275 Old Lancaster Rd. Sudbury, MA 01776 978-443-2209 x1370 Fax 978-443-6128

To:

Zoning Board of Appeals

Planning Board

From: Conservation Commission

Re:

Date: Aug. 31, 2016 revised Sept. 1, 2016 D. D. Rei The Coolidge at Sudbury-Phase II – Comprehensive Permit

At the Conservation Commission meeting held August 22, 2016 the Commission reviewed the Plans by Hancock Associates dated June 29, 2016 for the construction of a new 56-unit, 55 and older, apartment building with associated drainage, parking and septic. The project is filed as a Chapter 40B Comprehensive Permit for affordable housing construction. As such, the applicant is able to circumvent the local wetland bylaw.

Wetlands • Conservation Land Management • Land Protection • Stormwater

The proposed plans show disturbance with 25' of the wetland area on the property with the corner of the new building only 58+- feet from the wetland. Although this application to ZBA is for a modification of the permit issued for the Phase I development, the applicant is required to submit a new permit application and meet the state Wetland Protection Act requirements for new activities on the site within 100' of wetlands.

The applicant must obtain approval from the MA Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program under the MAS Endangered Species Act for the work proposed within mapped Estimated and Priority Habitat Areas.

Sequencing of the project will be a key component. An existing stormwater detention basin for the current parking lot will be eliminated with a new basin designed and constructed in very close proximity to the wetland. Accommodations for drainage during construction will need to be made for the runoff now entering the existing basin located at the site of the future parking area and turn-around. MA stormwater requirements must be met during and after construction.

With the proposed elimination of the large majority of the wetland buffer zone, the Conservation Commission expects the remaining area of the buffer to be critically enhanced to offset losses of the buffer's functioning to protect the wetland. This includes enhancing the remaining buffer area for pollution attenuation, wildlife habitat, and water quality.

It is unfortunate that Phase II was not considered during the design and review of Phase I. This would have allowed a more thoughtful approach to the remaining land and likely resulted in a better footprint of overall development relative to remaining natural areas.

As an addendum to the Conservation Commission's memo dated Aug. 31, 2016, I offer the following additional comments based on information from the staff meeting today. Following the meeting, the applicant indicated that they will be filing a Request for Determination for soil testing and borings within 100' of the wetland to be heard by the Commission at the Sept. 26 meeting. The results of this testing should provide answers to a number of questions raised at the meeting. In particular, depth to ground, including the

groundwater elevation at the underground parking and detention basin locations, and soils types and permeability on the site for infiltration of runoff will then be known and can be factored into the design.

Other issues for consideration include the following: Limits of lawn should be shown on the plan. Pest management practices should be outlined, keeping in mind that pesticides should not be used in or near wetland area. Irrigation must be 100' from the septic system and 100' from the wetland. The state natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program must approve work in the Estimated and Priority Habitat area. An Operation & Management Plan for the stormwater management system will be required.