



**Halifax Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
March 21, 2019**

Official

A meeting of the Halifax Planning Board was held on Thursday, March 21, 2019, at 6:30 p.m. at the Halifax Town Hall, Meeting Room #1, 499 Plymouth Street, Halifax, Massachusetts.

Members Present: Gordon Andrews, Mark Millias, Karlis Skulte **Absent:** Larry Belcher, Jonathan Soroko

The meeting was called into session at 6:40 p.m. and the agenda was read into the minutes by Gordon Andrews
Motion to accept the agenda as read

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

AIF

6:40 p.m.

Motion to suspend the regular scheduled Planning Board meeting and open the Public Hearing for 330 Plymouth St. 19-SPR-03.

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte

AIF

Public Hearing opened: Present is Casey Burch representing Solli Engineering for O'Reilly Auto Parts.

To follow up from last meeting, several comments from the review engineer they feel they have satisfied. (email sent to members, hard copies received)

1) Drainage calculations, under proposed conditions: discussed with Highway surveyor, Steve Hayward and advised there are flooding concerns along Plymouth St. and no additional run off should be allowed to flow onto Plymouth St. The plan should be revised so no run off goes into Plymouth St.

Put a leak off here, elevation in street currently grade of 71, catch basin 70.9 at the base of the drive, elevated the majority of the driveway, so goes into a leak off, and removed the front sidewalk connecting to parking lot, and provided a swale that goes into the wetlands. Will collect a portion of driveway and the swale is shallow enough for recharge and eventually around to the back wetlands.

Mr. Millias: proposing grade changes outside of he property to create that swale. Mr. Burch said no. will tie into at the property lines.

2) Ground water recharges, site design. Ground water recharge is required by Mass DEP.

To satisfy, increased the bottom of the basin slightly and raised the low orafus, and get the volume for the recharge volume required by Massachusetts standards. Basin from last design is a little bigger and the outward control structure did get remodified. (little over 3 from the bottom of the basin) Mr. Andrews asked if they were elevating the site, back of the building. Mr. Burch advised its about 72 and its 67 in that area. Mr. Skulte asked about the recharge rate. Mr. Burch advised it to be .52

3) Cover of discharge pipe from catch basin is 1 foot between the thickness of the frame and top of slavit catch basin. May not be possible to construct this with limited cover. Recommend cover be class 5 reinforced concrete or ductal iron.

They lowered the pipe slightly and get the cover and changed to class 5 RCD.

4) sump in catch basin should be minimum of 4', should be specified on sheet 3.02. Modified the detail to have a 4-foot sump.

5) The discharge end of the proposed rerouted drain line from Plymouth St. is shown to discharge into a level spread of a low grade. In order to prevent surcharge into a line and to allow easier maintenance, recommend the end of the pipe discharge at or above grade, the rip rap sump could be constructed at the end of the line to form in a similar manner to the level spreader.

We can raise it up and commission may be okay with it, but the Highway dept, its more distribution at the same elevation as their main line. Proposed not have surcharge condition and deal with flow freely and cover the pipe and go at ½ percent, the invert (here) is being above, at the same elevation and crown as the main line. Now flow will only catch higher flow. If that backs up, (because they blocked this and had problems in the road) this is better than a blocked condition, this leak off should take some of that burden from the road and won't go across the lane. These measures should help not remove completely, may always have flooding, but at least a 2 yr. and possibly a 10-yr. storm event, will alleviate some of the higher flow and higher storm events, should flow to the river down (fire station).

6) adequately convey the design the storm, the catch basin and the hydrometric separator should be equipped with a double grate.

Spoke with him (review engineer) he just wants this one out here to be a double catch basin.

7) long term inspection and maintenance manual included the engineering portion and outline and maintenance procedures for the catch basin.

Update that in the engineering report, (appendix G)

8) spill containment section of long-term maintenance manual references porous pavement

Deleted as there is no porous pavement on site.

9) soil control plan sheet 2.31 should specify silt sac inlet protection. They have provided that

10) soil control plan sheet 2.31 area protection fence to protect leaching area in the front of the property

Originally had septic in front, testing was done in the back, soils are adequate, forgot to move the fence over.

11) proposed sidewalk on right side of building shown to be 2 ½ feet wide.

Not actually a sidewalk, shouldn't be concrete, its regular asphalt, and have stripping for proposed curb stops. No pedestrian walkway.

12) driveway and parking area surrounded by petuinous concrete curbing for left side and front.

There was a flush condition because of high point of drainage and didn't think was necessary, but put curbing in for engineer.

13) snow storage should be identified on the plan

Area pointed out on plan

14) septic design will be reviewed by the Board of Health, Title V, 363 gal. a day They are submitting to BOH tomorrow, on agenda for April or May. Advised they will be going for variances and explained low average gallons of usage. Would like to use a meter reading. Mr. Burch went on to explain low employee count and low pedestrian usage. Members agreed that is for Board of Health not Planning.

(concludes comments from Review Engineer)

Mr. Burch continued with the events of the day. Today they went out to site and looked at the neighboring property and outlet control structure. Appears designed per plan but doesn't have an outlet at the property line of neighbors, so does flood and finds a path to low side. Strongly believe their plan will be and give it a better condition than existing now. Both recharge and peak discharge.

Mr. Millias asked the Algers (abutters) how they felt after walking it and seeing the plan, impact or improve conditions? Mr. Alger stated if he can put in a pipe going from the back, north side out to the back ditch to get the water away when it overflows. The Towns water is the big concern right now.

Mr. Skulte was not sure if they can as it is not their property. Mr. Burch stated that it is definitely a ditch and water is being discharged into that corner, so the low-lying area the water will go there. He does not foresee it going into the back and contributing to banks already issue. Still strongly believes it will go into the ditch and will go into the ditch on (their property) and takes a turn goes out. Mr. Alger said there has to be a pipe put in to get it (water) out of that area. [the back property is owned by Mr. peck] Mr. Alger also advised the ditch was built to take all the water out of the other area. Mr. Skulte advised that it limited because they (O'Reilly's) can't go off their property. It would be his (Mr. Peck's) responsibility to tie into that.

Mrs. Alger asked if this goes thru do, they have any recourse they have if it doesn't work? If they get flooded in the back land. Is there anybody that can help this if this goes thru and approved?

Mr. Millias stated that they are trying to do their best to make sure this design looks like it will work, but some natural disaster above and beyond, that the tricky part, if storm like we've never seen, in next 20 yrs. If it potentially it fails, that can't necessarily be on them. If what they do fails, an embankment drops, [etc.], they will be responsible, but for flooding, not sure. Mr. Burch, they stated if anything did happen to the detention pond, if it's doesn't go per Mass storm water code anymore, that's where they would have to come back and reconstruct it. Mr. Alger asked who is shutting the water off from the Town? Mr. Burch stated they are raising it up so that with small storm events it won't go in. It would have to surcharge the main pipe then go up into it. Mr. Alger asked if they are getting an easement to dump directly out. [no easement now] Mr. Andrews advised that the [board] has to take a look at what the Town is doing now and what is on the plans, before we comment on it. It is believed it should work.

Mr. Alger now feels it ill backup on the road and go up on the banks drain...

Mr. Andrews stated that [we] have to investigate to see where that run off is in the front, what it will do out on the road. If the catch basin from the bank gets impeded by the same water or they will catch it. Mr. Alger asked where the water is going from the restaurants across the street [Happy Dragon, Lyonville Tavern]. Mr. Skulte said it probably goes into the street, into the catch basins, and suppose to go to the west. Mr. Andrews again wants to look at the town plans.

Mr. Burch stated that they are 12' pipes, the area going to the road, was probably undersized. The road was rebuilt about 20 yrs. ago, from the catch basin and manholes.... Mr. Skulte asked what size is the main after it ties into the manhole? Mr. Burch ... along the front is 12'. Discussion continued when the road was rebuilt.

Mr. Skulte asked how he came up with the rate. Mr. Burch noted it was based on the soil type. Infiltration of .09 inches per hour as opposed to .52 at 2 ½ feet. Mr. Burch said that they are higher than that. Used it off of Hydraulic soil group as provided by the manual. Used a more conservative number because "B" it was higher, so used "C" which the review engineer said he should do. Mr. Skulte questioned that as "C" should be .17 incher per hour if using a lower number. Mr. Burch again confirmed he discussed it with (Pat Brennan, review engineer) and that is what he told him to use for that soil group.

Discussion continued between Mr. Burch and Mr. Skulte on the soil types, rates, elevations of catch basins, classifications, if they went to the Conservation Commission. Mr. Burch said they have no problem with the design.

Mr. Andrews opened for discussion. A representative from the bank [Mutual Bank] is present. Kelly Poulos. She is unaware of any issues, only with bank a few years, has asked around for information on any drainage issues that she heard of. She advised that she will have to go back to her CEO with the information. Been in touch with Webby Engineer, who said he did something every three years to maintain and check the area. Also

had a landscaper Mark Owens did some cleanup a couple times but cannot get in touch with him. She does not have any plans so can not speak in technical terms. Mr. Andrews advised that she was invited because of the drainage issue, [with the Algiers] conservation chairman met them out to the site. They [commission] had tried to contact them [the bank] numerous times, with no response and no clean up of the retention area and its overgrown, there is a maintenance program that is suppose to be followed, (should be in folder) Mr. Andrews does know that they will be reaching out to the bank and if no response they [conservation] will start to fine the bank. It is over grown, no trimming, trees not bushes, if you want to reach out to engineer. There is a schedule of maintenance, included in permitting.

Ms. Poulos said that most of the people involved from then is retired or no longer work there. She was unable to find any documents. Would appreciate any copies we can get her. Mr. Skulte asked if they are open to cleaning it and maintaining it, bring it back to where it is supposed to be. She said they do not believe they would ignore any letters from conservation commission. (secretary unable to find schedule in folder)

Mr. Andrews also suggested she reach out to the Commission. Chairman was at the site with Planning. [Secretary offered copies of what the board has] Branch manager was able to find Webby Eng. Business card and Vissella and Sons, (Brockton) they may be connected and will try this Arthur Borden. [Webby Eng. advised that he had a report from 2015 & would forward to both secretary and Mutual Bank.] K. Poulos said she will look into it.

Mr. Andrews would like to continue to next meeting to try and get plans from the Town to resolve the drainage issue (for the street) Mr. Millias also asked for Mr. Burch to clarify the perc rate pulled off a soil type. Mr. Burch said it was the first time he had seen it but is one of the standards for storm water and spoke with Pat Brennan about. Mr. Skulte said you can do it classification of USDA textural analysis send to a lab and they advise the classification to use for the actual elevation to use when doing the recharge even if it were the .09 probably be better than the .72 hrs. anyway, and he asked for Mr. Burch to look into that. (infiltration rate) Other than that, there does not seem to be any design issues, just to clarify [rate].

Mr. Andrews requested that an extension as the deadline of 45 days is coming soon. Letter of Mutual Agreement to be signed by representative and members. Mr. Skulte asked if Conservation had any questions or comments. Mr. Burch said no and have no issues as they consider this is all manmade wetlands, as it was originally farmed, and all drainage was put into this area. Continued hearing to April 4 at 6:45 p.m. extension for 30 days to April 24, 2019. (two meetings)

Motion to extend for 30 days petition #19-SPR-03

MOTION: K. Skulte

SECOND: M. Millias All in favor

Motion to continue Public hearing on April 4, 2019 [at 6:45 p.m.] and resume the regular Planning Board meeting

MOTION: M. Millias

SECOND: K. Skulte All in favor

Bills payable:

Motion to pay bill for Plympton/Halifax Express Public Hearing notice, legal Ad #10465 in the amount of \$84.00 for the RG Automotive site plan review

MOTION: Mark Millias

SECOND: Karlis Skulte All in favor

Form A: 395 Plymouth St.

The first one looked at a couple weeks ago, they took out the wording of "to be raised" for the two back buildings. Planning Board can approve the Form A, but would then create zoning violation. The larger building is creating the zoning violation, and it is also no habitable. Planning Board only looking at is at an ANR, Approval not required (Subdivision Control)

Motion to endorse Form A for 395 Plymouth St. file dated 3/1/2019 drawn by Outback Engineering.

File #19-A-03 Assessors Map 73 lot 1B, 15 & 15A, book 48346 pg. 206

MOTION: K. Skulte

SECOND: M. Millias

All in favor

Members briefly discussed the infiltration rates, classifications, soil analysis, soil types, SIV analysis. The rate being used, and it may not affect the outcome. May have mistaken a conversation as opposed to being told to use a certain rate by the review engineer. Believe it is a loamy sand. .089 lower than class C, which is not good, but recharge area is good with a 72-hr. recharge area. They were using .52 rate which is a high rate, to say how long it would take to drawn down, would do in 10 hours, reality is probably closer to 65 hrs., but requirements are to do it in 72, so probably ok that they used the .52 number in report.

Also discussed what happens if it fails. However, the review engineer and design look to work. If problem in basin they are responsible, but there is no base line beforehand, and what it is now.

Gordon advised he will try to contact the Highway Dept and get the Town plans for Route 106. D. Swanson said it was 11 feet down in front of Dunkin Donuts, shouldn't have a problem getting water into basin if 11 feet down. Manhole to pipe is 11 feet, catch basin at the site, shouldn't have a problem with water.

Motion to adjourn

MOTION: Karlis Skulte

SECOND: Mark Millias

All in favor

It was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Approved: _____

Terri Renaud
Planning Board Secretary
