

August 30, 2005

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Matt Hayes, Karyl Spiller-Walsh, Andy Rodenhiser, and Chan Rogers. Associate Member Eric Alexander arrived at 8:16 p.m.

ALSO PRESENT: Mark Louro and Paul Carter of VHB, Inc., Gino Carlucci, PGC Associates and Susan Affleck-Childs, Planning Board Assistant.

The meeting was called to order at 7:42 pm

CITIZEN COMMENTS – None

***Public Hearing Continuation – Pine Meadow II Subdivision***

Susy Affleck-Childs – The applicant has asked for a continuation.

The public hearing was continued to 9:45 pm on 9/13/05.

MATT HAYES – As we have some time until our next appointment, we can deal with some of our other business items.

***Set Plan Review Fee for Franklin Creek Definitive Subdivision Plan***

A motion was made by Andy Rodenhiser, seconded by Chan Rogers, to approve the plan review estimate of \$450 by PGC Associates. The motion was unanimously approved.

A motion was made by Andy Rodenhiser, seconded by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, to approve the plan review estimate of \$3,238 by VHB, Inc. The motion was approved. Matt Hayes recuse.

***Construction Observation – Mark Louro, VHB.***

Evergreen Meadow – They installed a lot of drainage this week. It is 75% complete. I was out there today. They should be done with the drainage before the next meeting. The detention basins are rough graded and staked.

Susy Affleck-Childs – Taniel Bedrosian called today and has asked for the Board to set the bond and authorize lot releases. I have scheduled that for the 9/27/05 meeting.

ANDY RODENHISER – There is a fence out there. Is that on our plans?

Mark Louro – No. As I understand it, the abutter (to the west – David Iarussi) did some filling in and I heard they plan to build a garage. Taniel decided to put up the fence there to separate his stuff from their work. But the Conservation Commission is investigating because it is a wetlands area.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I saw the agenda for an upcoming CONCOM meeting and they are having both David Iarussi and Taniel Bedrosian come in to discuss.

ANDY RODENHISER – I was up at the Hartney Acres area. The soils were all washing out from the site onto Nobscott Road. There was gray silt going into the catch basins. I talked to Dave D’Amico about it. The Town’s new stormwater management bylaw hasn’t been approved yet by the AG’s office so he can’t enforce it.

Mark Louro – I can make them put in some hay bales.

MATT HAYES – But is there a stormwater prevention plan?

Mark Louro – The subdivision regs in effect for Evergreen don’t require that.

Gino Carlucci – I believe that the bylaw is in effect. There is a slight risk of enforcing it while AG’s office is reviewing it.

ANDY RODENHISER – The accumulation of grit should be cleaned in the catch basins. They should get a warning and it should be cleaned up.

Mark Louro – I will contact the contractor tomorrow. It is certainly within the Board’s scope to have its engineer follow up on this concern.

Mark Louro – Also on Hartney Acres, they are starting to construct the wetlands crossing. The box culverts are not in. They still have not been delivered. 90% of drainage system is in. Some of the block has been delivered.

Country View Estates – I met with Greg Whelan tonight before the meeting. On Stable Way, the sidewalk, roadway top and berm is in place. There will be some repairs done over next 2 weeks from storm damage. They put in a lot of loam to back up the berm. They have not done the long list of punch items for Broad Acres Farm Road. Greg said Vinny (Boczanowski) will be out. I asked about the status of the detention pond for 37 Broad Acres Farm Road. The engineer he contracted with to do the design (FAIST Engineering) has not yet completed the redesign. David was on vacation. Overall, there is more progress in past month than in the past 1½ years. I did not prepare a punch list for Stable Way. There are lots of little details on Broad Acres Farm Road that have to be dealt with. The dead trees of concern were cut down.

Susy Affleck-Childs – Irene Streifer (37 Broad Acres Farm Road) called. She asked if Greg had requested any bond reduction and also asked if he had submitted any engineering for the

redesign of the detention pond on her property. I told her that he had not requested any bond reduction. I spoke with Mark Louro this morning and nothing has been submitted on the redesign of the pond.

ANDY RODENHISER – What is the status of our deadline with them?

Mark Louro – I did discuss the schedule with Greg. He intends to seek street acceptance at the fall town meeting if he is able to. His contractor will be out there over the next two weeks. He had been promised that work would be done by August 30<sup>th</sup>. They are moving forward and doing the work.

MATT HAYES – I mentioned to Greg today that Town Counsel would have a problem with us releasing bond money with the pending lawsuit by the Streifers against Greg. He felt that was an extra incentive for him to resolve the lawsuit with the Streifers.

NOTE – Copy the PB letter to Greg with the August and November deadlines.

Susy Affleck-Childs – We may want to ask him to come in to give the board an update.

CHAN ROGERS – Claiming the bond will take up some time.

ANDY RODENHISER – We need to hold these folks accountable. It is good faith on our end to do our job

It was decided to ask Greg Whelan to attend the September 13 meeting at 7:15 pm.

Mark Louro – Nothing else is progressing. I haven't heard much from Grapevine.

ANDY RODENHISER – Anything on that sign and whether it is in the public way?

Mark Louro – I have a verbal indication from the property owner on the corner that the sign is not in the public way but on private property.

ANDY RODENHISER – We should make sure that Paul Carter, the new VHB engineer working on the Medway contract, is aware of this matter.

Mark Louro – The sign location will show up on the as-built plan.

### ***Planning Board Staffing***

Susy Affleck-Childs – We have been informed by the Town Administrator that any funding for a part time person will need to come from within the FY 06 Planning Board budget. There are no other resources available. I would recommend reallocating \$1800 from Contracted Services to a new Part-Time Employee line item to cover the expense of hiring Stacey Wetstein for 10 hours a week for 9 weeks at \$20/hour.

CHAN ROGERS – I have reviewed her resume and she has excellent credentials.

A motion was made by Chan Rogers, seconded by Andy Rodenhiser to reallocate the FY 06 budget by moving \$1,800 from Contracted Services to Part-Time Salaries. The motion was unanimously approved.

Susy Affleck-Childs – You are going to have to decide how you want to allocate Stacey’s time. She can work Mondays and Wednesdays and Tuesday nights. Her schedule will impact how board packets are completed.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – We have a couple of people at the DRC who do a pretty good job at minutes. Maybe one of them would come in. I will call them – Katie Tortorello and Julie Fallon – to see if they are interested.

***River Bend Village ARCPUD - Public Hearing Continuation***

NOTE – Associate Member Eric Alexander joins the meeting at 8:16 pm.

MATT HAYES – This is a continuation of the public hearing for the River Bend ARCPUD special permit. I would like to note for the record that Abbott Real Estate Development is a client of my employer. Having discovered this, I have decided to recuse myself from discussions and voting regarding the application on the special permit and the definitive subdivision plan. If the Board wishes, I will be glad to remain as chair to run the public hearing but I will not vote.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – Yes.

ANDY RODENHISER – Yes.

CHAN ROGERS – Yes

Rich Cornetta – The applicant has no objection if Mr. Hayes continues to run the public hearing.

Mark Louro – I must disclose that Abbott Real Estate Development is an existing client of VHB. We have discussed in-house whether VHB reviewing the plan is a problem, and we are not concerned, but it is the board’s decision. We are working with Abbott on another project in another town, nothing related to this application.

CHAN ROGERS – I don’t have a problem with VHB reviewing these plans. VHB is one of the largest engineering firms in Mass and they practice nationwide. I don’t think there is any problem.

ANDY RODENHISER - I agree.

Rich Cornetta – The applicant has no reservations to VHB continuing as the Town’s engineering consultant.

Rich Cornetta – Good evening. I am attorney Richard Cornetta representing Abbott Real Estate in their application for an ARCPUD special permit. We are here on a continuation for the public

hearing. During the last public hearing, we gave a rather lengthy overview of the proposal. There was some discussion at the end of the meeting regarding the possibility for the applicant to introduce some affordable units to those proposed. As a point of brief history, I understand that some of the current members were not involved in the earlier ARCPUD proposal for this site. As it was represented to me, I understand that a draft permit had been prepared during the prior negotiations. A key topic was the number of units. This was a serious concern of the predecessor board. The ARCPUD bylaw would allow a maximum of 176 units. There was some give and take which ended at 115 units. The predecessor applicant proposed a mitigation of \$200,000 to be paid to the senior center. Now enters Abbott who had reviewed the project as originally proposed and it did not contain any affordable units. And now there is the prospect of adding some affordable units to the proposal. We went back amongst our team and tried to formulate a rational plan that we would propose to you this evening. We would propose a modification to the larger building and introduce 13 affordable units to the equation. But to add the 13 affordable units and maintain the \$200,000 contribution to the senior center, we would also need to create 5-6 additional market rate units, all to be added to the flats building. So the total would become 133 or 134 total units whereby we could offer up 13 affordable units for the project. All the added units (affordable and market rate) would be in the new building. We would not create a 4<sup>th</sup> floor but a T off of the building to add the units. We believe it would not materially effect the open space area.

Gary Gardner, architect – What we are proposing is essentially the same site plan. We have pushed the building a little bit easterly and added a short wing on the north side and a longer wing on the south side. This creates a courtyard effect with a loop driveway. We did consider the most economical approach which was to add a 4<sup>th</sup> floor. But even though that made more sense economically, we understood that the community might have trouble with that and it wouldn't fit in with the rest of the community, so we settled on this shape. We feel it also satisfies some of the comments we had from the DRC previously. They had asked us to put some wings on it. So this gives us that opportunity. The building is 3 stories high. It has the additional parking required for the 13 additional affordable units. Because footprint is larger, there is more room down underneath in the basement garage. Plus there is room for 25 cars on grade. So we end up with 42 2-bedroom and 6 1-bedroom flats. We haven't developed the exterior further yet. We wanted to get your feedback before we get into that. It will have a courtyard feel in front but still lots of green space in front too. We will still maintain over 300 feet to the property line to the east with the abutters.

MATT HAYES – Did you say that the two adjacent two houses have moved (to make room for the larger building)?

Gary Gardner – No, the large building is 20 feet wider than the previous building but it is within the same grounds.

ANDY RODENHISER – We have some building elevations in our packet. What is this?

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – This is a collection of 3 story residential buildings that the DRC found. These are some good examples of well designed multi-family structures.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – Where is the hill now with the larger building?

John Spink – It is in the basement. We are on the down slope again. We still have 6 feet of it.

ERIC ALEXANDER – I have a general comment. I am not opposed to solving this affordability challenge this way, but I will say that adding the units to me makes the design (of the larger building) absolutely critical. I wasn't displeased before, but I am going to be more sensitive to what the DRC would say with the size of the building increasing.

Jim McCauliffe – We will do that once we kind of have our arms around the affordability issue. We were kind of guessing, based on your comments, that adding height would be an issue. Maybe we could get your thoughts first on that matter. The simplest approach was to give you a 10% of total formula.

ERIC ALEXANDER – Let me clarify too, as I was the primary pusher. It is not my intent to improve on our subsidized housing inventory on the back of one developer. This is a fairly significant size development and I didn't want to see us losing ground.

Jim McCauliffe – Abbott is coming to the table and we are trying to do is be somewhat of a good citizen with a win-win. We are not coming to you with a plan to withdraw the senior citizen funding that was previously committed.

ERIC ALEXANDER – That is understood. I appreciate the direction you are moving in. But let me say again, whether I can embrace this solution will be very dependent on the final design of the building.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – some of the original wording is that we wanted to include affordable. This adds more units literally and figuratively on top of what we had. When the applicant first came to the DRC we discussed the characteristic of the architecture. We were looking for a better quality architectural statement, something more interesting. This is a very important project to the Town. I don't think we are balking at the idea of numbers. We are interested in the design. How are you going to do it? What quality and integrity will be added? If it is more of the same of what you have already shown us, then we will have trouble with it, but if it takes on some better character, that is a different story.

Jim McCauliffe – I hear what you are saying. But I want to say that there are 2 issues to solve here. We know we aren't getting out of here and we understand that you have to be happy with the design. But we can't finish the design until you tell us what you want to do with the affordable housing units. WE need that guidance.

ANDY RODENHISER – Is this an attempt to isolate the affordable units?

Jim McCauliffe - The affordable units would be dispersed throughout the flats building. Hopefully, the final special permit decision would specify which units are to be affordable.

CHAN ROGERS – Can you give us a preliminary schedule of your advancement of the complete project?

Jim McCauliffe – What do you mean?

CHAN ROGERS – Your statement is the basic concept, but you are not going to get into the details of design.

Jim McCauliffe - I have to know whether I am adding 18 units to the building or 0. Once I know that, I can work on the design.

CHAN ROGERS – So you want approval of the basic layout?

Jim McCauliffe – I was assuming when we come to some resolution on the affordable units, we would then come back to you with more details on the architecture, but we need to know how many units we are working with.

ANDY RODENHISER – The 5 additional market rate units would go into the flats building as well?

Jim McCauliffe – Yes.

ANDY RODENHISER – Karyl, is it your opinion that the change in the shape creates good opportunities?

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – Yes, or else it could be more of the same.

ANDY RODENHISER – Would it be more efficient if they approached design review knowing a number of units?

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – We haven't really seen any results of more details.

ERIC ALEXANDER – We can talk about this some more but there are some neighbors in the audience.

MATT HAYES – Is there anyone in the audience that would like to speak?

Dan Hooper, 6 Naumkeag Drive – I apologize for coming in late but I am not feeling like I have a full sense of the changes. It seems like they are proposing an additional 18 units over and above the 115. When I was last here, it was discussed having the bigger building more centralized. Back in a previous iteration of the site plan, I want to say it was 122 units with some affordable. That was somewhat of an agreement going back 2 years. We agreed down to 115 units and now we are going up to 133 units. I am concerned about unit count. The effect on Village Street is always a concern for the neighborhood. More units is more burden on Village Street. This seems excessive. I would like to know how it is configured. Being pushed down to the deepest point in the development doesn't seem to make the most sense to me.

MATT HAYES – Is there anyone else who would like to speak? Hearing no one else, does the board wish to accept the unit number they have proposed?

ANDY RODENHISER – What do you think of Mr. Hooper’s comments?

John Spink – The reason the building is where it is is because it is 4 stories high. We have sunk it into the ground. In that area of the site, we can sink it down without getting into groundwater problems. The only other place you can do it is up at the northwest corner of the site and that makes it more visible from Village Street. It becomes difficult to put it anywhere else on the site without it looking larger.

Jim McCauliffe – Regarding unit numbers, when we came into the project, it was our understanding that there would be 115 units with contribution to the senior center. We ran our numbers and it works, it is not a home run, but it works. If you wanted us to include affordable units within the 115, we would have to say goodbye. We have not considered withdrawing the contribution to the senior center. Based on the couple of meetings we have had, I understand your desire to have an affordable component. That is what we have come up with and we get some market rate units to offset the affordable ones.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – The more detailed, the more cultivated the designs become, the more expensive the units will be to build. What is your thinking about what is going to pay for the affordable units?

ERIC ALEXANDER – Have you factored in the additional cost that aesthetics would bring to the spreadsheet?

Jim McCauliffe – If we can get some guidance from the PB, then we would want to take that next step.

ERIC ALEXANDER – I am not opposed to the additional 18 units if that gets it to have some affordable ones.

Jim McCauliffe – That is part of the constant tug that you have to do when you want to build a project. You have to make sure that under the skin, it is built soundly. Then you put the skin on top. For the town homes we are trying to sell for \$410 to \$450,000, one of our options is to have somebody customize it. We are willing to look at that. You haven’t physically given us this stuff yet. We are here saying here is an interesting solution and we would want to sit down with you.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – We are very interested in talking with you. There is nothing worse than big and bad. We want to see it well resolved and something more inline with what we want to see.

ANDY RODENHISER – All the units around there will be more attractive and marketable if they have something good to look at.

Jim McCauliffe – We are with you 100%.



ANDY RODENHISER – I would echo Eric’s sentiments as well.

CHAN ROGERS – I look at it as a 2 step process. I am in favor of the math of the units. We can’t ask for affordable units without getting something in the mix. I am ready to accept the number and have the aesthetics come later.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – I would prefer to wait and see but I am not negative about the numbers.

ERIC ALEXANDER – We need to give them a building footprint to work from.

Rich Cornetta – So I believe I hear a consensus that we are looking at a 3 story building over a 4 story one. And the numbers seem to work

ANDY RODENHISER – Yes.

Rich Cornetta – I think in good faith we can now move forward.

Jim McCauliffe – I would like to sit down soon with the DRC and brainstorm and get some fresh ideas.

Susy Affleck-Childs – I will set that up with the DRC.

ANDY RODENHISER – I gave them the set of building elevations from JSA.

MATTHEW HAYES – We have several letters.

Andy Rodenhiser read a memo dated 8/16/05 to Susy Affleck-Childs from Mark Flaherty, Medway Water/Sewer. It is attached and made a part of these minutes.

Andy Rodenhiser read a letter from Paul and Kathleen Hickey, 3 Naragansett Street, Medway. It is attached and made a part of these minutes.

John Spink – In response to their letter, the water connection will be 6 inches and will go down the street and across to the flats building. The rest of the loop will be an 8 or 10 inch line. The water main will be in a trench with dams along the trench. The only thing we are doing within 300 feet of the back side will have no impact on their drainage. There is not a lot we can even offer to help over there.

Jim McCauliffe – We will respond in writing to this comment.

John Spink – We have an ARCPUD process and a subdivision process. We would be asking for waivers to discuss them under the special permit.

MATT HAYES – Gino, would that be part of the special permit?

Gino Carlucci – There might be some particular waivers that would have to come in under the subdivision but you could do it as an informal discussion during the special permit.

MATT HAYES – We will run the public hearings concurrently.

John Spink – I would like to get going for some discussion. I will put it in writing this week - road widths, road material, drainage, etc.

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – I think it would be helpful.

The public hearing was continued to 7:35 pm on September 27, 2005

### ***Pine Ridge Estates OSRD Public Hearing***

MATT HAYES – Welcome everybody. This is the public hearing on the proposed Pine Ridge open space residential development. We will begin by having the applicant give an overview of the project. The Board will comment or ask questions. I will then open it to the public for comments and questions and then the Board or the applicant may be able to address some of those questions. Before we begin, we need to set some review fees.

A motion was made by Karyl Spiller-Walsh, seconded by Eric Alexander to approve the \$975 plan review fee for PGC Associates. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Chan Rogers, seconded by Eric Alexander, to approve the \$1250 plan review fee for VHB, Inc. The motion passed. Matt Hayes recuse.

A motion was made by Chan Rogers, seconded by Eric Alexander to waive the reading of the public hearing notice. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to waive the reading of the public hearing notice – chan, ERIC ALEXANDER – all yes

Paul Yorkis – I would like introduce the folks who are here this evening who will be making a presentation.

John Claffey - applicant

David Faist – engineer

Dan O’Driscoll – surveyor

Michael Radner – landscape architect

Jennifer Connelly – traffic engineer

Paul Yorkis – The first thing I want to share with the Board is that the original application was named Pine Ridge Estates. After some thought, we have changed the name to the Village at Pine Ridge. It is my understanding that what we are going thru is a 2 step process. Tonight begins the special permit. When/if that is approved, then the applicant would go ahead with a definitive subdivision plan. From the plan that was distributed to the Planning Board and was available at the Town Clerk and Planning Board offices, we have made some revisions based on some

comments directly received and others that we have learned about. A question was raised as to where the mailboxes were going to be located. We have decided on a centralized mailbox location. We have a revised plan to show you (dated 8/22/05). A question raised on signage. In addition to signage within the actual development, we have added two caution blind person signs and two 25 mph speed signs. A comment was made during the review process by PGC Associates that the width of Candlewood Drive was not labeled. That is now shown. The development is to be served by Town sewer and water. There are no cuts or fills greater than 8 feet and no slopes greater than 25% .

We understand a number of citizens have communicated with the Planning Board and expressed their concerns about safety. When we met informally with the Planning Board, you asked us to do a traffic analysis. We contracted with Connelly Associates and Jennifer Connelly can go thru that now.

Jennifer Connelly – I am a registered professional engineer and a professional traffic operations engineer. We conducted this analysis during July. counted traffic 6-9 am and 4-6 pm – we found that the peak hour was 7:15 to 8:15 am and 5-6 pm – we looked at whether July was indicative – we went out 5 years into the future – we looked at background growth in the area – we assumed a growth rate of .5% per year. We took a look at what this project – expected to generate 120 trips a day (60 in and 60 out) – during peak times, 10 trips – for any sort of townhouse development (.5 trips per unit) in the highest hour – levels of service are A and B with range of delay of 7-14 seconds – we looked at sight lines – on candlewood, the sight lines are adequate from the new roadway – small tree on one lot – we looked at exiting out onto farm street – distance is adequate for 35mph road – access to and from the site is safe – we did receive a letter from VHB who had reviewed our study – they concur that the development will have minimal impact on the intersections we studied

Paul – along the same lines of safety, the PB at our informal meeting requested that the applicant consider using the walkway between Island and Candlewood as a means of emergency access – we were asked to discuss this possibility with the Fire chief – Mr Claffey and I met with Wayne at the site and I believe you have a copy of his letter – with addition of 7 foot gravel on each side of the walkway, that would be a satisfactory emergency access. In addition, because of the neighbors concerns as expressed in the letters, I specifically asked the chief, whether during the most recent storm which caused a lot of damage throughout the town, whether that storm resulted in an inability of the fire department or ambulances to reach those who were in need during or immediately following the microburst – I asked if I could quote him – he said, in certain instances, they had to figure out different routes, but there was no degradation in response during that time. I am sure he would provide a letter – the second means of egress, the fire chief has indicated in his letter that it would be satisfactory in his judgment – beneficial to the residents of candlewood and island

Paul – Jeff Watson has reviewed this plan ANDY RODENHISER you have a letter from Jim, his suggestions that if the special permit is approved that the signs would conform to the DPS requirement s- OK with us

Paul – question on where trash would be handled from the development – a request has been forwarded to the Medway BOH – they will meet next month – Bill Fisher sees no reason why they would not permit curbside pick up for the development – we will share their response with the PB

Paul – a question was raised by your planning consultant whether we had followed the 4 step process and plans for the buffer zone

Michael RADner – Radner design- registered LA – the developer had asked me to take a look at adding some landscape screening on either side of the roadway – plan dated August 30 – line of staggered evergreens and shrubs – variety of colors and sizes and heights – 10 feet to 25-30 feet height at maturity – width of 6-8 to 25-20 feet – intent is to provide a visual screen on either side of the road – we want to keep them within the ROW so we can be responsible to maintain – very little room for berming – we would be happy to work with the direct abutters to enhance this – this is a starting point for the discussion

Paul – I would like to spend a few minutes on the dwelling design – we met with DRC and made a presentation to them – in the second page of tonight's handout – this is a concept – the bylaw calls for at least half of the units to have side load garages – we have proposed a cluster of 4 units and we show the 2 end units of each cluster – none of the floor plans before you show first floor master bedrooms – if we get the special permit then the conditioning we would start interacting with the architect – each of the buildings has a different – intentional staggering – DRC asked if it could be more pronounced than it is or even angle – we are aware that the floor plans don't show the staggering as we want to have it

Paul – in terms of the exterior detail, I am passing around the front elevation from what is available from this firm – there are certain details like window boxes, brick façade – with the exception of the copper roof that is shown, it is our intention to build that kind of dwelling – what we need to do, when we secure the special permit, we will go to the architect and get a 4 unit plan and reflect changes - we are happy to return to the DRC to finalize plans after the special permit – you have received a letter from the DRC which was favorable in terms of the design but asked to see final product.

Paul – address drainage in Candlewood – the project that is being proposed has a separate and distinct drainage system – from the comments that VHB has shared regarding Candlewood to the PB, before Candlewood would be accepted, the sumps at the catch basins would have to be cleaned out and detention pond would have to be returned to the original plan grading – we understand that and the applicant in his communication with the PB – has indicated that he will do what is necessary for candlewood to be accepted – the pine ridge drainage system is not related to candlewood – when it gets to the definitive stage will have its drainage system reviewed just like any other project –

Paul – one of the requirements of the special permit is to have approval of delineated wetlands from CONCOM – they have met and done a site walk and as a result of that they have asked us to further evaluate an additional area – that is in process, in September, they will review that – they were very comfortable with- and were not disputing anything

Paul – overall improvements to candlewood – you have received an email from Dave Damico, DPS re: the VHB comments on punch list for Candlewood are acceptable to him – what is not in there and was referenced at the informal, the applicant will also meet with the Disabilities Commission on site to make sure that the curb cuts, etc. will be acceptable to them –

Paul – we would be happy to respond to any questions the PB may have

MATT HAYES – the emergency access from Island Road – would that be gated?

Paul – it will be signed. Chief Vinton has proposed specific signs – we made no assumptions if you are in agreement with what the chief has proposed, we will add it – no gate would be installed because then a wheelchair could not use the pathway – signs saying emergency access only

MATT HAYES – 25 mph signs, would you consider putting one closer to Farm Street

Paul – we have no objection to moving them to wherever he wants them or to do more if he

MATT HAYES – landscaping at the entrance to the development, have you checked headlights and where the lights would go – would buffer trees block any of that

Michael radner – that is the intention of the buffer strip to plant it densely enough – we need some setback for sight distance – we don't want to bring them out too close to the road – would there be some consideration to working with the butters to possibly plant on their property

Paul – yes

John – nodded yes

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – also across the street – there are 2 houses that would be directly opposite – if they are interested, they should have some input

Paul – the concern about planting is that there is sufficient room for snowplowing and planting that will survive salt and sand – there may not be enough room in the layout – the degree to which the applicant has any right to go onto private property

Mark Louro – the DPS would not want to see any plantings in the ROW or anything would have to be done on private property and would be subject to agreement with the property owner

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – I think that could happen

Paul – there is a difference between suggesting and requiring – requiring is a concern of the applicant

MATT HAYES – can you show us where the CONCOM had a concern on additional wetlands

John – showed it – we are not quite sure if what they saw is even on our property

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – it seems we are facing this catch 22 situation – need for a special permit and the conflict of us granting the special permit when there are outstanding concerns – the first being the tightness of the plan that stems from the fact there is an irregularity between what the footprint is shown on the plan and the actual architectural drawings - also concern that it won't fit

Paul – we don't know how much water will be displaced until we have the special permit and can start doing the design for the definitive plan – that is the whole 2 step process

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – I see it that the developer creates a plan that works for me and then I say yes, here is your permit

Paul – what is illogical

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – what is being proposed on the plan doesn't match what is being shown on the architectural

Paul – the PB has the authority to indicate what the footprints of the building are; the applicant needs some guidance from the PB on this; what has been proposed is this configuration, at the DRC, people thought it was OK but with some slightly different angles and we are OK with that – if the PB approves 6,000 sq. foot footprint, then we have to work within that – we felt that we owed the PB some representation of what this will look like – we feel that plans from Frank Betz are good ones – been used for single family home in Medway and been well received – we are trying to do the best job and we are happy to get feedback – we understand this is not a one night process – there are going to be questions raised and suggestions made – trying out

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – I would like to see what the real footprint

John – I think the way we left it with the DRC, if we were granted the special permit, we would come back to you – to go out now and get a full set of plans done now doesn't make sense – we are trying to show elevations but to go out with a full set of plans doesn't make sense because we haven't been granted anything yet

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – if there was one quad unit on this property there would be no issue, where you have 5 quad buildings, the plan is very tight, and I think the plan seems to fit comfortably as is, but not knowing if the detention pond works, etc – but what you are proposing in real footprints is not

Paul – I am a little confused – the August 19<sup>th</sup> letter from the DRC says that the changes should be made prior to or as a condition of – this plan shows 50% of the units with side load garages – the angling of units within a quad is not shown on here; the square footage limitation would indicate how things would have to be changed – we indicated to the DRC we said we would like

to put some first floor masters and so the footprints may have to be changed and the shape – we are willing to work with the PB but the expenditure of funds for a theoretical plan gets very costly- we want to get guidance and direction and once we have that we would be happy to move forward

ERIC ALEXANDER – I want to get more specific –perhaps I can rephrase Karyl’s concern – the footprints as presented conceptually are roughly 120 linear feet – the quads as you have shown are about 193 feet and that simply cannot fit – it is hard for me to understand conceptually how you will fit this all in and make it work – without going to the expense of getting full sets of plans done, I would propose to get a realistic conceptual site plan, underswtanidn that we are not to the subdiviosn plan, to get a conceptual site plan to get it more in line to match up

Paul – we can do that.

ANDY RODENHISER – on the 3-4 abutters on their back property line, has anything been considered as a buffer for them? There is no detail for the back properltyline here –

Paul – there is nothing proposed because we are leaving the natural vegetation there – we will not disturb that

ANDY RODENHISER – hav ethe neifhbors indicated that that is acceptable

Paul – we offered to meet with the residents and they were unable to meet with us

ANDY RODENHISER – would you be willing to consider some buffering there

Paul – it is pretty heavily

CHAN ROGERS – the natural vegetation is very thick and is far thicker than anything you could achieve

ANDY RODENHISER – concern about winter months

CHAN ROGERS – the abutters should offer some opinions on that MATT HAYES er

Paul – their attorney contacted us and asked if we could meet but it couldn’t be scheduled

ANDY RODENHISER – on your notes and comments, is this more in compliance with the bylaw –

Gino Carlucci – I think there is still information that hasn’t been addressed. For starters, I didn’t really comment on the landscaping of htepojrect – the bylaw requires a 4 step design process involving a landscape architect – I think that process has been inruitively followed but it has not been describvred or presented – need some documentation – there wasn’t a site context and analysis plan presented though some is shown on exiswtn gconditions plan – on open space

requirement of the bylaw, the bylaw says that 50% of the tract should be open space and that no more

The site is just over 50% wetlands and 50% of the site has to be open space – the amount of uplands in the open space has to be a minimum of 4.5 acres – that has to be shown

There are some design standards in the bylaw that could not be evaluated – the bylaw asked for design comparable to a preliminary plan –

ANDY RODENHISER – so, for us to grant the special permit, do we need to have that information – or do we do waivers

MATT HAYES – can that be provided

Paul – one of the key members of our team is not available tonight but these items can be easily added to the plan.

Mark Louro – because there is not a lot of technical info on the plan, we limited our review to the traffic study – minimal almost non-existent impact on level of service at the intersections – the intersections considered – farm and village; candlewood and farm;

MATT HAYES – will now open it up to the abutters with comments and questions – please state your name

Wendy Burr – sewer plant is noted on the map, how close is that to these buildings – what is the distance?

David Faust – we are showing that the sewer plant is the abutter – there is an aerial -

Wendy Burr 0 when you modify master, change the square footage

Paul – no

Wendy – the elevation drawings will you cut into this hill, you will need buffers underneath

David – we will have to add topography to the plan – this site toward the rear – there is steep hill which is why candlewood was never built up to farm street – we kept corner undeveloped – once we add topography- we do not intend for back yards to cut into the hill – we haven't gone to that level of detail –

Mark Louro – what is roughly the buffer form the Farm Street ROW

David – 100 to 200 feet



John Hickey representing Candlewood neighbors – residents have asked me to comment – 17 homes, originally designed was for 2 points of access but only one was built – seeks to add 20 other homes to be served by one point of access – primary concern is safety of their children – issue of density, and traffic – more homes, more cars, more trips – we did hear 120 more trips per traffic study – our clients are concerned about the traffic within candlewood – emergency access – concerns about use of emergency access use during the winter or when wet – there are 38 kids – 19 under the age of 10; one is severely handicapped – candlewood is 29 feet wide but width encourages speed – the applicant's fact sheet indicates – is there another way to develop this parcel with access to village street – we acknowledge that it is a long run- why should candlewood drive bear the full burden of this subdivision on the issue of open space – the parcel is 50% wet – the open space in the applicant's plan, is 70% wet – it won't really be very usable – if this board sees fit to allow the special permit the residents ask the PB to implement every feature possible to protect their children – lighting, perhaps right turn only out of development – all features to ensure privacy, screening, stone walls, to protect against headlights – protect the abutters in particular – from detention basins and parking – the clients are not against the open space subdivision concept – but not here on the outskirts of town and on top of another subdivision

Chris Damafoural – 11 candlewood – looked at 2 intersections coming out - I live at the sharpest turn – you are changing the characteristics of the neighborhood – these homes that you would be marketing too – not family oriented, 2 incomes, no children, faster cars – my kids have to cross the street to get to the sidewalks – I have a lot of concern about 20 units back there – high income, dual income families without kids – traffic going thru there – if there was a secondary access, then I would assume the traffic would be less

Second concern is emergency access – I had a tree fall in my yard – I would have been in serious trouble if a tree had fallen out on farm street

MATT HAYES – are there handicapped ramps on the existing sidewalks

David – we have not evaluated candlewood for that

Kahls, 12 Candlewood – I directly abut the site and the ROW - - my concern is really again is the density – the number of units backs here - I have 2 children – we are going to be experiencing from this development – cars will be turning right into our house – we are going to see everybody is going to go in front of our house – that is a safety concern – my mother in law is 91, she walks on candlewood – if the number of units is different than it is – I bought this, we were one of the first, I knew that the road stub was there, I knew it could be developed, I had no idea that 20 units could be back there. It is a question of design – this is a sense that there is something a little bit off – goals of bylaw . . . character, existing communities, etc, that is a problem for me - it really is a high density operation here, this village having all of its access to candlewood – I like the original bylaw, etc. – the only problem is that it is going to candlewood – if there was access to village or farm street it would fly thru – reduce the number of units, we wouldn't be concerned if there were 6 units and talking about mitigation measures and that would be it – the number of units is really a concern and that is a big issue for us

Bud shorpsire, I am married to Joan Wasnewsky – I am hearing the NIMBY syndrome – I wrote a few notes that I need to read from – I married joanie 55 years ago this week – we never complained when construction occurred all around us – read his letter –

Richard sousa, 14 candlewood – at the risk of sodnign redunct, our biggest concern is safety – I am not sure that there is anyone intheis room that 120 trips in and out of the ndirhbfood will keep my child safe – this development doesn't fit; it was putin place because of he sale of the peoprty – the number of units is being done to make it work financially – easy solution, concept – I just don't think what it is all about – even though there has been traffic study – I believe there will be a safety risk

Charles, 5 island road – iw oudl agree with wasnewsky trust, - the town has changed a lot –part of what people want is to maintain the small town feel – signs at the end of the streets starting to diminish that whole feel – putting up signs to tell us not to park near the access road seems silly – if it is not going to be cared for, then why have it – who will maintain the access raod? Second thing I would like to bring up, I am tryignot understand how the PB is maintiang an ongoing plan for the town of medway where people cant wash their cars or water their laws due to water limitations, the town cannot afford to do the basics – what is the ultimaitke plan fo rhtis town moving forward – this meeting seems to me to be indicatative of the problem – how is the town going to cover the cost of addtional services – fire, police, trash pick up, all these things together – I just don't understand where the planning is – putting 20 units in a small little space – this whole thing just doesn seem to be well thought out

Mark Louro , 7 island road – I directly abut the sidewalk parcel – wemoved in 12-13 years ago – the path and drainage is in that parcel – if it it going to be made into a road it needs to be reengineered – our only gripe is why to put the gravel down and signs up – it has worked as an emergencyh access all along – when we moved into island, we bought on a cul de sac.

David Murphy, 8 island road – live on other side of footpath- 12 years ago, we built on a cul de sac – when island road was approved, mr. yorkis was on the PB – he is trying ot change the characger – the proposal for a seoncdary emergency access would be in effect a priminary emergency access – every emergency reeponse person would know that they could go that way – create an unsafe condition – the original deisgn of island road and candlewood has been succesffl – dozens of people use that footpath area – now we want to create a priminary entrance to candlewood for every emergencyaccess vehicle in town – I would hcalleng ethe board to ocme up with another secondary emergency access

Petra fallon, 13 candlewood – I live on the sharep corenr – concern as I back out now – I have a 2 year old daughter – concern- she walks andplays on candlewood as other kids do – we all suffer form the NIMBT syndrome – no one want sthis – we suffer the most because all that traffic will be right on us – I agree with everyone who has spken – it appears that everything si being crammed into this development – all of the features tht needs to be met are being banadaged in – my question to you is why has another access point beenpursued, looked at, what are the reason s- we have sked mr. yorksi that question s and we really didn't get a clear answer – at first the answer is that the seller of the land “preferred” not to have the access come off

village street – we understand and respect that - something is being crammed in and an alternative is not being looked at – why and will you please look at it.

MATT HAYES – mr. yorkis, could you comment on the alternative access

Paul – the plan before you is the plan submitted by the applicant

Jim, 18 candlewood drive – I have a few concerns – I have a very steep driveway- sheer luck that there has not been an accident at this corner – my son is blind, deaf and in a wheelchair – he has multiple medical issues – we have police and fire that park there – I can almost guarantee you that there will be an accident there - our property has one of the steepest driveways in the neighborhood- if this goes in, we will never be able to allow our children to play – concern about traffic study being done in July vs. September – a more realistic – concern about winter – this entire street becomes more narrow –you are going to see accidents – this is going to impact the safety of my children – I have not been invited to any meeting with Mr. Yorkis – I just wonder . . . curious if sight lines were studied within the neighborhood –

Mike Newman, 9 candlewood – across from ROW – I will concur with my neighbors - 2 kids, somewhat steep driveway – god forbid a ball rolls down – accident – safety is our biggest issue – for my family and for my neighbors – I am disappointed that they brought up the NIMBT factor – we are OK with a development in that area, we feel 20 units is way too many, we expected it would be 4-5 and we are OK with that – we had parties when we were 2 income, no kids –

Tom Anderson, 16 candlewood drive – one question that everyone has been dancing around – when candlewood drive was built, 2 accesses were planned and

MATT HAYES – maximum length of a road with a dead end is 600' for a subdivision - this being an OSRD special permit, it is not necessarily a requirement

Tom Anderson – I have heard different members of the board make a comment, at some point in time, 2 access points for an OSRD may be required – seems like an immediate quick hit kind of development- better define your rules – if two are required for a subdivision for a certain sized, why not for an OSRD

MATT HAYES – under the special permit process, the PB has considerable discretion, as per density, we may require it to be reduced; as far as another access, there is no other access proposed, we could deny the plan based on the absence of that –

CHAN ROGERS – when I came on this position, I served 40 years ago on a pb – PB in Massachusetts don't do much planning, we don't really have the opportunity to do planning – we spend about 90% of our time doing – you cannot refuse the development of land because you don't like it – you can only act in accordance with the law – it is nice to say that you would like to say there will have to be 2 entrances – we can either accept it or reject it – the second entrance for candlewood would never have been built – it was unrealistic that that street would ever be built – none of us were on the board at that time – we cannot correct past errors

Rich sousa – on a subdiviosn, the maximum length for a dead end is 600 feet – why not for OSRD

MATT HAYES – 600 foot length is in our subdivisioin rules and regs- we can reject or deny a waiver – with a special permit, we have more discretion – there i

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – by the nature of an OSRD there will be a density factor to cause the buildings to be localized in one area and to save open space – the benefits outweigh the problems

MATT HAYES – the board has to weigh that MATT HAYES er on a case by case basis –

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX – is there an impact analysis that each subdivision is done – if we are focusing in on one subdivision, how are all of us as taxpayers are effected?

MATT HAYES – a development impact statement is now a required component of a subdivision plan

ANDY RODENHISER – I did ask Mark Louro Flaherty about impact – he is not expecting this to be a major impact – the town is up against a state cap on the amount of water to withdraw and pump – we can buy water from other towns or pay a fine for using more water than what they are allowed – he evaluates whether it is cheapter to pay the fine or the cost to buy water

\_\_\_\_\_ - how od we mange

ERIC ALEXANDER – you are talking about a planning function – as a town we don't have the capacity to do so – we are not empowered to address those issues –

Mark Louro - all the town departments have a chance to review the plan

ANDY RODENHISER – we follow the 1999 master plan – that is our guide – knowing what the residents said – 67% response – you may remember it – the input the community gave is in the document and that is what you said – to try to preserve open space – this open space permit application is in that spirit of what the community said they wanted –

\_\_\_\_\_ - I don't think anybody expected

perhaps 5 million dollar homes could be built here vs. 20 \$500,000

ERIC ALEXANDER – I am sympathetic – the factof the MATT HAYES er is that something can happen on this land as can on any piece of property – we cant just say no because there is an impact on town services –

\_\_\_\_\_ - make the property value for less homes, but more value –

ERIC ALEXANDER – the ultimate purpose with the OSRD bylaw is not people in less space, it is the same amount of people in less space

\_\_\_\_\_ - that is not true in this particular project

MATT HAYES – the OSRD bylaw allows for a number of units for a certain piece of land – based on amount of uplands, and wetlands, and a simple formula to determine maximum number of units – for this parcel, the maximum number of units could be 23- they are proposing 20 – with an OSRD, we can reduce it – if they were to come in with a regular subdivision, we couldn't tweak the number of units

MATT HAYES – if they were to go in with a standard subdivision, it wouldn't eliminate access thru candlewood

Petra – you said earlier if the plan is legal you must accept it; I am trying to understand then, if there are concerns re: safety, what are you doing – will you tell them to revise it?

MATT HAYES – safety is always a concern in the design – if they came in with a standard residential subdivision, we would have less of an ability to say no to things, - if it came in following all our usual standards, it would have to be approved – with a special permit, we have more leverage to work with developer to change things

Petra – I don't believe Mr. Yorkis has provided an adequate answer to my question

MATT HAYES – according to this plan, there is no access to village street

Petra – I don't have an answer that satisfied me

Mark Louro – they have to consider the plan put before them, we don't know whether or not it was considered – if the applicant owns the property, that is part of their thought process- they have the right to submit a

CHAN ROGERS – he only has control of the land he owns – we can't tell him to go do something to somebody else's plan –

David Murphy – the point of being a plan, the plan doesn't include a secondary emergency access road - I would ask that the plan exclude the gravel expansion of

Paul Yorkis – I would like to clarify something – it is not me who proposed that – the PB asked the applicant to explore that possibility – we, as the applicant, are obligated to explore that possibility – the PB will make a decision in its best judgment whether or not to include that component –

Nancy Neuman, 9 Candlewood – summary statement, you have before you a plan as it stands – based on all of our concerns, you as a pb can go back and look at this plan and deny it if you are not comfortable with it as shown

Susy – must draw direction from the bylaw itself –

MATT HAYES – this public hearing will be continued to 8:30 on September 27<sup>th</sup> – 4 weeks from tonight

We will have to do all the letters then

11:15 public hearing ends – ERIC ALEXANDER leaves

break to 11:20

---

ANR Plan for 10 Walker Street - now two lots

ANDY RODENHISER – I have to disclose that I have worked for George Pavlik, but I don't have any economic interest in the project before us –

Gino Carlucci has reviewed it – just needs a comment that approval does not constitute compliance with the zoning bylaw –

It is two lots with frontage on Walker Street, a public way, ½ acre zoning – lot shape factor is fine

CHAN ROGERS – question on Pearl Street

MATT HAYES – this came in as a 3 lot ANR before – the frontage for the 3<sup>rd</sup> lot was on Pearl Street and the board denied it – now reduced to 2 lots

Motion to endorse the ANR plan for 10 Walker – Chan, ANDY RODENHISER – all yes –

Tom – we are requesting a waiver of the filing fee as we feel it is a continuation of the previous plan;

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH - I would agree to that;

Motion by CHAN ROGERS to waive the filing fee, seconded by Karyl.

ANDY RODENHISER – I am concerned that we are broke and we need to recover our costs -

All in favor – Karyl, CHAN ROGERS

All opposed – ANDY RODENHISER and MATT HAYES

Susy – motion fails

\$250 to town of Medway – received a check - # 1581

---

Mark's departure

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – you were really superb in people skills – very good with all the developers especially wehn they were horrible to you and us

Mark Louro – challenge in the begiinng, I enjoued working here – interesting people – something I will take with me

KARYL SPILLER-WALSH – you mopped up a lot of messes

ANDY RODENHISER – just met with you and enjoyed working with you

CHAN ROGERS – pleased that towns can hire somebody like you

Mark Louro – becoming more and more popular – quite a staff at VHB to back me up

Handouts

CPTC training schedule

-----  
Commonwealth Capital – Suzanne has authorized Gino Carlucci to update the application – will do it tomorrow –

-----  
Motion to adjourn – karyl, CHAN ROGERS – all yes

-----  
11:50 pm

\*\*\*\*\*