

Halifax Planning Board Meeting Minutes June 19, 2014

A meeting of the Halifax Planning Board was held on Thursday, June 19, 2014, at 7:30 p.m. at the Halifax Town Hall, Meeting Room #1, 499 Plymouth Street, Halifax, Massachusetts.

Members Present: Rick Greeley, Member

Mark Millias, Clerk Larry Belcher, Member

Absent: Rob Piccirilli and Gordon Andrews

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. and the agenda was read into the record by Mark Millias

MOTION: Rick Greeley

SECOND: Larry Belcher AIF

(Zoning Board members: Robert Gaynor, Bob Durgin and Deb Tinkham in attendance)

Appointments:

7:30 p.m. - Amanda Estates - Site Plan Review - Multi-family Development

Present: Amanda Monti, Steve Kotowski of Webby Engineering: Mr. Kotowski presented a brief presentation to Mr. Millias (as he was not at the last meeting) This came before the Planning board a while ago for a Definitive Subdivision which did not go thru. The applicant is going before the board to do a multi-family 12 unit development under the Zoning By-law for a Special Permit. Utilized all of the proposed roadway layout we did for the subdivision that was reviewed by Merrill Engineering. At the last meeting we gave the Board a copy of the review, which should be on file anyway, but brought a copy with us. At the time Merrill reviewed all the profiles, the roadway the drainage that was proposed under the eight lot subdivision, the only difference, what we did was shortened this small tangent section of road so it is smaller so we should have an actual increase in the amount of drainage area that we had. So we felt that keeping with everything the way it was the Town's review engineer was satisfied, that going forward to the Board of Appeals we should look favorably. This will be a private way, won't be accepted by the Town. It will have an Association that will take care of all the maintenance, and owner occupied, they won't be rentals. Individually sold off as individual units or if someone want to be a duplex, they can. I can go into the plan a little bit, but it is basically the same plan that came before you on the Definitive. With the exception for the majority of the work that is outside of the roadway. They will have individual septic systems, public water will be brought in, the drainage is the same, the wetlands crossing is still the same. Went to the Conservation Commission because they had some concerns because they had never seen this plan before, and went before them, they only had one issue that they are looking into, because they are not sure about what authority they have to allow a crossing. Under a limited project local Conservation Commission can allow up to 5000 sq. ft. If you go beyond that then the DEP kicks in. We did submit this to DEP and Conservation years ago, when going for the Definitive. Again, nothing has changed and the DEP did send back comments that basically said the project was acceptable to them as long as it is ok with local Conservation Commission. As a condition of the approval we have to get a water quality certificate from the Army Corp of Engineers. They now have jurisdiction on any water body in the country.

So, all the trees that were proposed, sidewalks, drainage, hydrants are in the same location. The intersection, which was the major concern with the board when we were going forward in this area, we kept it as large as before, all this has stayed the same. So, this was reviewed at the time by the water dept. by the fire dept. and we felt that we addressed all their comments, so we hope that we can go forward with this and get approval for the site plan. Again you've seen it before, you've had it reviewed and conservation hopefully we'll be back in a couple weeks with them and get the OK from DEP that they (Conservation Commission) can approve the 5000, and hopefully get our water quality certificate from the Army Corp. as a condition. Most of the work which is more of a concern with Conservation is outside of the 100' (buffer). Lot of buffering that goes on the project as far as what is required for buffering, between property owners and stuff like that. All the dwellings are separated by 100 ft. and a unique issue that we have, and get tricky but we can satisfy the requirements, have to do a grid of 200 x 200 ft. suppose to perc 80% of them, when bought property and did exploratory perc tests, only a few were witnessed by the Board of Health, so going forward, will ask the Board of Appeals to allow us to go back and do official perc tests. Did some in areas in correlation to the subdivision lots. Did a lot of soil testing out there, some of it was witnessed by BOH, some just for our own drainage designs, but when we go forward we will have to do actual perc tests that will be witnessed. That explains what this is and how we got here. Any questions Mark or other members?

Mr. Millias: I am familiar with the property already, was the tangent section going to be outside the wetlands, does that change at all?

Mr. Kotowski: The last time I was here I had the comparison between the, (subdivision) when we did the Definitive we had about 1250 ft. of roadway, so we shorted this tangent so it just beyond this tangent, so as come through this, then you have a curve, then a tangent, then a small curve and then another tangent, so it is this one that we reduced down by about 94 ft. We didn't change the high point either within our profile, we just shortened that section of road, which would have been relatively flat with a slight increase up to the high point. Elevations and catch basins, everything stayed the same, except for the size of the basins, we didn't change that, so should be more than adequate to Merrill's review, decreasing impervious surface. One thing to note on these, we are proposing dry wells for each one of the units. We did our surface modeling calculations, we had a lot more disturbed area under the residential subdivision, the houses were spaced out more in this area, so we disturbed a lot more land, now everything is more confined to this area, and we did a proper analysis, if this was something we hadn't worked on, then we wouldn't have been able to demonstrate that we actually decreased the amount of potential runoff, because the development has shrunk down so much.

Mr. Millias:; I think it looks good. Are you looking for an extension tonight?

Mr. Kotowski: Yes, Think we should, as some members aren't here that were last time. I guess she left a message at the office.

Ms. Monti: Yeah I got a call around 3 p.m. Called him. So were you thinking 30 days or you have 60 on this. Secretary: I didn't know what you would want.

Mr. Kotowski: That's fine because we want everyone here, and we still have the Conservation Commission

Mr. Millias: In 30 days we should be able to meet with a larger group.

Mr. Kotowski: The next meeting is July 3rd.

Mr. Belcher: We probably won't be meeting on the third, so the next one is the 17th. We're already down one person on the third.

Secretary: 30 days would bring us to July 23rd.

Ms. Monti: Ok so we'll do the 30.

Motion to continue Site Plan Review and to extend for 30 days (deadline for decision).

MOTION: Larry Belcher
SECOND: Rick Greeley AIF

Site Plan Review- Halifax Trails: 265 Monponsett St. – Multi-Family Development

Present: Greg Driscoll and Alan Comeau. Presenting Mr. Driscoll of Jacob/Driscoll Engineering:

We are here tonight for the Halifax Trails project. Tonight the only thing new is that I have the drainage calcs. Those are basic, there will be a more thorough report to be submitted later. Wanted to make sure I catch some of these revisions and comments that we will get as we move forward, instead of designing all the time. The system will work according to the calculations. The ponds here will go to these, driveway here will go to this pond, these two back ones weren't big enough relative to, it swales back there, so there will be a storm captor

or culvert to treat the road. May be able to narrow the basins down a little bit, make them a little bit smaller, the calculations, everything works right now. That is it for new things on the site, was hoping for any comments back from the Town.

Mr. Millias: I'm just getting familiar with it now, are there two existing ponds and one basin being created?

Mr. Driscoll: No, this is an existing wetland, (right here) this is one right here, overall, there is a portion of the property that drains this way. A high point for here, everything else from the facility next door goes from this wetland to this wetland, so this is the design point for a good portion of the site. This is a Town House Development, being brought forth by Halifax Trails, 26 units, 2-3 bedroom units. Couple 6 unit buildings and couple 4 unit buildings. This parcel of land over here, there is a Purchase & Sale on that, combined those two lots create the 26 acres will need for the 26 units. This is the main drive, access drives and will have garages in the back. Unique type of arrangement, with double unit then a single unit. Each unit will have its own private patio. This unit here will have no windows on the side, will be stairs and pantry on that side, so everyone has private outdoor space. Around back will have driveway and two car garage, more parking for residents and guests. Overall layout, handicap parking. Going through Zoning Board right now in regards to separate lots, may end up, instead of asking for several variances for frontage and rear setbacks, may ask for one variance to not put each building on a separate lot. This garage will be demolished. The developer will be putting in a garden so each unit will have its own garden. Eventually we are going to con Com for this area, it's nice to walk thru. Nice ridges to make trails on, nice nature area for the residents to utilize. Not developable at all.

Mr. Millias: Has it been delineated at all?

Mr. Driscoll: Yes. That is something that we will file on our next revision, the wetlands through here. These, flags delineated about 3 years ago, just had them updated, pretty much the same, moved a little bit, but that will be part of the next revision.

Mr. Belcher: And the other lot too? Is in question, the entire lot.

Mr. Driscoll: No, not the entire lot.

Mr. Comeau: No, were not building on the remaining land at all.

Mr. Belcher: It's just to establish because you need woodland, not wetland over there.

Mr. Comeau: Yeah, basically the by-law doesn't distinguish between wetland or upland for, when using credit land for acreage for the amount of units.

Mr. Driscoll: There is a prevision about being able to perc within a 200 x 200 ft. grid.

Mr. Millias: But this project is relying on the actually obtaining the other lot. You don't own it yet?

Mr. Driscoll: yes.

Mr. Comeau: We have it under agreement, for about a year now. Owner is anxious to sell because no one is going to buy it but me.

Mr. Driscoll: It's not developable, other wise ...

Mr. Comeau: Not even a single house lot on that 14 acres.

Mr. Driscoll; We are going to utilize the central area for septic for these four buildings. This building is a little bit lower so will probably have a separate one over here.

Mr. Greeley: You said it would be 2 and 3 bedroom units?

Mr. Driscoll: Yes, it will be a mixture, all the same size, will just mater if you move some walls the rooms around. Expecting people will down size their house, those people to be buyers for this type of project.

Mr. Greeley: They're all the same size? Footprint?

Mr. Driscoll: Yes, the front will be broken up a bit, they won't all look the same.

Mr. Millias; do you have a road profile in that set?

Mr. Driscoll: Created it with a right of way, for the frontage on the lots, but that might go away. We don't have to split the buildings up onto separate lots.

Mr. Millias: Are you expecting a lot of grading going up into the septic area.

Mr. Driscoll: No, not really.

Mr. Millias: Because they are all going to be accessible walk into the front, with a garage under on the back, on all units.

Mr. Driscoll: Yes, there is going to be a planter, about 2 -3 feet reveal on the foundation, will be up relatively high.

Mr. Millias: So it will be less grading?

Mr. Driscoll: Yes. The way the site is right now, existing grades, this is the higher area and drops off, so that helps us achieve what we want.

Mr. Millias: Is it creating a crossing by pond 2A, or is it going to be a pipe in the culvert, or something connecting that to...

Mr. Driscoll: This one over here connects over to this wetland, a pipe that stops right there, we are going to cut that pipe off, and put it into this basin before it goes out.

Mr. Millias: So there is already an existing pipe now?

Mr. Driscoll: Yes an 8" clay pipe. Then we are proposing, this wetland is layout like this and the grade goes up, pretty high grade right there, I think created from that pipe, so we are proposing to fill that wetland about 1000 square feet and then replicate in this area. We will be proposing that to Conservation.

Mr. Millias: The open space, is this for parking?

Mr. Driscoll: yes, that is for visitor parking. The residents pull around here and will have 2 garage spaces and two parking spaces, should be plenty.

Mr. Millias: Four provided and then guests.

Mr. Driscoll: Yes, and these are the locations.

Mr. Millias: Do you know how many in total?

Mr. Driscoll: 143, 5 ½ per unit. Providing 4 handicap spaces.

Mr. Comeau: about 80 % of entire site is open space, we've never done that before.

Mr. Driscoll: Overall coverage is 2.8%

Secretary: We haven't had too many comments come back. We do have Conservation, and I can get a copy of that for you.

Mr. Driscoll: There are updated versions of these two maps and the calculations received tonight.

Mr. Millias: Pond 3 area where it is proposed now is outside of this lot?

Mr. Driscoll: Yes, it does cross over into the other lot.

Mr. Millias: Do you know if we have that... sheet 7, all these ones cut off.

Mr. Driscoll: This note will be removed on the next revision, the topography in this area. We have the extended topography in this area, and we also have the wetland flags in this corner right here. 100' buffer kinda goes over to that corner.

Mr. Millias: The sheet as well as the wetlands, 100' buffer.

Mr. Driscoll: It will be on the next revision, we did the survey about a week or so ago. Originally we thought that we could go out and see the flags were still there, but weren't so we went back out to survey them.

Mr. Millias: These are the dumpster pads, one for each road. So, there is just a garage there now, no other house or utilities or anything?

Mr. Driscoll: Probably utilities because there was a house there, burnt down and the garage will be removed.

The driveway will be turned into grass.

Mr. Comeau: The only thing in the front will be the entrance to the development, everything else will be field.

Mr. Driscoll: The idea of the development was to keep everything back away from the street, screening from this and trees over here, tucked away in the back.

Mr. Greeley: You having a sign going out front?

Mr. Comeau: A rock probably, carved rock with a light on it maybe. A lot of trees, landscaping, will be very pretty in there, we're going to spend a lot of money on trees and landscaping.

Mr. Greeley: what about lighting?

Mr. Driscoll: We will have street lights shown on these plans, about 100' apart.

Mr. Comeau: You'll hardly see it from Route 58. There will be so many trees that you won't even know its out there. That's the whole idea, that's why I wanted to put everything out back.

Mr. Millias: Do you know what the total impervious coverage would be?

Mr. Driscoll: Have it broken out, I believe the building coverage is 2.8%.

Mr. Millias: The building being at 2.8% gives it some scale. Plus looks like mostly open, pavement minimal except for the drives in the back.

Mr. Driscoll: As far a traffic flow, it's a one way around this way.

Mr. Millias: Are you going to have signs right here.

Mr. Driscoll: Will have "right turn only" out of the driveways. We met the fire Chief about the access.

Mr. Comeau: There was a discussion about an auxiliary road, he said he didn't see the need for an auxiliary road what so ever.

Mr. Millias: do you know how far it is to the cul-de-sac, or where the split is?

Mr. Driscoll: It's about 450.

Mr. Millias: I know they have a turning radius requirement. They take a look at that also, do you know?

Mr. Comeau: This radius is larger than cul-de-sac.

Mr. Driscoll: The fire chief said he liked that he had access to the back as well.

Mr. Millias: Satisfies me for now, would you like to present the update soon?

Mr. Driscoll: Yeah, I was hoping to get some comments back from some of the departments and incorporate them in.

(Secretary advised they have 30 days to respond)

Motion made to continue to next meeting July 3rd at 7:45 p.m. If meeting cancelled will be July 17 at 7:45 p.m.

MOTION: Larry Belcher
SECOND: Rich Greeley AIF

Deb Tinkham asked what the process from here, as they are working with the ZBA. At what point would the Board make a decision on the site plan or initial review of the site plan. Secretary advised of Planning Board time frames; Town Departments have 30 days to respond, Board has 45 days to approve or endorse unless a mutually extended. Take comments under advisement. 30 days, brings date to July 10, next meeting after that is July 17th, would be earliest to make decision. Have until July 24th is the 45 day.

Rick Greeley asked if there were any other projects around.

Mr. Comeau advised has some in Rolling Hills, one on Crosby Rd in E. Bridgewater off Washington St. across from Robin's Pond. Boston condo's.

<u>Site Plan Review – George Smith for Solar Farm. 2 Monponsett St.</u>

Submitted plans to Board, Petitioner could not attend meeting. Members present reviewed plans, discussed authority the Board has. Secretary advised that we as the Town does not have much say, by law, Town can't stop solar or alternative energy from being developed. But they still have to do the site plan. Have received comments back from other Departments. Conservation – no problems. Fire Dept wants keys to front gate or lock box. Have until July 31st to make decision. Within the 100' buffer but staying outside the 50'. Mr. Smith will be in for the next meeting.

Motion to approve and pay bill to WB Mason in the amount of \$36.75 for office supplies.

MOTION: Larry Belcher

SECOND: Rick Greeley AIF

Motion to approve and pay bill to WB Mason in the amount of \$37.58 for Name plate and signature Stamp for Larry Belcher.

MOTION: Larry Belcher

SECOND: Rick Greeley AIF

Secretarial:

- Advised that Chairman had a meeting posted for the 23rd just in case. Larry cannot do Mondays. In the event we had to hear Amanda Estates, but we got extension.
- Line Item transfer confirmation.
- Memo from the Zoning Board secretary in regards to a 40B training course. Would like to know how
 many Planning Board members would attend if we had a class in Halifax. Mark, Larry and Rick all
 interested.
- State Ethics training, every 2 yrs on line, each year receive rules & regs and sign sheet

Adjourn:				
Motion to adjourn meeting.				
	MOTION:	Larry Belcher		
	SECOND:	Rick Greeley	AIF	
It was unanimously voted to	adjourn th	e meeting at 8:45 p.	m.	
Respectfully submitted,		Date Appro	oved:	
Terri Renaud				
Planning Board Secretary				