

WAYLAND PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

FILED BY: Sarkis Sarkisian, Town
Planner DATE OF MEETING: **November 7, 2017**
TIME OF MEETING: 7:00 P.M.
PLACE OF MEETING: Town Building 41 Cochituate Road

AGENDA

1. *Open Meeting Public Comment (7:30 P.M.)*
2. *74 Moore Road Conservation Cluster Development Special Permit continuation of Public Hearing. (7:35 P.M.)*
4. *Minutes of September 5, 2017, September 19, 2017, October 3, 2017 and October 24, 2017 for approval (8:30 P.M.)*
5. *Town Planner Report and review Cascade 113 & 115 Boston Post Road revised presentation(8:50 P.M.)*
6. *Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair 48 Hours In Advance Of the Meeting*
7. *Adjourn (9:00 P.M.)*

D. Hill opened meeting at 7:37 PM. A. Reck, I. Montague and N. Riley in attendance.

1. Open Meeting Public Comment (7:30 P.M.)

No public comment.

2. 74 Moore Road Conservation Cluster Development Special Permit continuation of Public Hearing. (7:35 P.M.)

Jake and Joe Tamposi and Michael Sullivan present on behalf of the Applicant. Peter Allison was present on behalf of TEC who conducted peer review for the Board.

- Peer review by TEC:
 - D. Hill questions for Mr. Allison – 1) when reviewing the peer review and site plan, could not find any elevations of the project related to the drainage via a seasonal ground high water. Mr. Sullivan went through what was listed on the plan. 2.5-3' above the high water table. Mr. Allison noted minimum is 2' per DEP standards. No mounding analysis was done. D. Hill – is it worthwhile to have that done? Mr. Sullivan agreed to do the calculation. 2) Any reason the roof drainage is being done to flow toward the street? Mr. Sullivan – due to concerns on the neighbors in the rear and the soil being better in the front of the houses, the grading of the site was done so that the water would flow toward the road. 3) Mr. Allison reviewed the conventional plan separately to determine if the conventional subdivision complied with all rules and regs and bylaws and the answer was it did without waivers. D. Hill reviewed the same and had a question on whether the minimum length of the cul de sac was long enough to meet the rules and regulations. Based on the language the length does not appear to be sufficient.
- Mr. Sullivan – went through summary of changes on plan. Located trees on the westerly side of the property. Drainage through a series of catch basins and manholes, brought to front through a sub-surface leaching field shown on the plan. A typical note will be added to the plan. Existing garage will move toward 74 Moore Road and the existing driveway will be removed. Property line has been changed so the pond is totally within the open space parcel. Path walked during the site visit is shown in red on the plan.

Profile of the driveway for the purposes of drainage has been changed and grade has been increased as a gradual increase going into the property to account for drainage flowing toward front of the property.

- Discussion ensued:
 - D. Hill – existing path and proposed path shown on the plan. Part of the path goes over the ANR lot. Proposal on this? Developer's preference is to move the proposed path rather than go over the ANR lot and/or encumber the ANR lot with an easement. S. Sarkisian – how many feet will need to be re-graded to accommodate keeping on the lots? Estimated around 70' to move it about 15' toward the ponds and away from the ANR lots. Likely some clearing that would need to be done to direct people in that area. I. Montague suggested that they take a look at why the trail is in that location. Marc Brofsky stated that the path is a fiction as to the benefit to the Town. No one walks now and no one will walk there in the future. D. Hill mentioned one of the neighbors walks around the pond. I. Montague mentioned Conservation Commission was interested in this due to the ability to connect to other Trails.
 - D. Hill – question on septic system in the front. Any reason the primary cannot be switched for the location of the reserve? Concern is about saving the maple tree. Mr. Sullivan – yes, can switch them, though thought it would be preferable to keep the buffer near the street rather than taking down those trees. Can likely move the septic around to try and preserve the maple. Can include a condition on that particular lot for where the septic system will be located. Mr. Sullivan can move this on an updated plan.
 - D. Hill – common driveway question on whether the driveway can be pushed away from the maple at an angle. Mr. Sullivan will take a look at it.
 - D. Hill – at prior meeting a comment was made about moving the house box on Lot 3 off of the 50' line. Would request that the box be moved a few feet out so that the excavation would not be within the 50' buffer. Question about whether a condition would be acceptable to not excavate within the 50' buffer. Could condition on no existing trees to be disturbed during excavation. Mr. Brofsky – question about whether the house could not be made smaller and moved further back. Andrew Phillips – one concern is about minimizing profile and direct view. If the house were to pivot it might end up being a more direct view.
 - Landscaping:
 - S. Sarkisian – presented memo from Don Leighton. D. Hill – Asked Mr. Phillips which buffer he preferred – do provide substantial screening for second story. Would be happy to take a look and help to decide on the trees to stay and go. Applicant is happy to accommodate recommendations.
- Comments from Town Boards and Officials:
 - Review of memo from Applicant responding to compilation of Town comments. Discussion for Conservation Commission relating to #5 for removal of trees. Applicant's understanding was that Don Leighton would identify those trees that were of significance not to be taken down. Any concern with a condition that no trees in the 50' perimeter buffer would not be taken down except for those specifically identified. Applicant had no concern with that. N. Riley – noted that during the walk through Don Leighton mentioned there were some trees that could be thinned toward the road. If he recommends the same that may be worth considering. Mr. Sullivan agreed to put the failed test holes on the existing conditions plan to have that background information.

- TEC Memo:
 - Town Engineer would like to review and comment on this report. D. Hill – needs to put the revision date on the definitive plan. On point #2 on first page the approximate should be taken out and the actual number inserted. Thought several conditions could be dealt with as conditions on the permit rather than during the hearing. A few things to address now, #10 for example. Will need to review Mr. Sullivan's memo and will go through this at the next meeting. Mr. Sullivan is working through these issues with TEC.
- D. Hill – asking for the underlying zoning be included on the current plan rather than the conservation cluster information.
- S. Sarkisian – barn is a concern and has talked with the Applicant about a façade easement on the barn to ensure it would remain in place given we are going out of the way to allow this within the 50' buffer. D. Hill – one way to deal with this is with a historic preservation restriction. Applicant is less interested in taking away rights from a future property owner. Philosophically against encumbering the property in this way. A. Reck – Applicant is seeing the benefit of having a structure within the buffer zone. May be some middle ground on a way to enforce this in a reasonable manner.
- Vote to continue the hearing. Next meeting will be November 28, 2017. Applicant requested we have the beginnings of a draft decision. A. Reck motion to continued. N. Riley seconded. 4-0 in favor.

4. Town Planner Report –Presented review Cascade 113 & 115 Boston Post Road revised presentation(8:50 P.M.)

5. Minutes of September 5, 2017, September 19, 2017, October 3, 2017 and October 24, 2017 for approval (8:30 P.M.)

September 5, 2017 - A. Reck moved, I. Montague seconded. 4-0.

September 19, 2017 – A. Reck moved, I. Montague seconded. 4-0.

October 3, 2017 – D. Hill moved, I. Montague seconded. 4-0.

October 24, 2017 - A. Reck moved, I. Montague seconded. 4-0.

6. Matters Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chair 48 Hours In Advance Of the Meeting

Mr. Sarkisian passed out emails for each of the Board members.

Notice received on 40B project in Weston. Weston denied the project.

Mass Central Trail through Weston and Wayland – gravel packed road will be in place for winter, paving will happen in the spring.

Should get K&P to give us a template to start with on the recreational marijuana bylaw.

7. Adjourn (9:00 P.M.) 9:50 PM. I. Montague made motion. N. Riley seconded. 4-0 in favor.