

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 14, 2018

Present: Vice-Chairman Peter Abair, John Hincks, Charles Karustis, Meagen Donoghue (Director of Planning and Community Development), and Beth Suedmeyer (Environmental Planner)

Absent: Chairman Stephen Garvin, Nancy Kilcoyne

At 7:35 p.m. Vice-Chairman Abair called the meeting to order.

Master Plan Discussion

Vice-Chairman Abair said that he had a few questions regarding the RFP for a professional planning consultant. He asked if the word "committee" as referenced in the RFP could be defined. He also suggested that the RFP specify a definite date to reflect the completion of the contract.

Ms. Donoghue agreed that both of these suggestions would make for good discussion. Ms. Donoghue asked the Board if they would be interested in forming a Master Plan subcommittee which would handle aspects of this RFP as well as other areas.

Mr. Hincks mentioned that the Board had a conversation about the prospective Master Plan consultant having a role in the proposed subcommittee.

Ms. Donoghue agreed and added that the Master Plan Subcommittee would also appoint the Master Plan consultant.

Mr. Karustis volunteered to be a member of the Master Plan Subcommittee.

Vice-Chairman Abair asked the Board if it was necessary to maintain such a strict level of specificity as outlined in the "Scope of Services" part of the RFP.

Mr. Hincks said that the maintenance of some type of timeline was beneficial and he offered that the consultant should be free to adjust that timeline as he/she sees fit.

Mr. Karustis agreed, adding that the contract duration is 16 months according to the draft RFP; but suggested that if the consultant has viable reason as to why that time must be extended; the contract should address such a clause.

Mr. Hincks elaborated saying that the exact date of contract completion must be reflective of grant funding. He further suggested that the project date for completion should be June 30, 2019.

Mr. Karustis agreed with that date, but also included that the RFP could indicate that the consultant might present other alternatives with reason.

Ms. Donoghue suggested that the Subcommittee could assist her with an appropriate timeline for the RFP. Mr. Karustis agreed.

Vice-Chairman Abair offered to become a second member of the Subcommittee.

Ms. Donoghue stated that the Board's new member, Justin Finnicum, could not vote at tonight's meeting, but she would gather the signatures of the Board tonight so that the Town Clerk could swear him in.

Mr. Finnicum said that he would help in any way that he could.

Mr. Hincks said that he was pleased that the Board secured the grant monies for this Master Plan project and thanked Ms. Donoghue for all her efforts to this end.

Ms. Donoghue added that she too was happy to report that the funds received totaled \$150,000; \$20,000 from the Community Compact, \$75,000 from the fall Town Meeting, and \$55,000 from the Sudbury Foundation. She added that the Foundation was a great group to work with and she was very grateful for their consideration and contribution.

Public Hearing – Site Plan Modification; Willow Hill School, 98 Haynes Road, (Assessor's Map D09-0400)

Present: Thomas Peterman, Peterman Architects, Inc., Marilyn Reid, Head of Willow Hill School, David Heinsohn-Roe, Director of Facilities at Willow Hill School.

At 7:50 p.m., Vice-Chairman Abair opened the public hearing for Willow Hill School.

Ms. Donoghue introduced Thomas Peterman, architect for the Willow Hill School and said that the original plan was modified in 2003 and that the school is back now to do another modification to the site plan.

Ms. Donoghue added that she met with Ms. Reid, the head of the school, in the fall and had a very productive meeting.

Mr. Peterman introduced himself as well as head of school, Marilyn Reid and David Heisenrow, director of facilities at the Willow Hill School. Mr. Peterman provided a summary background on the Willow Hill School, stating that Willow Hill is an independent school which enrolls students with learning differences and is chartered by the State. The school has been at this site since the early 70s; and he was involved in the original 2002 modification application. Mr. Peterman detailed the 2002 modification, which built a new classroom building, parking lots, driveways and significant improvements to the school. The 2002 modification cleared an athletic field, put in a sidewalk the entire frontage of the school along Haynes Road and took a bulk of its 26 acre campus; transferring that land into a conservation easement which ensured no further development.

Mr. Peterman added that the school appeared before the Conservation Board recently and they have approved the current proposed modification with an order of conditions. He stated that the school also received favorable comment from the Design Board two weeks ago. He explained that the current modification application is asking for a connection between the Mason and Porter buildings with little visual impact from the street. Mr. Peterman stated that the connection will provide a weather-tight and safe access between the two buildings, and will allow the school to separate the dining and theatrical functions from the one-purpose space they currently have in the Porter Building. He further detailed that the proposal involves taking down a one-story structure behind the Porter Building, and constructing the connecting building. Mr. Peterman maintained that in the 2002 plan there was a proposal to connect the two buildings, but due to budget constraints, the school did not go forward at that time. He said that the proposed addition will provide a new dining hall, new kitchen and large storage room on the second

floor. He added that the vision for the dining hall is to also be able to have school activities such as dances there; and allow the theatre area to have a more permanent sitting as the space would not be shared for dining. He maintained that the addition will be handicap accessible as well, and that the lower level will include tutoring rooms, school counseling, expansion of the art room and wood shop; as well as restroom, IT space and additional storage.

Mr. Peterman stated that the school met very rigorous rain water standards in 2002; and that would not be changed. He added that school enrollment and staff will not change either, as the maximum enrollment is 62 students and is fixed by the State. Mr. Peterman maintained that the work will be confined to an area away from the public street, with minimal disturbance to the abutting properties.

Vice-Chairman Abair commented that the addition will not affect traffic or the amount of parking needed, and that the understanding is that the school does not anticipate an increase in the number of events held, yet distinct space for performing arts is a focus here.

Mr. Peterman answered that there is no change in events or staff number, and that the school simply wants to improve the quality of performances and that sharing dining and the performance function has been very difficult. Mr. Peterman added that the proposed addition will create a much improved performance venue; better acoustics, lighting and staging, but the number of seats will remain the same.

Vice-Chairman Abair added that the Board would present more questions and then open the floor to any public questions. Vice-Chairman Abair stated that the Design Review Board minutes from Jan. 23 were favorable, and he referred to an e-mail from Sudbury Director of Public Works, mentioning a cross connection between the roof drain and the outlet pipe to the infiltration basin being unclear.

Vice-Chairman Abair also stated that there is a February 13, 2018 memo from Ms. Suedmeyer, regarding the increase in impervious surface; which perhaps makes the project subject to a stormwater management permit process.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated that she spoke to the Conservation Commission director and the Planning Board may have considered delegating the stormwater process to Conservation so that the school would not have to come back to the Planning Board, but now that the Order of Conditions has been used by the Conservation Commission, the school will need to come back to the Planning Board.

Mr. Hincks stated that the stormwater permit is required because there is an increase of 1, 100 feet of impervious area and the bylaw requires that a net increase of more than 500 sq. ft. needs permitting. Ms. Suedmeyer confirmed Mr. Hincks' statement regarding the bylaw.

Mr. Peterman said that he was just made aware of this now, and that he did not have a copy of the NOI; but would be happy to submit that application.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated that much of the application information has already been addressed via the NOI process and the stormwater report in the site plan review, and that this is just an omission in the application submission.

Mr. Karustis said that he appreciated the presentation and that his only concern was the cross-connection between the roof drain and the piping, and asked if that issue had been addressed yet.

Mr. Peterman stated that it had not, and said that the school can install cleanouts on the roof drains and the outlet pipe, which is running to the detention pond behind the building. He added that if further

clarification is needed, it could be included in a memorandum, or something of that nature; whatever is required.

Mr. Hincks said that he thought that this issue would be addressed in the stormwater application. He asked Mr. Peterman if there would be any further proposals for connecting the Mason and Wheaton buildings since that was the consideration in the 2002 modification plan.

Mr. Peterman replied not, and that there would be no reason to do so, because Wheaton is an administration building.

Vice-Chairman Abair thanked Mr. Peterman for his presentation and stated that the Board would look forward to seeing him again with the stormwater application.

Resident, Thomas Greenwood of 126 Haynes Road, said that he had no issues with the school and that they have been good neighbors and very quiet, even on graduation day. He said that his only concern is traffic on Haynes Road and when the Mason building was built, the school extended the sidewalk from his house down to the school. Mr. Greenwood went on to say that there were requests at the time to extend the sidewalk further, but for some reason that part of the project was dropped. He added that this is a very "risky" stretch of road to not have sidewalks. He asked, as part of this project, if anything could be considered to assist in resolving the safety issues for residents and those who walk on the street every day.

Vice-Chairman Abair asked if there is a possibility that part of the existing condition could include the extending of that sidewalk to Marlboro Rd.

Mr. Peterman said the sidewalk now goes along Haynes Road and terminates due to wetlands, and that the location of the catch basins for the school are in this location.

Mr. Hincks stated that he was very familiar with that area and agreed that it is rather unsafe and asked Ms. Donoghue if the Board could call this to the attention of another Town department to see if anything could be done to improve safety in this area.

Ms. Donoghue responded that this is a very timely topic as she sits on the Traffic Safety Committee and the committee is meeting tomorrow. She added that she will bring this to the Committee's attention.

Vice Chairman Abair stated that the Board would look forward to an update on the sidewalk safety issue at a subsequent meeting. He reminded that the Board will expect a Stormwater Application submission as well, and would want to see Stormwater Management Application before proceeding to approval, which is Board custom.

Ms. Donoghue stated that recently the Board approved a site modification plan with a condition that stormwater application would be approved later; and that perhaps the Board could follow the same type template for this application. She added that similarly, the only condition was the stormwater application.

Vice-Chairman Abair stated that the Board could consider that approach, but that the Board would want to continue this hearing to the next meeting date and the Board could also get comment from the civil engineer Board member. He added that the Board's next meeting is scheduled for Feb. 28 and at that time the Board could possibly consider doing the approval with condition of the stormwater plan being approved, subsequently.

Mr. Hincks asked if it was fair to say that the Board does not see any issues with the site plan itself, but because the bylaws require a stormwater permit, the Board needs to follow that process.

Vice-Chairman Abair answered in the affirmative, stating that the Board is being consistent and added that he liked the project.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To continue Public Hearing – Site Plan Modification for Willow Hill School, 98 Haynes Road (Assessor's Map D09-0400) to February 28, 2018.

Continued Public Hearing – Stormwater Management Permit – 70 Indian Ridge Road, (Assessor's Map J09-0312)

Present: Jacob Lemieux, Civil Engineer with Hancock Associates, Gary Bennos, Owner.

At 8:20 p.m., Vice-Chairman Abair recognized Jacob Lemieux, Civil Engineer with Hancock Associates and said that the Board had several additional documents regarding the continued hearing.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated that Janet Bernardo of Horsley Witten Group, the peer reviewer; is in agreement with those revisions resulting from the Board's comments of the last meeting and did recommend a couple of additional conditions for consideration. Ms. Suedmeyer said that owner, Gary Bennos, had visited the Planning Board office earlier this week with several questions regarding draft conditions. She would discuss these when the Board considers the draft conditions.

Mr. Lemieux gave a brief description regarding the project and covered the concerns and revisions from the last meeting. He addressed the capacity of the driveway infiltration and the basin to capture the 100 year stormwater; saying that he had done additional calculations and increased the size of the catch basin rim to better the flow rate. He added that the grate chosen should be adequate.

Mr. Lemieux said that he was able to revise the driveway slope to be 9.8% without having to increase the length of the concrete or adding any impervious area. He detailed that the grading was adjusted and that the northern property line will be staked as requested. Mr. Lemieux stated that five foot arborvitae trees to grow to approximately 15 feet, will be planted at the lot lines; adding that some existing trees will remain.

Vice-Chairman Abair asked if the trees are noted on the plan.

Mr. Lemieux said that 11 arborvitae are noted, in addition to evergreen planting detail.

Mr. Karustis said that he appreciated the applicant accommodating all the requests and changes.

Mr. Hincks thanked the applicant and Hancock Associates.

Resident and abutter, Dan Cinicola of 76 Indian Ridge Road, thanked the owner for the adjustments made and also thanked the Board for their consideration.

The Board had a draft decision before them for consideration. The peer reviewer had suggested the Board consider some additional conditions.

Ms. Suedmeyer asked the Board if they wanted to specify the exact size of the new trees going into the site.

Mr. Karustis stated that fifteen feet in maturity is probably appropriate. Mr. Hincks added that five foot trees growing to fifteen feet is appropriate and arborvitae will grow as much as it wants to grow, even more than fifteen feet over some period of time. He added that it would be harder to plant anything much bigger than that on a hillside, stating that he did not feel it necessary to specify size as a condition.

Mr. Karustis added that he believed that size should specify the height or the species.

Mr. Lemieux said that perhaps the condition could be based on the height of the tree, so that would provide for more options to choose from, but that it probably would be the arborvitae.

Mr. Karustis agreed that the arborvitae grows rather quickly and wanted a condition stating that the tree will grow to a certain height in a certain time frame.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated that it is primarily the arborvitae providing the buffer/screening; so maybe best to specify the initial size of the arborvitae. She asked Mr. Lemieux if there were choices other than the arborvitae.

Mr. Lemieux replied saying that he was not proposing any other trees; however between the limit of clearing and the lot line, there are existing trees of various types.

Mr. Hincks made suggestion that a condition might read that there are five arborvitae trees to be planted on the Northside and eleven arborvitae trees along the other side, whose starting size is five feet or more.

Vice Chairman Abair agreed and brought up the possible implementation of a performance bond as insurance, in the event that the project should fall into an incomplete condition for any reason.

Mr. Karustis said he agreed with the performance bond idea.

Mr. Hincks reiterated that the bond would not be contingent on full completion of the job, it would just be the stormwater management component.

Vice-Chairman Abair agreed.

Ms. Suedmeyer stated that she would consult with DPW to determine the valuation of the system to meet compliance, and then work with the applicant to insure that the Town would get a bond amount at that value. She suggested that the Board might want to get the bond amount from DPW to include in the condition. Vice-Chairman Abair stated that he thought that the Board could trust DPW to set the bond amount appropriately and it didn't need to be stated in the condition.

Mr. Hincks stated that the owner and his representatives would not have to come back before the Board.

Ms. Suedmeyer mentioned that the last condition concerned the yard drains and she asked Mr. Lemieux for the yard drain rim class and specifications.

Mr. Lemieux answered that he would further be open to an order of condition which could dictate that each of the yard drains must have the specified model of rim (MDS 1511). Mr. Lemieux then provided the exact model name, class and specifications.

Ms. Suedmeyer indicated the owner has requested the following minor revisions to the draft decision. On Page 3, C.1., the Owner requested consideration of preliminary installation of sediment and erosion control measures during initial land clearing, which would then be transitioned to the plan specifications once vegetation is removed. This will separated the installation of the limit of work markers from the installation of the sediment and erosion controls. Also, the conditions associated with inspecting depth to ground water would be changed so it is required prior to initiation of construction of infiltration system rather than prior to issuance of the Building Permit. The Board was fine with these condition amendments.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To Approve Stormwater Management Permit for 70 Indian Ridge Road, (Assessor's Map J09-0312), with amended conditions.

Delegation of Stormwater Permit to Conservation Commission – Mill Village, 365 Boston Post Road, (Assessor's Map K08-0026).

At 8:40 p.m., Vice-Chairman Abair announced the delegation of Stormwater Permit to Conservation Commission and asked if there were any comments.

Ms. Suedmeyer said that this is a draft general stormwater management permit, and she hoped that the Board is in agreement to consider delegation of this project to the Conservation Commission without the receipt of a full application. Ms. Suedmeyer explained that the scope of the project is to repair and replace an existing septic system, and because the majority of the project falls within the wetlands buffer and riverfront area, jurisdiction falls under the Conservation Commission.

Vice-Chairman Abair stated that the last time the Board deferred in this manner, the site was with the church application for the parking lot modification. He added the project went well and nothing changed in terms of the building and runoff. He noted that the Mill Village application is similar.

Ms. Suedmeyer said that with this type of project, we do not anticipate a change in impervious area and the owner is expected to provide improvements to the greatest extent practicable. She included that under usual circumstances, the Planning office handles the review of General Stormwater Management Permits, and the Board doesn't review them. Ms. Suedmeyer maintained that the delegation option provides a more streamlined approach in getting the job moving along and not having to deal with two Town entities. She added that the town engineer and herself could still comment on the application to the Conservation Commission.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: That the Planning Board delegate Stormwater Permit to Conservation Commission – Mill Village, 365 Boston Post Road, (Assessor's Map K08-0026).

Discussion of Master Plan Process

At 8:55 p.m., Vice-Chairman Abair asked if there was any further comment on the Master Plan Process.

Mr. Karustis asked when the subcommittee would want to meet.

Ms. Donoghue suggested meeting the week of Feb. 26th.

Subcommittee members agreed.

Administrative Report

At 8:58 p.m., Vice-Chairman Abair opened the Administrative Report. Nothing was presented.

Minutes for Review – June 27, 2017; November 28, 2017 and January 24, 2018

Vice-Chairman Abair introduced the Review of Minutes.

Ms. Donoghue stated that several of the minutes presented reflected joint meeting minutes with the Board of Selectmen when Mr. Hincks and Ms. Kilcoyne were appointed to the Board in 2017.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the minutes of June 27, 2017.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the minutes of November 28, 2017

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To approve the regular session minutes of January 24, 2018

Meeting Schedule – February 28, 2018, March 14, 2018, March 28, 2018

Vice-Chairman Abair announced that the Board will be meeting on February 28; with two March meetings scheduled.

Ms. Donoghue asked if any members thought they would not be able to attend any of the meetings.

Mr. Hincks said that there was a possibility that he might be absent from one of those meetings, but had no definite plans yet.

At 8:50 p.m., Vice-Chairman Abair made motion for the Board to go into Executive Session to discuss strategy with respect to potential litigation where an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the litigating position of the public body and the Vice-Chairman so declares regarding 648 Boston Post Road.

On motion duly made and seconded, it was unanimously:

VOTED: To close open session and go into Executive Session and not return to open session.