranch houses. She observed that they said it brings a sense of community, but observed that it divides the community that is already there.

She lives in the house right across the street from the new development. One concern she has is lighting, especially lighting for 88 units. That is a lot more light than 8 houses. She said that she is please that they will keep trees. Taking down trees and putting up buildings have effect on noise. She said she would like to see tall and thick plantings between the two sidewalks to help with the noise. She would also like to see them incorporate 100 Spring Street into their design. She encouraged that they put a fence along the Spring Street side in addition to the rear and sides.

Chairman Lester noted that such a fence would block off the view. He then asked if there would be a sidewalk behind the existing one.

Attorney Gallogly responded that the internal sidewalk is part of the private condo.

Mr. Matarazzo added that it is 20 feet to the side walk. He felt a fence in front would be like putting up a wall. They should "celebrate Spring Street.

Nancy Hinkley, 86 Spring Street, said she would not like to see it boxed in, but would rather see some houses.

Carol Wallace said she would prefer to see plantings.

Nancy Hinkley said she did look at the lighting and that Mr. Costello had said they would be shaded and would not reflect.

David Cole, 10 Curve Street, said his house will be right where cars make the turn. There is a fence along the wall. How close to the wall is the fence? Will the wall be taken down?

Mr. Matarazzo said they would put the fence on their property if that worked better.

Chairman Lester asked that they regulate the lighting and adjust the poles.

Mr. Sullivan said they should put lights on outside and shine inward.

Brian McGillicuddy, 25 Oriole Road, questioned the fence.

Mr. Matarazzo replied that it would be a solid fence.

Mr. McGillicuddy questioned how many guest parking spaces would there be.

Mr. Matarazzo explained that every home has a 2 car garage and then room for 2 cars behind. Then there are 100+ spaces along the roadway. People would only see 5 or 6 cars.

Mr. McGillicuddy asked if it would be a private way? (yes) He said he was assuming middle age adults. What about school children? Where will school buses park? (outside of Spring St). He observed that Curve Street has a lot of traffic. He asked if there was an additional lane for traffic to get around this development. He was further concerned that there was additional RU lots that

will be developed creating more units and a lot of traffic. Need to look at a potential bottleneck – should think ahead - should be a separate lane to get into this development.

School buses would stop at the driveway.

Phil Tuths, 117 Spring Street, said he knew Mr. Costello was putting together a development, but he is shocked at the density – it is maxed out – homes next to one another – looking at the potential of Medfield center – which is all zoned there – could be there – you can build to a certain extent – maxing out is greedy – impact – people will go over Curve Street to avoid the lights at the center – The Curve Street bridge is a dangerous bridge – There are no sidewalks – there have been a number of accidents at the intersections 27/109 – they have police details at St. Edward's just so cars can get out – concerned for the number of cars and guests – traffic does backup along Spring Street just about to his house – not in the character of the neighborhood – was expecting it to be more consistent - looks like 22 single family homes with condos – density and traffic is a problem

Chairman Lester: board did propose a zoning change to reduce the FAR in response to mansionization and it was defeated at town meeting – we did try – town made a policy decision – so this is what happens

Mr. Tuths: do not have to build out

Mr. Costello replied that the units are 1700 sf – 2700 sf ---- small property – 2300 sf is probably the average of Spring St., Miller St. area

Mr. Tuths: traffic concerns will not go away – average traffic speed is high

Chairman Lester: clearly concern of traffic on Curve Street – He asked that they look at the impact on Curve Street.

Mr. Sullivan said it has been suggested that Curve Street is a pressure release valve – many people will make the left

Mr. Finn said he lives on Curve Street and expressed concern for sight lines – no sidewalks – the playground – the bridge is blind – very busy street

Carol Wallace asked how long for construction

Mr. Costello replied 2.5 to 3 years.

Mr. Tuths said there is a need for safe access – sidewalks

Board voted to continue the public hearing to April 11th at 8 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

Present: All members and Mark Cerel, Town Counsel

STREETS FOR ACCEPTANCE

Voted to recommend acceptance at town meeting.

GREEN STREET - BOND

Yes, bond necessary.

MEDFIELD STATE HOSPITAL

George explanation of what is happening for the benefit of the students present.

Drew Leff - representing DCAM - presentation of proposals

DL - orientation to the site - have agreed parcel to be continued to be used for public safety - another for public recreation - surrounding the core campus will go to DCR with agricultural and conservation restrictions on it - core campus (yellow are deemed not historic and could be demolished - some others may also be removed - agreed upon rescue plan - continued care living - portion for over 55 - retaining historic buildings and cottages and building new buildings where there are disturbed area - organized around quadrangles - apartments and senior in center - 12 cottages plus additional 19 single family homes in a "village" on small lots, series of quadrangles and open space around - land to the Charles would maintain as conservation/agric land - water tower to the town for general use and an easement access to it. Only access into it would be via Hospital Road - currently complying a traffic study - current zoning is BI which does not allow residential - residential plan focused on seniors - works economically - concern for cost of redeveloping the buildings - developer will need to pickup - issue is how to create zoning so pb can review plans close to what is planned - concerned that the impacts on the town are no greater - Medfield State Overlay District follows the underlying BI zone - looked at as one zone - single family area - core zones - so 4 sub districts (A - Agricultural/Conservation District no build - B - entry area no build - C - village district - single family homes D - multifamily district) can put different kinds of restrictions in the areas.

DL Went over the "Overview" - SPP - to control # of reviews - need to discuss with TC - suggested go in a - said want to limit the # of single family homes to 35 - wireless only on building or structures (SEE HAND OUT)

George - would like town and state on same page - avoid confusion - Sselectmen have voted to support the Model plan - would like a Memorandum of Understanding between the town and the state about what will be done - e.g. - survey, sequencing of events

Drew - intension to go under DCR prior to going to STM - in terms of memo will talk with the board

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

Mark – some need to be addressed in that fashion – confusing here with somethings belong-
bothered by the subdistricts

George – before

Mark – if overlay covered just one district – implementing plan for just this district – the concept
of spot zoning and contract zoning

Steve – important effective – do need to approve at STM – 2/3 vote – if conferred before STM
will be more confident

Mark – put restrictions in place, do not need zoning – overlay would pick up on it –
selfcontained overlay district – not reference to outside docu

Steve – two components – Village and other

Mark – key to have a very tight Memorandum of Understanding – zoning piece will have
flexibility – nonresponsive proposal – pb needs to have the usual authority to make the necessary
findings – still have discretion - need to consider the future

Drew – should be looking to zoning overlay not to provide protection – can make it restrictive to
the model plan

Mark – may come out that way – should have it so a screening process

Drew – special legislation that would restrict the proposed development to this plan – will need
to have in place before STM – safe guard

Tim – what if bids that come in do not reflect what the town and state have agreed upon

Mark – would have to be part of the memorandum

Drew – would not get through zoning

Mark – concern has to be a 40b

Drew – working so not use 40b – can't go against a state law but require developers to submit
plan that meets the design – if deve does nto comply then state comes back and take back the
land - here because want to work a zoning that reflects – zoning and memorandum will protect

Mark – memorandum will afford the town protection – in Foxboro the state did not like any bids

Drew – the wining bidder on that auction must go with the plan (Foxboro)

George – want because it is a lot of work – want some protection that will not go to auction

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

Drew – time limit on it – it won't fall within it – here because we do not want to do it

Mark – overlay district done all of the time – nothing magical – it will be the enabling piece to all the developer to do

Elissa – are there other agricultural districts that would be advantageous

Mark – it is not agri but rather BI and multifamily districts

Elissa – what kind of impact on other BI districts

Mark – was concerned about just this area – colleagues at state would allow to fly

Drew – overlay whole area

Mark – if limited to core area – agri – put CRs in and that will help

Drw – DCR will take it under their control but not designate to town – get together with Mark to go over

Mark – looking at it from a format status – memo – would recommend criteria would become findings – productive to sit down and go over

George – will be hiring a consultant to review – SPP is new – the system we have

Mark – when it is developmental issues – nothing stopping – this is more a planned development – can bond and site plan approval

Drew – felt better to have in one place

Wright – drainage for the site

Drew – have an engineer to look at that issue – currently into drains underground – less imperviable area in this plan – have not allowed with how it goes with Medfield Subdivision – civil engineer will go over

Steve – drainage should be required

Drew – no place to put a detention basin in the area – currently drain lines there

Wright – safe guard so deve does not do the ease pat – scenario whwere must complete certain things first

Drew – bond –

Mark – bonding under subdivision authority – craft some regulation

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

George – do not have a mechanism

Drew – anticipated to be driveways – they would build out the road

Mark – private roads and driveways

Tim – possibility of phased development part of the RFP??

Drew – likely to be phased

Mark – can do under conditions

Drew- will want to put in – want them to be required to restore the buildings and not leave after building single family homes – can't just build one part – should be able to put in zoning

Mrk – can put in zoning

Wright – cut through issue

Drew – property line does not come up to the neighboring road - can put landscaping requirements in the area

Wright – could buy the end lot and work something out

Mark – req a deve to grant the restrictions – not clear that the state is subject to granting to self – statutory mech whereby a private party can grant a permanent to the town

Steve – again want to have in place before

Mark – see some legislation from state

Drew – wouldn't the MOU do that – will try to put them in as actual easements

Steve – want to happen

Mark – if the trans to DCR then would be ok

George – move on – move forward – 10 points

- 1 – agree model plan
- 2 – parcels
- 3 – power plan
- 4 – demo of clark
- 5 – accomplish transfer to DCR with restrictions

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

6 – town and dcam agree on what protections go into zoning vs rfp (Drew questions this one define and put in mou\

7 – pb deve

8 - town takest ot tm

9- state issues rfp with specs

9 – state awards project

Drew – would need to work out with the BOS – need to go back to DCAM – have been drafting the special legislation – including –

George – want it to move along and not slow down

Steve – certain things

Wright – take what given for tonight to give to our

Drew – in terms of consultant – will work with Mark – get on board now with this – would refine – should go ahead

Mark – communications tower

Steve – send us a memo

Wright – would need the plan and charts with # of units – wanted all dated tonight

Richard Ross – state rep – and Sen Timilty – new – Lida did have DCAM and rep so could understand how handled – this is a model – able to hear that the proceeds go back to Mental Health – how to contact – great project – excited about it – will help in anyway that can

George - ? special legislation

RR – Lida is probably the key person to keep with

Sen Tim – concern that the town be protetcted – should not pay for por use – fall under committee – should be able to fast track – Paul Feeney hear – concerned on what deve paid – proceeds to mental helath and 40r

Steve – overall statement – tremendous amobut of work over the years – pb job to make sure that happends – what drafted is productive

Drew – will get better and bettere

George – 4 sub districts – 2 outside should be separate since not part of the parcel – do not need a's because be conveyed over

Steve – b is part of it – more b to the west of the entry

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

George – can't make a zoning subdistrict that you cannot build there – could include a view easement

Steve – want it prior to

Elissa – somethings will have to progress simultaneously

Wright – timeline on traffic study

Drew – next few days – expect a draft within the next few days

Elissa – subsequent meeting - table 6.3 are reversed - ? cluster for the single fmially

Wright - ? single family homes

Drew – showing 32 on plan but 35 in the zoning – rough plan – could possibly reduce density elsewhere

Wright – how feel about that

Elissa – model plan show 32 with 35 as a maximum

Drw – developer cannot exceed impacts

Elissa – possibly of trade with developer

Steve – appropriate

George – comments

John Harney - ? dev would take a restriction from DCR

Drew – land is states land – not given to DCR – concern that state puts a restriction on in favor of self – need to look at – it stays with the state

John – not convey to the town

Drew – cannot convey to the town for free – parcels are not given over for free – require the deve to convey to the town

John – that is a sore point

Drew – do not know it that oculd be worded

Steve – if get conservation restriction

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

Paul – as a private individual – came up at selectmen's meeting – there is a rep that no towns are going to get anything free – goes to dev and then dev gives to the town

Drew – justification is that deve is getting many benefits

Elissa – a condition of approval

Drew – as a condition

Mike – RFP called in Fox for fields to be given to the town

Drew – not RFP but one of the proposals submitted

Pete – land along hosp rd should not be dev

Town do want to have cell towers on the water tower – too close to existing

Opportunity for deve to be granted façade easements on the buildings

Housing concept is only one that will fly not sure of the assumptions – 175,000 per house lot – want a number (money) then lower the density if the value comes in

Tim – wuldn't that change what the deve has bid on – if over what negotiate with the state – instead revenues over should be shared with the town

Pete – will qualify under 40r – would prefer reduction – fifth idea – good idea to limit the # of bedrooms in the single family units

Steve – was ZBA

Pete – cluster – attached buildings – model if the buildings were attached

George – then you would be talking multi family

Ann – like Turtlebrook

Paul – once you attach they are multi family

Drew – looked at 40r in another area – regs should be out by now – need to be within a certain distance of public transit

Pete – there is a catchall that allows for large projects

Drew – would go back and look at – if so then would not need overlay district

Ann – a fall town meeting?

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

Wright – putting out rfp and if the information – reasonable – will be working on during the summer – need time in early fall to bring everyone up to date

George – make a reasonable goal – follow up meeting – agreement and steps

Concluded at 9:30 p.m

109 Spring Street Site Plan

George – In

Ed Griffin – 2 townhouses at Spring and Rhoddendrum – lot is
Meets all of the requirements for a two family lot
Approval from BH

Soils better at this site – all roof runoff into the recharge system – explained what a recharge system

George – make presentation – then board questions followed by public

Ed – remove some pine trees from the front rest would stay

Tim – frontage off Rhodd

Ed – yes – setback about 25 feet

Paul Rob – frontages Spring and – reviewed what have

Ed – two driveways with garage unders – lot slopes toward corner

Paul – flat thought out – no other drainage facility along Rhodd – no additional run off – actually reducing the amount of pervious surface on the property – taking out a large area of pavement – and the existing dwelling – existing area is 5390 sf. Proposing 4800 sf – there is no direct recharge now

Ed – final cal – reducing – half circles with stone, filter – under ground

Paul – excellent sandy soil

George – point to trees

Paul – Rhodd side is a large fir tree (30') but canopy is 20 ft. covering Rhodd – a number of white pines including ups against house – couple whit pine s and desicuous in back - reviewed the landscape p lan – along spring st a number of trees will stay – pines will come down and regarding in front of condos

Tim – is lot heavy wooded and dark

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

ED – yes

Tim –screening to neighs

Ed/Paul – yes

Paul – finished grading – retaining walls to allow the garage under – fence on the property line with #5 Rhodd will need to be moved closer to the property line – replace with a new 6 ft fence

Ed – garage under to keep the whole area smaller - grade does call for that along Rhodd

Paul – rises up 5 feet

Wright – foot pitch from driveway out – 4 foot wall t

Paul – five feet from the property line

Ed – interlocking blocks

Paul – 5 feet from the property line – should be ok

Wright – drainage structure right up to the rear lot - ? move more into the lot – recharging underground

Paul – better off keeping away from the foundation – similar to a septic leaching system – prevent any water getting back into the foundation – clean water

Wright – using 10 foot of the abutters property underground for drainage – want to make sure not putting hinderance on property

Ed – BOH did not raise any issue with it

Wright – seeing more and more of the recharge – using more

Ed – think Mr. D would have raised that issue if import

George –lighting

Ed – just the lights in the back and spot light in the back – two lamp posts in the front – spotlight on the back of the house – units are 2250 – four bedrooms each

George – FAR and lot meet

Ed – yes – probably close to half of what is allowed

George – questions from the board

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

Wright - utilities

Ed - attach right to the existing sewer line - will have to bring one more water line in off of either street

Carol - 105 Spring St - trees are mine - would request no spot lights in the back - invades privacy - lights on a building shielded are ok - would like more information on the leeching tank - what will see where the leeching tank (grass - all underground)

Paul - solid concrete tank - from down spots - solid pipe to the leeching facility - series of plastic containers with stone around - water goes into the system and percolates down into the ground

Carol - what about all the snow - ? swampy

Paul - conditions sandy and excellent for this type of conditions - no ground water down to 16 feet - water would have to rise up 16 feet - the down spouts have an emergency spill way - backup in the pipes and shoot out one to the ground. The conditions very good - ground will get saturated

Carol - have not found sand -

Paul - have dug two test pits witnessed with the BOH agent

Tim - suggested get BOH review from them

Carol - leave as many trees as you can - especially in the front - flowering tree in front

Paul - not proposing to take any

John Sale - #6 Rhod - Rhod is somewhat of a private street - street like the Baja - moving access from Spring to Rhod - holes 6in deep - as neighbor fix the holes - how ensure runoff will not pound on Rhod - think it will collect - trees hide power lines

Ed - they do not meet code - will be calling them to fix it - would like to get together with the town to accept the street - would be willing to work on

John - will be a mess

Ed - not sure to what extent

John - water runoff - concern will soften up - what doing is great

Tim - encourage to work with the neighbor

PLANNING BOARD
MARCH 14, 2005

George – do you have a legal right to use Rhodd – just private roads – rights to use the roads are subject to the deeds as to has the right to

Paul – deed for the property – conveyed a right to use Rhodd

Carol – what is the difference between the two zones

Ed – two different residential districts – allowed to go 30 feet into another zone

George – minim light – trees – something in Rhodd – street drainage issues

Tim – to tree issue – many cut along rhod – maintain some of trees

Elissa – on the roadway issue – he has right to improve it =- should talk with town and butters – cannot require him to do it

Wright – can make condition not make the road worse

George – could require some improvement

Elissa – concern water lines and heavy equip will cause

John – driveways will go into road

Ed – water is running into the recharge

Wright – will cause runoff onto rhod

Ed – if they all run – run down grass and into the street - thought reasonably nonaggressive – no problem no spot lines – work with the neighbors

Voted to close the public hearing at 10:30 p.m

Voted to approve 109 Spring street site plan with conditions

No spot lights in the rear

Max plantings/salvage of trees along rhod – keep existing trees where feasible

Integrate driveway - improve with the

Cannot create a worse condition on the road and hope will work with the road

Steve Browne not present for 109 Spring St.

Adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

Planning Board
Monday, April 11, 2005
7:30 PM

Present: George Lester, Elissa Franco, Tim Sullivan, Wright Dickinson

Meeting was called to order at 7:30.

Legal Notice for zoning amendment articles for the ATM2005 was read into the record by Chairman George Lester. Mr. Lester provided a brief explanation of proposed Article 17 regarding definition of side yard.

Public Comments

Leslie Shore, 315 North Street

If this bylaw had been in place last year it could have protected us with problems with daycare center. Would be very appreciative for a change for any future proposed uses.

Board agreed that is would provide more protection to residents.

Mr. Lester provided a brief explanation of Article 18 regarding site plan review triggers. Project cannot be segmented to avoid site plan review.

Public Comments

Tim Sullivan stated that this was meant to protect residents and the rights of neighbors. Alleviate commercial property growing without oversight of the town.

Gil Rogers, 283 North Street

Does it require site plan review if there is a change of use say single family to a daycare center? Is this included or is it just square footage? Will it cover residential change to non-residential change?

Elissa Franco responded that it is covered in this zoning amendment and would trigger site plan review.

Mr. Rogers was still concerned that the definition of non-residential was not clear nor was there a good definition of ground floor area, and this caused the ZBA to struggle. Would like the PB to review this for the next ATM.

Mr. Lester provided a brief explanation of Article 19 regarding the clarification of lighting of signs. Matt McCormack of the Sign Committee was present and agreed that this would make the bylaw less confusing.

Public Comments

Leslie Shore, 315 North Street

What department do you go through to get sign approval? Is signage addressed through Site Plan Review?

Tim Sullivan made a motion to close the public hearing, 2nd by Elissa Franco and the vote was unanimous.

Elissa Franco made a motion to support Article 17, 18 and 19 as written in the LEGAL NOTICE, 2nd by Tim Sullivan and the vote was unanimous.

7:45 Appointment with Nick Mihopolous

Would like to move his day spa from Dover to Medfield. Moving over the Thai restaurant and into the space currently occupied by Tim Borgher. There is a letter in the file confirming an agreement to lease the space.

Board would like applicant to come under Site Plan Review as his use is covered under Personal Services. Board asked applicant to contact Norma Cronin upon her return for a site plan review application.

8:15 Continued Public Hearing Olde Village Square

Board opened the continued public hearing and asked the applicant to provide an update

Mr. Tom Connory, VP of Unique Homes explained this was a continuation from March. The team of consultants was at the meeting and prepared to answer any questions particularly regarding Curve Street and a lighting/landscaping plan.

Art (?) was present as the Traffic Engineer and had completed additional study regarding Curve Street. One of the issues is that drivers discovered Curve Street when South Street was under construction and are still using it as a cut-thru. Speed limit is posted at 20 on Curve and 30 on South Street. Speed is not being observed nor is it being enforced. Initial Level of Service (LOS) stud showed impact to be negligible. Superimposed all of the traffic turning left onto spring and going to Curve and the LOS still showed no change. There was a slight increase and delay but LOS did not change. This was a very conservative look at the study.

Tim Sullivan said most of this is behavioral issues for drivers. It will add to que at Route 27/109 but que is blind at this point. Traffic engineer responded that those using Curve sreet are not out of towners, they are residents familiar with it. The proper progression of Route 109 and Route 27 needs to be addressed by the Town. Kristine Trierweiler explained that the town is still working with Mass Highway regarding the signalization.

PB asked if drainage information was available for the project yet and the BOH agent Mr. Domey has not finished his review. Project is on the agenda for Wednesday with the BOH so they should have an answer by then.

Wright Dickinson stated that number of residents had concerns regarding buffers, screening and landscaping. Had this been addressed since last meeting? Mr. George Mattarazzo, landscape architect, speaking for the development team said that on Spring Street no fencing would be put in just plant materials. Large (6-7) feet plants would be transplanted throughout the property as buffers. There will be a buffer between existing sidewalk and proposed new sidewalk area.

George Lester recommended making the streetscape look as natural as possible as well as achieve sense of safety in this area.

Wright Dickinson was concerned if these were slab on grade homes or had basements. A discussion ensued about if residents choose to finish basement (which will be an option) will that put the development over the allowed FAR. Attorney for the applicant stated that FAR only included 1st and 2nd floors not basements. Wright pointed out that FAR included basements if they were made habitable. Applicant stated again that target market is empty nesters, those with kids in college, etc. so shouldn't be a need for basement sleeping space. Would like Norma to talk with Building Inspector about this issue further.

Public Comments

Keith Dickers from BOH stated that Mr. Domey has not finished review and it should be available at the meeting on Wednesday.

Resident, 4 Curve Street

First pleased when heard it was Ralph Costello building project but quickly disheartened. Has 6 issues:

1. Public safety and traffic: Don't believe the traffic studies from either engineer. Situation is just not viable up there. Concerns for roadway and the park. Not satisfied that traffic study said traffic would be "negligible". This is not common sense.
2. Fire and Police Issues: Directly abuts a train tract. Is there an emergency plan in place for chlorine gas leak, an evacuation plan for the existing and proposed neighborhood.
3. Quality of Life: People don't move to Medfield for a city like development. If they want this go to California, Las Vegas, Newton not Medfield. With 3 bedroom units you will get families of 5 and 6 people.
4. Environment: how does this affect the depletion of the water resources.
5. Landscaping: Large caliper trees on site 150 year old birch trees, maples, etc. Mr. Costello needs to show interest in those trees. Most are marked to save only if field conditions allow.

6. Pushes Letter of Law: ask developer to do what is right by developer and neighbors and town. Needs a reduction in the number of units and an increase in the buffer.

Kevin Delaney, 6 Curve Street

Agree and 2nd everything my neighbor said. Has 2 small children and lives on Curve Street. Lived there for 14 years and has been raising safety issues for 14 years and no one is listening. Sidewalk was requested before bridge reopened and nothing. Traffic is getting worse. Kids are using street to get to park and this will remove all pedestrian access to park. Doesn't ring true that there will be no affect on traffic levels for this town.

Ralph Costello, Applicant

Traffic study is a science and is based on consultant review by the Planning Board with an independent consultant. Traffic for Curve Street was bad 15 years ago and has not improved. It is and always will be a problem. This won't further impact it....it has already been impacted.

Tim Sullivan asked about the density and landscaping. Ralph Costello stated that development was originally slated for 49 units but cut back to 44 to reduce density. There are less units and more FAR. Decision on density has already been made when this plan was presented. This utilizes the bylaw and is allowable. Tim Sullivan agreed that while allowable it does fall at the line of putting pressure on neighborhood. Planning Board tried to reduce the density allowable a few years ago at Town Meeting but it failed to gain the 2/3 necessary. Maybe this will regenerate the importance of this issue for the town. Mr. Sullivan suggested a decrease in density may be more saleable in the long run. The applicant has the right to do the plan but that doesn't mean this is the right plan. Ralph Costello stated they are committed to the plan. Woodland has 5.56 units per acre, Mayflower has 4.74 units per acre. With bigger acreage bigger density, Mdfld Gardens has 15.24 units per acre, Green has 14.79 units per acre and Mdfld Crossing has 13.33 units per acre.

Attorney for applicant stated that if this is allowable by right under zoning it should not be shocking that you see someone use the density allowed. Mr. Sullivan stated in six years on PB he had never seen an applicant use the density to this extreme and this is what seemed to be driving the opposition to the project.

Wright Dickinson and Elissa Franco were concerned about the number of bedrooms listed on the plan. Is it a master bedroom and 2 bedrooms for a total of 3 bedrooms? Ms. Franco was more comfortable with a 2 bedroom unit than 3 bedroom units.

Chris Potts, 7 Curve Street

I have 3 concerns:

1. Traffic Accidents from those taking left on 27 to get to Curve. Not a safe situation, no way to control flow of traffic turning left (Applicant stated 3 accidents in 2002, 1 in 2003 and none in 2004)

2. Traffic Study should be done to review the construction of Route 109 and its effect on this project and Curve Street.
3. South Street was under construction then there were 18 wheelers on Curve Street with school buses coming the other way. High School Track team running on Curve Street.

Wright Dickinson suggested a construction management plan would be a good idea by the applicant. Hard to police it but it's a start. Working with Ken Feeney and the BOS this can be developed and would address truck traffic, hours of operation, noise and dust.

117 Spring Street, Resident

Density is not appropriate. Danger on Curve Street and it's not safe now. A 19 foot roadway has never been safe. No sidewalk, no access across bridge. Any increase over 7 units already there is not acceptable. Basement finishing is an issue, bldgs are elevated by 3 feet who is going to check to make sure they don't exceed height requirements? Any increase in traffic is unacceptable.

Ralph Costello stated that units will be raised by 3 feet from grade to ridge. It's not cheating on zoning and is enforced by Building Inspector.

Mark Elliot, 4 Curve Street

What does this do to volunteer fire department. Kristine Trierweiler explained the town has transitioned to a full time 24/7 department. Would like to hear from fire dept regarding evacuation of train derailment, staffing can cover this type of development. Who do they see about the condition of traffic and safety of the roadway. PB referred them to the BOS.

George Lester stated that he understands the safety of Curve street but that it is already inherently dangerous and this new project will only increase that marginally.

Wright Dickinson suggested a right turn only sign. Small step but might be going in the right direction. Ralph Costello said at this point that is not incorporated into the plan. Traffic Engineer stated that will just force people to do "turn arounds" into other driveways. Traffic like water takes the path of least resistance and to go down Curve Street. PM traffics could be reversed for Curve Street.

Resident, 4 Curve Street

Reducing the density will reduce the traffic. Just reduce the number of units. The Preserve has fewer units and a little more space around them. The traffic consultant is paid to tell the Planning Board what you want to hear. He is paid and that's all there it to it.

Resident, 7 Curve Street

109 Construction will play a part in this. Needs to be addressed.

Elissa Franco suggested a no left turn between the hours of 7-9 AM and 4-6 PM similar to signs in Dover. School buses would obviously be excluded from this.

George Lester listed some items for the applicant to address:

- turn restrictions
- rumble strips
- no truck traffic (construction)
- better enforcement of speed limit
- traffic calming

Resident, 4 Curve Street

There will be more than 4 cars at 27/109 backing up. Density is the key here and what do we do now. What is our recourse? How can you help us with this?

Attorney for Applicant

It is presumptuous to say that density is what is causing the traffic

Ed Love, Boiling Spring Avenue

This is 10lbs of shit in a 2lb bag. Been here 37 years and it blows, no it sucks. 44 units equals 88 people on thanksgiving without any guests. Not acceptable. Maybe we should sell units with offer that first person hit can 1/2 of Ralph Costello's holdings.

Planning Board needs more information on the following:

Fire Chief (evacuation plan)

Entrance exit and enter

Construction Management Plan

Tree Retention Plan

Traffic Engineer should make suggestions for improving the safety, traffic calming, etc.

Dale's response to traffic engineer

Board of Health comments

Building Department height and basement questions

Elissa Franco made a motion to continue the public hearing to Monday, May 2nd at 8:00 PM, Tim Sullivan 2nd, all in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 10:10

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 9, 2005

Present: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, Elissa G. Franco, and George N. Lester (The Planning Board is currently down one member.)

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

DISCUSSION PLAN ON PHILIP STREET

Kevin Joyce showed the Board a discussion plan for property off Philip now or formerly owned by the Kelcourse family. The plan showed a potential lot layout for 7 lots. He said he would be working with Richard Merrikin on engineering the project. He stated there is a setback issue on Fairview Road. There currently is one home under construction as an ANR lot. He explained that he was here to get feedback from the Board before going forward with more engineering. He is proposing a 400+ foot road which they are reconfiguring to satisfy zoning. They are also working with the Conservation Commission regarding the wetland areas.

Planning Board Administrator Norma Cronin noted that she has been receiving many phone calls from people in the area about trees being cleared.

Kevin Joyce responded that he will speak to the people regarding the trees. He added that he represents a prospective buyer of the property and has asked the Kelcourses to stop cutting trees.

Mr. Lester asked if they would be reconfiguring lot 3.

Mr. Joyce said they can design to satisfy. He does not know of any waivers needed at this time.

Chairman Browne reminded Mr. Joyce that he must show control over the property before coming back either with a preliminary plan or a definitive plan.

OLDE VILLAGE SQUARE (Site Plan) – continued hearing

At 8:10 p.m. Chairman Browne continued the public hearing for the Spring Street property proposed as Olde Village Square.

Mr. Tom Connery, representing Unique Homes, commented:

1. They have concluded the matter before the Board of Health and have received approval with conditions.
2. He provided the Board with a proposed Construction Management Plan, a copy of which is in the file.
3. He proposed traffic calming measures to include
 - One way circulation
 - All vehicles exiting the site would stop before crossing the sidewalk
 - Banding would also be put in place to remind drivers
4. Regarding the Fire Chief's memo, a copy of which he just received this evening
 - He met with Chief Kingsbury couple of months ago
 - They discussed the major circulation plan with regard to minimum requirements

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 9, 2005

Chief Kingsbury spoke that he submitted pictures at the time when Medfield Woods was seeking a Comprehensive Permit from the Board of Appeals and at that time suggested a standard of no less than 20 foot wide paved roadway. He stated the ambulance is 9.5 feet wide. He continued that, if a car is parked along the side of a way, the likely hood of that way being blocked when the way is less than 20 feet, is high, and that would be the case, especially in the back of this site. He strongly suggested that the Board should allow nothing less than a 20 foot wide way.

Chairman Browne noted that the primary access is proposed at 22 feet wide.

Chief Kingsbury responded that the primary access is ok, but access to the rear of these building is important given the density of the project. Some places are only 10 feet apart and with plantings, thus, the firemen cannot put a ladder up between the structures. He continued explaining that the four multi-unit buildings will be sprinkled as required by code. He suggested that the others should be as well, but noted that he could not require them to be. He explained that the fire department needs response space. He also reminded people that the space becomes more difficult in winter when there is snow piled up around the sides of the roadways. He acknowledged that the heavy buffer planned in the rear was to cover noise. He said that he is comfortable with the location of hydrants.

Mr. Dickinson, following a list of concerns expressed at the last meeting by neighbors, asked about an evacuation plan in the event of a toxic spill on the railroad tracks.

Chief Kingsbury responded that it is no different then the rest of the community. They would handle it in the same manner as any other area along the track. There is no difference because of the size of the project.

Chairman Browne asked the Applicant if he could make the changes requested by the Fire Chief.

Richard Gallogly, attorney for the applicant, responded that he thought there is adequate access. He added that they have shown that a fire-truck can make the turn around the building. No parking is allowed in the rear of the buildings except in the areas directly behind the garages. All owners are required to put their cars in the garage.

Ralph Costello, the applicant, said he doesn't see parking along the 16 foot strip in the back because it would violate all the neighbors.

Chairman Browne asked what is between the roadway behind the buildings and the property line.

Mr. Conery answered that it is landscaped buffer.

Chairman Browne asked if they could take the last four feet and make it passable by a vehicle.

Rob Truax, engineer, responded that they would have to pull the trees back. He thought the road in front is the main road. The idea of the road around the back was not for people to drive around, just those who live there. He added that they showed that the Chief's fire-truck can go around. He pointed out on the plan. He stated the fire hydrants are all in front. If several cars

PLANNING BOARD

MAY 9, 2005

are parked then the trucks would not be able to get by. This would also impede neighbors getting by.

Mr. Costello stated that the association documents require owners to pull their cars into the garage leaving the 20-foot area behind the garage open for other vehicles so that no one should be parking in the traveled way.

Mr. Brown asked if the 20 feet is measured from the garage out?

Mr. Costello responded, yes.

Mrs. Franco questioned the distance between units.

Mr. Costello stated that they are 10 or 12 feet apart at the narrowest point depending on the design of the unit and it opens to as much as 35 feet. The length is 75 feet.

Mrs. Franco asked how difficult it was to fight a fire in the 10 foot opening and 75 feet deep.

Chief Kingsbury explained that the area would have trellis and other plantings narrowing their access and making it more difficult.

Mrs. Franco asked if the area of concern was just in the back.

Mr. Truax explained that the roads are 16 feet on sides as well as the back.

Mr. Costello added 16-18 feet. 16 feet in the rear and 18 feet on the sides.

Mrs. Franco asked if the units on the side also had 20 feet behind the garages.

Mr. Costello said they are the same with the same parking restrictions.

Chief Kingsbury said the problem is access to the rear. He said there can be all the signs up and requirements in the covenant but he wondered who will enforce it when the holidays come.

Mr. Tortorici added that when they are working on the units, trucks will be parking out back. He spoke of getting carpeting or appliances, furniture etc. delivered. Someone needs to police it. He said his concern is public safety and in this case that includes access. The 20 feet width should be a mandate. The density here is great. Consideration of the 18 foot width is a potential problem. This is still an issue to be addressed

Mr. Lester checked that there is a 20 foot space from the road to the garage door.

Mr. Costello confirmed that and said that he does not think anyone will park in the roadway. There will be a requirement that people who live there must pull their car in. At no time would anyone be allowed to park there, even if they break down they must be towed immediately.

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 9, 2005

Mr. Lester asked for verification that the area behind the garage provides 2 parking space, which was confirmed.

Mrs. Franco questioned if there are parking spaces along the 22 foot roadway in front of the units.

Mr. Costello responded, yes, that it is designed so cars may be parked there. The 22 feet is the main road way. It is only the driveway that we are talking about and they are committed to keeping it free from parking.

Chairman Browne asked if there were additional comments from the Building Inspector.

Mr. Tortorici answered that he considers the access to the rear of the buildings not safe at the proposed width. Cars will go back there and park. He also stated that there is not much additional he could say about the separation of the units. He feel they are too close together even if they are within their zoning rights.

Mr. Dickinson questioned the designation of a fire lane.

Chief Kingsbury responded that they do not work at Shaw's.

Attorney Gallogly said that he did not see the problem because if there is a fire behind a building you access it from the front.

Mr. Tortoricci responded that would work with a single house, but the density is the problem here.

Attorney Gallogly relied that the fire hydrants are on the front and that fire hoses go 75 feet; people have driveways that are 16 feet wide and houses that are 300 feet from the road.

Discussion continued relative to fighting a fire in close density.

Kit Viator, 4 Curve Street, spoke that if the fire chief says he needs a certain amount of space, hopefully we would defer to his judgment. The density of the project is a problem. She would like to see a reduction in that density. Many of the problems addressed could be solved by such a reduction. She continued that they introduced that there would be basements and also said they would be on a 3 foot foundation beyond ground level. This is raising the height. This is imposing a city upon the neighborhood. She is eager to hear about a solution to the traffic on Spring St. and Curve St. Reducing the density could help this problem as well. We asked for a plan to save mature trees on the property. She objected to the construction management plan allowing construction on Saturday, and stated that the length of the work day is untenable. She asked the Board and Mr. Costello to show respect toward the neighbors.

Mr. Conery replied that the hours are general construction hours.

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 9, 2005

Attorney Gallogly said they are not raising the height. What they have proposed will comply with zoning. He said that generally what is happening is that the people disagree with multifamily dwellings within this zone. He added that what they have proposed is a project that is allowed in the district.

Mr. Lester said he considered the questions to be legitimate about the square footage of the basements and does it count, as well as the height question. Are they raising some of the grades and is it legal.

Mr. Costello said that they are not proposing to build basement space – nothing in the Bylaw

Discussion of whether raising the grade

Mr. Costello responded that it is the grade that is around the house that is the measure and not the existing grade.

Building Inspector agreed.

Mr. Dickinson questioned that if it were a flat site today and then they put a mound what you create would still be ok.

Mr. Costello responded in the affirmative. He also stated that the height would be no more than 35 feet. He noted that many times a grade is changed for a lot of different reasons.

Mr. Truax said that the land is flat between the buildings. It would be impossible to build up to go to 40 feet.

Mr. Lester questioned if they anticipate bringing in fill.

Mr. Truax explained that they would spread around what they excavate.

An abutter asked if there was any bylaw about working on Saturday, as well as one regarding noise.

There is no noise ordinance in town, just as there is no law against working on Saturday.

Mr. Dickinson questioned how they would handle the mature trees.

Mr. Costello replied that his commitment is to bring in a number of trees. Wherever he can, he will save existing ones.

Mr. Lester asked if they could make any adjustments for the increased traffic that could be expected on Curve Street.

The traffic engineer said that the signals need to be synchronized. They looked at Curve Street. The actual pavement is dilapidated. He would encourage improvement of the road.

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 9, 2005

Mr. Lester asked about the possible use of signage etc.

Art Scardio with GPI replied that all you would be doing is shifting the problem. Curve Street is not used by out of town people. They are local people – parents picking up their kids – don't have a magic wand – fix the street where belongs - funds there to resolve it

Chris Potts – evidence – 50% of those going over Curve Street are from Norfolk Ma and Franklin – when construction on South Street. – people frustrated - during construction on 109 cars go down Curve St.

Chairman Browne: reconstruction of 109 –sounds like that was a time when the cars would have been using Curve Street.

Mr. Potts - % of back up – how much money was spent to regrade South St.? Curve is not designed to handle many cars.

Carole Wallace – 105 Spring St – even though focusing on this construction – there is also other construction going on – Boiling Spring – Robinson Road – 109 Spring St – Mr. Costello said it would take 3 years. It will be a nightmare because of the activity on the various sites.

Chairman Browne said that traffic studies relate to the long term. He said they could restrict access during construction.

The traffic engineer suggested a restriction on the use of Curve Street for construction vehicles.

Mr. Truax was concerned that they would not be able to start construction until after 9 a.m.

Mr. Costello said it would be difficult to do.

Mr. Dickinson said material deliveries should be scheduled for times beyond the heavy rush hour traffic times. That can be monitored.

Chairman Browne asked if there were any further comments.

An abutter asked if the units would be built in sections and then sold.

Mr. Costello replied that he has not determined yet. He added that he thought of building different sections. He might wait on the 5 unit buildings until later. He has not made a final determination.

Mr. Connery said there would be a phasing, not a one time build out.

Diane Delany – 6 Curve St – asked about limiting the traffic.

Mr. Dickinson said we did talk about that, but it is the Selectmen's jurisdiction.

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 9, 2005

Diane Delaney – have concerns about the traffic – concern about the fence – feel awful can't imagine living in house during construction. It will ruin us for 3 years

Mr. Costello said he would put up a 6 foot wood stockade fence before construction begins.

Mr. Dickinson asked if he would reduce work hours to from 7-3:30 so that they would get off the site before the rush hours.

Mr. Costello said that is not unreasonable until 3:30 or 4 pm

Mr. Tuths said he lives across from Curve Street and expressed concern for any additional traffic. He said one Selectmen did not want anything done. He expressed concern for the idea of living with construction for 3 years. The project is very dense. It would be nice to limit work times for quiet and quality of life – sound travels and six foot fence will not reduce it– too dense for the neighborhood – 4 parking spaces per unit – additional on-street parking (yes) – He asked where they would park on the holidays – safety issues created by access – private way – cannot control

Chris Potts – jurisdiction of Planning Board – no control over Curve – have control over what developer does – not allow people to turn right out of the development.

Nancy Hinkley felt that you cannot have people just go to the right because it will create a back up.

Art Scarido (GPI) said that with the closure of South St. people found another way – a turn restriction (even if they obey) is just makes someone at fault if an accident – can restrict – what about a neighbor who says he cannot turn – it is not as simple as just saying it – reality need to fix the major roads such that people go back on it.

Chairman Browne said he would like to hear from the fire chief.

Attorney Gallogly said there are six objectives of the *Zoning Bylaw* – see where the scope of the jurisdiction is. He added that they are not belittling public comment, however, we are operating under the *Zoning Bylaw*. They meet the density under the *Bylaw*. The Board can deliberate and make a decision or can drag it out another meeting.

Chairman Browne said he expects that the neighbors would like to meet with the Selectmen.

Mr. Lester asked the neighbors if they had met with the police chief.

Mrs. Viator said they spoke many years ago and were told not to worry it would be resolved. long term plan – once bridge reopened – option was a one way flow – turn restrictions – like to say understand meets the letter of the law but does it meet the spirit – is this the model development – Fire Chief – implore take a look at this – looking for a reduce density plan - would go along way for building good will. She questioned if this was the feel of the town we

PLANNING BOARD

MAY 9, 2005

want to have. The community is saying no. She asked that the Board request a reduction in density.

Mr. Tuth restated the issue of traffic patterns on Curve – Police Chief did not want it made a one way street – site is hemend in – busy 27 and 109 – needs to remain open – limit size and density

Mr. Lester said he would like the Police Chief's input.

Mr. Connery said that he did meet with the Police Chief and it has been a tried and discussed

Attorney Gallogly said the *Bylaw* says substantial increase.

Mr. Costello said there has always been a problem on Curve Street – would like to see problem solved but cannot do it with this project.

Mrs. Franco stated that this Board needs to do what it has jurisdiction over – not sure that maybe could be a recommendation – think we have exhausted discussion

Chairman Browne asked if there was other input from the Board. (none)

Discussion about closing or not closing the hearing – take under advisement and deliberate

Voted to close the public hearing and take under advisement to deliberate at meeting June 6, 2005 at 8:15 p.m.

Boiling Springs

Steve – read legal notice – allow the FC and BI to speak first

Chief – Kingsbuy reference is not me – should have a 20 foot layout minimum – Mr. M showed plan – turnaround at the end not adewquat –

Walter – should be equally split down the middle – 20 feet to adequately serve – back up wht the chief has to say

Richard Merrikin – def sub basically subdivisin of no 6 boiling springs ave. – shaded area is where subdividing – existing private way – access for 8 houses – gravel – 14 foot width to the road – existing is 425 feet long to the end of the row – if look at the plan 412 feet – add a culdesac at the end to comply with the current regulations – proposed #6 – propose to upgrade Boiling springs ave all the way to spring st. – present row is 37 feet – ask for waivers to be allowed to be built as a private way – looking for what could do complying with the regulations – discussed in the preprelink phase – add a culdesac onto bs – giving it the 425 feet and not extending – provided the 50 foot layout in area where have control of – which creates two lots generallyi in compliane – the existing way is only 37 so need to make adjust so have a 24 fot paved way with sidewalk on one side – conforming pavement for the culdesac – usually grass ststrip varies – adjusted the widths of the grass strips so meld into – already is a house on one lot

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 9, 2005

and he can move it – WHAT WOULD LIKE to do – is a straight on culdesac and extend it about 15 feet so that the house where it sits right now would satisfy – would be consistent ;;;;; what is there is 14 foot gravel – brought in sewer and water already there in the road – propose to construct a 16 foot way – all of the houses already have driveways and lawns – tried to place the paved portion over the existing – pavement is not in the middle of the way because not there because people have nice landscaping – culdesac with a T intersection – well within the 500 foot – for the fire chief took templates and put on the turn around – new detail and will leave plans – widened wings to 16 feet and 42 on both sides – larger radius on left side to allow the ladder truck to turn- would allow trucks etc. to move in and out – not uniform but works well – have the 16 foot paved surface – did hear discussion – small development – people have been using this 14 foot for many years – cape cod berms on either side so another 12” on either side – are adding drainage – propose a drainage system to collect all of the water from the impervious surface borings show sand – overflow – will take care of all of the drainage on this project – storm septic unit to purify the system - profile does not quite meet all of the regulations – there are driveways – road goes up and down – made a grade to work with everybody's driveway to match – some vertical curves are not quite what the regulations require. When done there are some items to think about – not sure that this needs curbing – in the back have to get from the top of the hill to the bottom – with the grading have two walls 4 feet high – 4% grade further into the 50 foot buffer than someone would like – such as a higher wall 6-8 feet wall (need it for the hemi) have 4:1 slope

Steve – shouldn't the curbing function to the drainage

Rick – can do the curbing with grass – flows could be erodable in the grass – not a big watershed – would not have an erosion problem once the sides are established with grass

Steve – do you have sufficient control over street to center and

Rick – nice driveway so trying to meet what is there

Steve – comments from audience first

Maria Love – those were gravel driveways that were then paved by someone associated with Mr. Borrelli

Rick – can put it in the middle

Maris – would not effect us

Rick – that is true

Mr. Love – pictures of the road – Mr. Borrelli tore up his property – according to our deed and Mr. Borrelli's deed – we own half and he grassed in his half – cannot deny access to either 17.5 feet

Rick – if the Board figures better in the middle then fine

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 9, 2005

George – saying was put down because

Rick – am assuming the gravel road where is near now

..... depends where talking about

Maria – there were trees and much wider – stunned when they grassed in – neither can deny other – everyone

George – took his half and converted as lawn and drive over your side

Steve – recently

Carole Wallace – first driveway on the left – would like to see the road stay where it is – concerns on the other end – would cut off people's driveway – would like to see where the center of the row

Rick – at your driveway it is close to being in the middle – when get beyond then the left – your garage would be a foot off the line

Carole – sidewalk?

Rick – have to show the board that we could comply – they have to decide if needed – not proposing

Carole – end of the street drops off – T shape at end

Rick – there is the edge of the property line and edge pavement – have put a regular circle but not the pavement – instead of that a T shaped

Carole – do you need to add flow? And does it go into the wetland

Rick – yes – would have to fill about 20 – 25 feet from the wetlands – could do that but Conservation would like it if would pull it back

Victoria chefs from street – show the location of the roadway

Rick – do not have any authority from going into other people – should improve – would be hard surface and would be wider than the existing situation – your driveway will not be the turnaround – all vehicles would turn around at the end of the road

Maria – they will turn around

Mr. Love – where would the snow go

PLANNING BOARD

MAY 9, 2005

Rick – will push over

Mr. Love – where will consstruc veh park during constru

Rick – road has to be constructed – issue if park within the way – if they park on a lawn they will have to restore the lawn – what was done in the past

Steve – subdiv rev – will require a bond

Mari – narrow and a dead end cannot get off the street – trucks look at you like do not belong - do not even bother – spent a lot of time calling the police last summer – tore up the road – nvefr notified

Rick – that has nothing to do with this application – do not provide a construction sequence

Steve – would you do that here

Rick – yes, Mr. B will be hiring a contractor

Steve – will be part of the plan – there will be a construction plan

Carole – how much a bond

Steve – suffice3int and substantial until all the work is completed with a covenant – can allow it to be sold but the bond goes beyond – they could build the road

Vickie – coveneant – to insure work to be done

Steve – could finish the road without the bond

Carole – who will maintain this road for the long term – 15-20 years down the road

Maria – hole

Rick – BS is a private way – everyone must maintain – anyone could maintain or improve the road – the maintenance remains the same as before – Ken F has said the most expensive to maintain are the dirt roads –

Steve – neighbors say they never had to maintain it because it was gravel – need to have a clear understanding who will maintain – there will be a homeowners association to maintain the drainage system

Maria – for infinity?

Rick – yes – just as yours was

PLANNING BOARD
MAY 9, 2005

Maria – never did maintain the road –

Carole – curbing or not curbing – length of the street

Rick – show curbing all the way from spring st. – aksing the hoared not necessary

Carole – would agree with that

Rick – copy of Dales letter and address all but grading issue on the back

Maria – in the fall at some meeting of the planning board refusal because the existing house was 5 feet too large for this house

Rick – original thought would not have to do – he could do it as an ANR – since he did not get that then we are here.

Walter – board veryfiy the width of this

Steve – site walk

Elissa move Wriqh – continue to June 20th at 8:15 p.m

May 28th (Saturday) at 8 am see where sloping in the back – need plan before go for site walk

SEND EMAIL

PLANNING BOARD/BOARD OF SELECTMEN

June 6, 2005

Present: Stephen J. Browne, Wright C. Dickinson, Elissa G. Franco, and George N. Lester (The Planning Board is currently down one member.) Board of Selectmen: Ann B. Thompson, Paul B. Rhuda, and Osler L. Peterson

Convened at

Laura Einbinder – 3 years in Medfield, born in New England – followed some of the issues – state hospital – bayer property – issues pertaining to the long term planning of the town – read newspaper - go to every town meeting

SB – suggestions to get issues on the radar screen

LE – significant number of woman who are not aware – want to get peer group engaged – best way is to do that itself - grew up in Westwood – coming back to the Boston area – analysis chose Medfield – objective ranking of schools – prox to boaston – size – location – looking for sma town new England

Paul – feelings on growth

LE – came with clean slate – should be managed – active in neighborhood assocviation in Charleston

Ann – would you like to see more business and insdusty

LE – what exists can be better managbed – would look at what the possibilities are – can manage what have

George – drainage – bylaws – legal aspects – do you have any

LE – familiar with those as a resident – aware that is part of work

George - ?good sense and ability to say no to developers

LE – have had to say no in the pass – had to fire people in the pass –

Paul – length of culdesac and connecting all streets through

LE – every town has gone through it – in Wrox – now is dead end, one way and speed bumps on it.

LE - if there is an opening in the Board of Health husband is a better candidate

George – BOH and PB interact

Beaver problems – septic systems controlling how development goes in and the wells – tools so do not lose control – learned interesting fact Paul Revere head of 1st BOH

Paul – why move to medfield –

Keith – lived on Harford St. – fixed it up – 900 sqft. – school system doing more for the infra structure – more afterschool programs – more of a sense of community – never go back

Paul - ?cul v cut through

Keith – want the tools to control – access for fire – allows to control the deve better – nobldy wants cut through – people want the nighborhood feeling – lights in the center have come up – setting parameters is how to develop

Call

Ann moved all get nominated

Pete second

So voted

Discussion

Steve – usueful to have someone with uspst

Elissa – Keith been coming to the meetings – history – up to speed – difficult for other tow to contribute – need someone quick

Ann – number on

Wright – would welcome some help on construction and Keith would bring that

Paul – think there are two attorneys on board – jeff good – nuts and bolts guy

Pete – impressive served 4 years on Dover

George – need someone to climb down in catchbasins – hope town could find a place

Roll call vote – unanimous for keith diggans

Closed the selectmens meetin at 8:10 p.m. per vote of Selectmen

PLANNING BOARD

June 6, 2005

ANR

Endorse plan for 240-242 South Street

8:20 continuation of Olde Village Square

Chairman Browne stated that the Board had closed the public hearing at its last meeting on May 9, 2005. Since then it has received new information.

There was a discussion regarding opening the public hearing to consider evidence provided by the Building Inspector.

The applicant considered that the evidence was discussed during the public hearing.

Board members considered that the decision would be tainted without allowing for further discussion and voted to reopen the public hearing for the purpose of discussion of the Building Inspector's letter only. The date for that hearing was set for July 18, 2005 at 8:15 p.m..

Both the Building Inspector and Fire Chief will be asked to attend.

Closed at 8:45 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD

JULY 18, 2005

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

Absent: Stephen J. Browne

BOILING SPRINGS

8 p.m. convened by WD

Rick Mer. – changed walls, guard rail, added snow easement; 16 feet at beginning then widens out to 20 ft. where Mr. Borelli owns – given Construction sequence . Also a letter sent to BOH and public works to eliminate a catchbasin near Spring St. – in lieu developer will put a capecod berm down Spring st. to an existing catchbasin – keep in the paved way – doesn't make much difference to the drainage – will not have trenching in the front area not owned – could close and take action – mainly the BOH – copy of Homeowners Association document (Town Council has copy as does BOH) Will be ability for the town to do the work. Entrance – what might be able to do to improve the sight distance – nothing that can do on Mrs. Wallace's side of the street so everything will stay the same – it is vegetated. Other side in ROW of Boiling Spring there will be a little bit of sloping about 5 more feet – biggest problem is hanging vegetation and mailboxes. Wall work would not improve sight distance.

WD – questions from board

RM – added fencing in front of MR. Loves – parking space labeled and gravel – intention to convey the strip to neighbor whose driveway is particularly on it and it would be handled by him. Mr. Love's garage is over the line so have created a parcel A that could be conveyed to Mr. Love – will approach that after (200 s.f.) – Mr. Love's driveway is on his own property

WD – talked widening

RM – wider on the south side – larger than the typical turn around

WD – shrubs around the parking space

RM – would convey an easement for the parking space when convey parcel/strip

GL – homeowners only 2 (yes) care for all drainage (yes)

Norma – Mark seemed confident in what to say

RM – town should not be holding money in its account but should be the homeowner's account

KD – town give an idea of what the cost will be

RM – Mark was more concerned enough money to inspect – if inspect then maintain – copies of the construction sequence. – would go right on the plan

PLANNING BOARD
JULY 18, 2005

GL – question of legal access to the area for development – concern Mr. Borrelli's lawn is cut back – want to make sure the area is removed

RM – the proposed goes from 16 to 18

Chief Kingsbury – you made the determination to keep the beginning 16 (yes)

WD – able to turn around at the end – you can do so (no comment)

GL – flair is on the side of Mr. B (yes)

WD – questions

MR. Love – presented pictures to the board about the alignment

RM – pictures are at the end in front of Mr. B property – pointed out Mr b's lawn – Mr. Love calls it

Mr. Love – showing the existing is not what he says

Maria Love – Boiling Spring Ave – not fare for him to have lawn and not

RM – the # 16 and 20 are not what deals with what is there now

GL – taking away 4 feet of the lawn

Maria – they put in the markers – they are saying that is where they are measuring from

RM – 20 is not magjic can make it widened to 22 if that will make the Love's happy – not an attempt to keep lawn but to keep the road where it is

EF – the more pavement is more problems – road exists wehere it has for some time – trying to limit the change

Bill Proia – attorney for the Loves – report submitted by MR. Love – report raises some of those issues - have not had time to put together an opinion – back to roadway – understand where is and not create more drainage problems or runoff – did not want to create a shifting of easement rights to one side – not sure what the solution is – original documtn 37 foot easement with benefits shared. Feeling of inequity – shifting of rights onto one side

RM – requested a waiver to not have a pavement in the middle for the purpose of keeping it where it is because the people have landscaping

EF – easement is where it is

Bill P – the easement is - roadway is not – where people wanted to trave

PLANNING BOARD
JULY 18, 2005

EF – what are suggesting a rendering of the plan – a shift that will effect the others down the road

Bill P – have not had a lot of time – asking for time to get into this and do some title work – not involved until recently – want to explore the title question

EF – are you suggesting there are title differences

Bill P – documents are similar to that report

George – issue of Rhoddendrum explained in the Woodridge Sub

RM – there was some discussion of the legality – approved by Town Council

EF – each access road has its own difference

George – this was a parcel created out of the Woodridge Suib – made no findings at this time

Bill P – would like to avoid action in another

Norma –

Bill P – the subdivision may present an over burdening of the easement – do not want an approval

Maria Love – when they were surveying the land they took a very large orange metal brass piece and put it in the middle of the driveway

RM – cannot tell you without seeing – they use markers temporatily – could have been a traverse point –

Maria Love – thinking that is where the road end

RM – no – dark line

Mr. Love – are you sure (RM yes) – would like to see a copy of the

Mr. Borrelli – George faxed that to the other attorney

WD – is there a desire to eliminat the berm

RM – explained capecod berm – it creates the gutter – fill in behind and loam and seed

WD – drawing of drainage –

PLANNING BOARD
JULY 18, 2005

WD – will be getting more at the end for parking – questions

RM – curbing waiver – seem to support

WD – fine

EF – get rid of the catch basin up front works well

WD – motion to close the public hearing

EF – moved to close

GL – in favor of more info if necessary

EF – moved

Bill P - not asking for more time based on the consesion discusse

GL – second

So voted

Will move into the next hearing.

OLDE VILLAGE SQUARE

Vice Chairman Dickinson convened the public hearing at 9 p.m. by reading the legal notice to reopen the hearing

Attorney Richard Gallogly for the applicant explained that the Board originally closed the public hearing on May 9th. The Building Inspector submitted a letter to the Board on May 10th with 3 issues.

Walter Lewinski – left interior road same 22 feet – widened outer roads to 20 feet (except for short area 18 ft) - provided a material like honeycomb which will sustain the weight of fire trucks and provide emergency exits – will grass over – he showed the turning movements for fire truck - reviewed plan and said it shows there is plenty width within the 22 and 20 feet.

Attorney Gallogly said there is a memo in the pack that Fire Chief agrees

Mr. Lewinski explained the grading plan.– in the back is a full wall all the way up – filled in around the front – currently meet the building code – really close so will have to make some adjustments – short retaining wall out front – two walls in the area five feet high – can bring within the town's zoning regulations – will work out with the Building Inspector.

PLANNING BOARD
JULY 18, 2005

List of conditions:

Mrs. Franco: grading must comply

Mr. Dickinson : maintenance of the porous pavement in the trust
Board of Health further approval
Site plan approval conditions – dropping the ending time to 3:30 p.m
Satisfy the conditions of all other boards

Mrs. Franco: that the conditions are on the plan

Motion to accept the conditions.

Concluded at 10:10 p.m.

ANR plan for Harding Street endorsed

Adjourned at 10:15 pm.

PLANNING BOARD
OCTOBER 5, 2005

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 Browne.

ERIK ROAD ANR PLAN

VOTED unanimously to endorse an ANR plan of land for Erik Road, lots 8 and 9, dated 21 September 2009, drawn by Landmark Engineering of New England, Inc. of Norfolk, MA for Calvin W. and Scott W. Colwell, Trustees of Hoover Realty Trust, Westwood, MA. Said plan shows Lot 9A with 1.043 sq. ft. being transferred from Lot 8 to Lot 9, thus creating a new Lot 8A with 24,640 sq. ft. and a new Lot 9B with 49,791 sq. ft.

DELA PARK ACRES

VOTED unanimously to return all surety for subject subdivision.

CONSULTANT RFP

Administrator Cronin explained that 29 RFP's were mailed out and requests for another 17 have been received and replied to by email.

The deadline for submission is October 22nd at 2:00 p.m.

VOTED unanimously to adjourn at approximately 8:30 p.m.