

## WAYLAND PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

FILED BY: Sarkis Sarkisian, Town Planner

DATE OF MEETING: **May 9, 2017**

TIME OF MEETING: **6:00 P.M.**

PLACE OF MEETING: Town Building, 41 Cochituate Road

### **AGENDA**

*Note: Items may not be discussed in the order listed or at the specific time estimated. Times are fluid given unpredictable duration of time.*

**6:00 P.M. Open Meeting Comment/Correspondence/ Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair 48 Hours In Advance Of the Meeting/Town Planner report**

**6:05 P.M. Continuation of Public Hearing Whittemore Place** Amendment to the previously approved Definitive Subdivision plan in accordance with the provisions of the most recent Subdivision Modification Approval (with Condition) issued by the Planning Board in January 13, 1998. The Approval requires that the owner of the subdivision re-apply to the Planning Board prior to construction. The Applicant is also requesting for release of Lot 1 with the associated Parcels 1A and 1B from the Subdivision. The Proposed Development is Whittemore Place Subdivision (Klempner) located at 209 and 213 Old Connecticut Path assessors map 44, lot 2, 3 and 4.

**7:30 P.M. Joint committee/board meeting of various groups involved with housing issues.**

1. Town Meeting approval of using Community Preservation funds to hire a part-time housing consultant. Specific tasks of housing consultant? Is the MAHT interested in using some of their funds to, perhaps, make it a half-time position?
2. Thoughts about other recommendations in the housing consultant's report from last October?
3. Update on the Housing Partnership's revision of 40B guidelines.
4. Other new business

**9:00 P.M. Approve minutes April 25, 2017, set meeting dates**

**9:05 P.M. Adjourn**

Meeting called to order at 6:16 PM by D. Hill.

No public comments.

**Continuation of Public Hearing Whittemore Place**

The day prior the Town Planner received an email from Sean Reardon and circulated a draft decision for Whittemore Place.

Mr. King presented for the Applicant. Went through the issue of the groundwater data. Two more rounds of sampling were completed and compared with regional wells. From the last few readings they were around 80% of maximum high water levels due to recent rainfall. To allow for more comfort, the modeling allowed for high water levels being around 1' higher than 1998 levels and allowed for 2' of the retention basin to be disregarded in terms of a sensitivity analysis. With this worst case scenario, the water level only rose 4". Mr. King went through the revisions to the plans, including adding elevation and adjusting the drainage easement per prior discussions.

A. Reck – asked if elevations had been assigned for the houses. Mr. King replied no. The house on Lot 2a could move up or down. With groundwater so shallow there should be no basement. Houses to either be built up or will be slab on grade. The basin would also end up dictating the elevation of at least one of the houses.

Mr. King continued to describe the landscaping easement added for the lilac and dogwood trees and the snow storage easement for the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Sarkisian – spoke with the Department of Public Works and discussed the snow storage issue. K. Murphy asked what they thought of the hydrant. S. Sarkisian responded no issue.

The memorandum from S. Sarkisian was passed out, which included that the water main needed to be increased. Pavement thickness needed to be increased. A 2' reinforced grass shoulder to be added to the road and the driveway agreement with 213 Old Connecticut Path was finalized.

Mr. King agreed to revise the plans to include a gravel pull off, which could be included for access from the main road so the vacuum truck could clean out the vortex system and swale.

D. Hill – groundwater elevations brought up to close out that discussion. The Board discussed changes to the existing drainage easement. J. Steel asked about the landscape easement and how the restriction would be included, whether a deed or some other document. Asked if perhaps it was a little heavy handed to be involved in the preservation of these two trees as between the parties.

Mr. King discussed the incorporated cape cod berm on the plan and the updated detail and cross section of the road.

D. Hill – suggested we move through the discussion on the draft decision. Noted that note #9 on the plan delineates who is responsible for what maintenance in terms of the stone lined swale and the stormwater treatment system. D. Hill asked if the plan could label the specific areas on the plan related to this issue to avoid any confusion.

The Public Hearing was suspended and was to resume as soon as the Joint Committee/Board Meeting of the various groups involved in housing issues concluded.

The Public Hearing reconvened at 9:09 PM and the Board went through the decision page by page with suggested revisions.

K. Murphy made a motion to approve the Decision as revised. I. Montague seconded. 5-0 in favor.

I. Montague made a motion to approve the minutes from April 25, 2017 as amended. A. Reck seconded. 5-0 in favor.

Mr. Sarkisian mentioned the recreational marijuana article would be coming back up in the fall Town Meeting and that the Planning Board had been asked to consider sponsoring the same. To be discussed at a future hearing.

I. Montague made a motion to adjourn. K. Murphy seconded. 5-0 in favor.

#### **Joint committee/board meeting of various groups involved with housing issues.**

A sign in sheet was passed around and the attendees introduced themselves. Ms. Bratt asked if there was anything not on the agenda to discuss. Nothing noted.

1. Town Meeting approval of using Community Preservation funds to hire a part-time housing consultant. Specific tasks of housing consultant? Is the MAHT interested in using some of their funds to, perhaps, make it a half-time position?

A discussion was had in terms of the list of activities on page 12 of the Housing Organizational Structure hand out. Ms. Bratt pointed out that the list is very long for a part time position. D. Hill asked if there was a non-profit that does this type of work and if it would make sense to reach out to them for a scope for this type of position. Ms. Balmer discussed that she had already done so and that the scope we have matches up, but there may be some items that may not apply up front, hence the discussion with the various groups and boards. Discussion that there is a need for consolidation of monitoring and one point of contact for all housing related issues and who would be an expert on all things housing. After the meeting it was determined that Ms. Balmer could put together a scope and come back to the larger ground or a small work group.

Ms. Bratt – the Housing Authority was potentially interested in monitoring work. Currently does this work for some sites in Wayland. They do know the stock and issues in Town that could make it a good thing to keep with the Housing Authority with a little more budget rather than duplicating efforts. Ms. Balmer mentioned that if the work is split she still needs one point of contact.

D. Hill asked if there could be a consultant in charge of this whole process, to be the go-between person with the Housing Authority Partnership and the monitoring.

Ms. Bratt asked if there was any other availability for the budget from any other source.

Ms. Antes – the Housing Trust needed more information before committing funds. Various roles and what it would be used for. Goals, legal basis and the like would all be helpful.

Ms. Bottan – do we need to keep under a certain number of hours for benefits? Ms. Balmer replied no, not ready to hire a Town employee, but need an expert in a consulting role.

Ms. Balmer – asked if it was possible for the Housing Authority Partnership to do everything? The consensus was the Housing Authority Partnership would need more information.

J. Steel – may make sense to start small and have the consultant to help to define the scope, rather than try to narrow down now and let the position work through the scope.

Ms. Bratt – how many hours per month can we get for \$15,000 a year? Ms. Balmer has that data and can provide.

D. Hill – asked why not lay out the scope and determine the funds. Ms. Balmer replied she had \$20,000 in funds from the CPA.

Ms. Bottan – do all of the services fall under what is allowed under the CPA? Ongoing question to be determined.

There was some discussion of a potential perceived conflict with the Housing Partnership being the consultant and also members serving on the Housing Trust. There is a bifurcated scope between the two so perhaps less of a concern.

The members discussed whether Ms. Balmer had priorities. D. Hill mentioned that no one is staffing the Zoning Board of Appeals, like Mr. Sarkisian does for the Planning Board. It was determined that the Housing Partnership would come up with what is needed beyond monitoring. Perhaps not limited to the existing budget but an a la carte list may make sense. Housing Partnership would put together a memo with a consolidation of the high priorities and Ms. Balmer would circulate.

## 2. Thoughts about other recommendations in the housing consultant's report from last October?

Ms. Bottan – perhaps not as confusing on structure and responsibilities as the report appears. J. Steel – noted the number of volunteers on one issue and whether there

was any way to make the bodies more efficient. A few members pointed out that there may be some benefit to the same sort of training being provided to new Housing Partnership members being provided to the community at large to avoid any confusion on the set up of housing interested groups in Wayland and each of their roles.

3. Update on the Housing Partnership's revision of 40B guidelines.

40B guidelines were passed out and reviewed. Ms. Bratt asked for consolidated comments from the attendants that would then be incorporated into a final draft that would be circulated.

No new business.