

Town of Sharon Planning Board

Minutes of 5/14/20

Sharon Community Center

Planning Board Members

Rob Maidman, Chair	Pasqualino Pannone
Kai Yu, Vice Chair	Peter O'Cain, Town Engineer
Shannon McLaughlin, Clerk	
David Blaszkowsky	

Other Attendees:

Bob Shelmerdine - Cape Club

Shane Oates - Civil Engineer

Tom Houston - PSC

Laura Nelson - abutter

Meeting Initiation

Chair Maidman called the meeting to order at 7:07 PM.

Meeting Minutes

Mr. Maidman moved that the minutes of 2/27, 3/26 and 4/16 be approved as submitted. Mr. Blaszkowsky seconded the motion. The board voted 5-0-0 in favor of approval. The minutes of 4/30 will be reworked and presented at the next meeting for approval.

Cape Club

The Public Hearing on the revised Cape Club Plan continued. Mr. O'Cain referred to his May 12, 2020 Review of Cape Club Permitting Plans Cape Club of Sharon Townhouses Permitting Plan Set revised through May 01, 2020. It states:

The Sharon Engineering Division of The Department of Public Works has reviewed the third submission for the Cape Club and we have the following comments:

CMDL Responses from 5/01/2020 Letter

. No RLA (Registered Landscape Architect) nor PLS (Professional Land Surveyor) stamp are located on the newly submitted plans. Revised plans must still carry the same professional review and approval as the original plans.

The revised Landscaping Plans (Sheets 45 to 49) will be stamped by a Registered Landscape Architect and the final Lot Layout Plan (Sheet 18) will be stamped by a Professional Land Surveyor. A waiver has been requested for the previously submitted/approved Existing Conditions Plans.

Engineering Division follow-up: Sheet 18 was not submitted to this department and no sheets have been stamped by a PLS. The sheet number skips from sheet 2 to sheet 19 in the electronic and paper submissions. This issue applies to several subsequent comments.

CMDL follow-up comment: Sheet 18 is complete and is included in Revision 2 of the permitting plan set. Sheets 2 through 19 were purposely not included in the 3/29/20 plan set to conserve paper. These sheets are included in the Revision 2 plan set.

Engineering Division follow-up: Agreed. Item completed

2. The vertical and horizontal datum has not been denoted on the plan.

The vertical datum is NAVD 88 per note 2 under "Existing Conditions Information" on the Notes and Legend Plan (Sheet 2 of plan set). It appears that Note 3 was unintentionally deleted and has been reinserted with the reference to the horizontal datum, which is Massachusetts State Plane.

Engineering Division follow-up: It is preferred to include the datum on the north arrow or survey notes and not under existing conditions notes. There should be survey plan references included on the plans as well.

CMDL follow-up comment: On Sheet 2, the notes have been changed from "Existing Conditions Information" to "Survey Information". Furthermore, this set of notes is now included on Existing Conditions Sheets 3 through 17.

Engineering Division follow-up: Agreed. Item completed

3. Utilities Note (2) on page 2 of 57 of the submittal package shall also include the following language "Any site plan modifications must also receive approval from the Town Engineer prior to installation".

Note 2 of the Utility Notes on Sheet 2 of 57 have been revised as suggested.

Engineering Division follow-up: Agreed. Item completed

4. Utilities Note (4) on page 2 of 57 of the submittal package notes the RIM elevations are approximate. Any variance to the design of the stormwater systems must first receive approval from the Town Engineer.

Note 4 been clarified on the Notes & Legend Sheet. The purpose of this note is to give the contractor the flexibility to make minor adjustments to the rim elevation to ensure that they are set flush to hard surfaces and above landscaping surfaces given that there are construction tolerances for the installation of the various proposed surfaces.

Engineering Division follow-up: Agreed. Item completed

5. Cape Club Drive as denoted on the plan should read as Cape Club (ROW Width – Private) Drive for clarity.

Agreed. The plan set has been revised and the roadways are labeled as "Private" however there are not established ROW widths as the overall lots for the Club House (Lot 3) and the Townhouse Lot (Lot 2) as depicted on Sheet 18, Lot Layout Plan, are inclusive of the roadways.

Engineering Division follow-up: Sheet 18 was not submitted to this department.

CMDL follow-up comment: Sheet 18 is included in Revision 2 of the permitting plan set.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed

6. Fairway Drive as denoted on the plan should be renamed with (ROW Width – Private) Drive for clarity.

Agreed. The plan set has been revised and the roadways are labeled as "Private" however there are not established ROW widths as the overall lots for the Club House (Lot 3) and the Townhouse Lot (Lot 2) as depicted on Sheet 18, Lot Layout Plan, are inclusive of the roadways.

Engineering Division follow-up: Sheet 18 was not submitted to this department.

CMDL follow-up comment: Sheet 18 is included in Revision 2 of the permitting plan set.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed

7. As per 4397 h., please add the delineated wetland lines with appropriate flag notations, as approved by the Conservation Commission.

The delineated wetland lines are depicted on each sheet throughout the plan set. The corresponding flag notations are only depicted on the existing conditions drawings. This is done for plan clarity purposes. Turning these labels on would make it very difficult to read the proposed information on all other plans.

Engineering Division follow-up: Existing conditions plans were not submitted with this filing.

CMDL follow-up comment: The existing conditions plans (sheets 2 through 17) were purposely not included in 3/29/20 submission to conserve paper. These sheets are included in the Revision 2 plan set.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed

8. Tree screening planting for the abutters, Laura Lynn Nelson (236 Edge Hill Road) and John H. Beagan (226 Edge Hill Road), has not commenced, as required by the agreement made with them.

The Applicant intends to complete these planting after reviewing locations and the type of planting with these abutters. The planting of the screening will be accomplished by the end of April 2020, but in no event later than May 31, 2020, subject to seasonal issues. Applicant will notify the Town Engineer upon completion.

Engineering Division follow-up: This item has not been completed. Should be a condition of approval or completed prior to plan approval.

CMDL follow-up comment: Agreed. Please see Condition No. AA.5 and AA.10 of the Modified Decision.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed

9. The pressure sewer line at the stream crossing does not have any proposed protective sleeves. Piping at critical junctures, such as water lines or sensitive crossings, should always be sleeved for added protection against potential material or mechanical failures.

Agreed. Protective sleeves have been noted and depicted on the proposed utility plans at the suggested locations. See Sheets 37 through 39.

Engineering Division follow-up: Agreed. Item completed

10. The Treatment works and field are not shown on the all applicable sheets. All proposed and built structures need to be shown on every sheet in order to verify compliance with local and state regulations.

Agreed. The plan set has been updated accordingly, and now depicts the proposed treatment works, field, and associated structures, see Sheets 37 through 39. Submitted WWTP Plan Set will be forwarded to the Planning Board once completed.

Engineering Division follow-up: WWTP plan submission must be a condition of approval. Plans must be submitted and approved prior to building permit issuance for phases 2 through 5.

CMDL follow-up comment: Agreed. Please see Condition FF.2 of the Modified Decision which requires a Groundwater Discharge Permit or Approval to Use prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for any Unit.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed

11. A new proposed hydrant must be sited at or around unit 45/46 to meet the 500' between hydrant regulation requirements.

Agreed. A new hydrant has been sited at the above referenced location. See Sheet 39.

Engineering Division follow-up: Agreed. This item has been completed.

12. Sheet 18 of 57 has the term "Draft" on the page, only finalized plans should be submitted. Sheet 18 also has no bearings or distances on many of the new property lines.

Agreed. A final Lot Layout Plan with the prerequisite lot line geometry and PLS certification has been prepared and is included in the revised plan set.

Engineering Division follow-up: A final "Lot Layout Plan" has not been received.

CMDL follow-up comment: The Lot Layout Plan (Sheet 18) is included in Revision 2 of the permitting plan set.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed

13. Units 29-32 are extremely close to a detention pond created by the current topographic configuration. Due to the current configuration, there appears to be the potential for water impoundment at the foundation of the proposed units.

The grading in this area has been adjusted to eliminate the potential for water impoundment at the foundations for Units 29-32. The backyard area, which does act as a detention pond in the 100-yr storm, has a max water elevation of 57.98 during this storm, which is below the proposed basement finished floor elevation for these 4 units, which has been adjusted to elevation 58. Please note that based on surrounding test pit data, depth to groundwater is approximately 55.80 in this area.

Engineering Division follow-up: It appears that periods where the detention basin is saturated and has standing water, the water table elevation will essentially be at the basement floor elevation. TP 2-15 indicates groundwater at 55.1 and basement floor at 58.1 but the basin bottom is at 58. It is very common for water to stand in basins for at least 48 hours, so the water table would essentially be at the basement floor elevation, which would lead to basement flooding under worst conditions. It is advised that another configuration is considered that either raises the buildings or alters the drainage in that area. Additionally, the basin has no overflow options and as the basin silts up over time, groundwater will be an issue in units 29-32 and water will be standing in the basin for prolonged periods of time.

CMDL follow-up comment: This detention basin is a grassed backyard (low impact design) that will promote the infiltrating of stormwater that falls directly on to the grassed surface as well as the roofs for Units 29 through 32. It also has a catch basin grate as an outlet so it's not relying strictly on infiltration to empty and has a discharge point if the ground is saturated. The following is a summary of water elevation, peak flow, and total volume exiting this basin for each of the storms that were analyzed:

Storm Frequency	Water Elevation in Basin	Peak Discharge in CFS
-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------------

Total Discharge Volume in CF

1 Year	57.83	0.0	0.0
2 Year	57.87	0.0	0.0
10 Year	57.99	0.2	467
25 Year	58.04	0.7	1,570
100 Year	58.10	1.5	4,103

Based on the model, there is a minimal amount of water discharging from this basin, as most of the water infiltrates into the vast grassed area, with the rest discharging through the catch basin. Furthermore, with only roof water discharging to this grassed area, the basin is not expected to silt up over time as there is no source of silt. Please note that the basin does have an overflow weir across the cart path at elevation 59.40 (was previously 59.75). While we don't anticipate flooding will be an issue in the area, we've revised the proposed basement elevation to 59.40 to match this weir elevation, which is 1.3 feet above maximum water elevation in basin in the 100-year storm.

Engineering Division follow-up: Agreed. Item completed

14. Units 17-21, 29-32, 41-44, 49-52 do not show attached drainage lines for roof runoff. Is this intentional?

Yes, this is intentional as some of the units are able to flow overland and therefore do not require piping. Specifically, Units 17 to 21 flow overland into Basin 14-1; Units 29 to 32 flow overland into the corresponding grassed side or back yard and ultimately into existing CB-1 in the less frequent more intense storms; Units 41 to 44 flow overland into the vegetated areas behind the units; and Units 49 to 51 flow overland into Basin 13 while Unit 52 flows overland into the vegetated area east of the cul-de-sac. Please note that the plans have been revised, adding spot grades and making minor adjustments to the proposed grades to clarify these flow patterns.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed.

15. IS-1 Infiltrator for roof runoff on Sheet 26 of 57 shows a trench length of 145 feet yet the stormwater report shows credit for 175 feet.

The dimensions for Infiltration System IS-1 found on the summary table on Sheet 26 match the dimensions presented on page 62 of the Hydro CAD proposed conditions found in Appendix B of the report therefore the design and the calculations are consistent (both 145 feet).

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed.

16. IS-2 Infiltrator for roof runoff on Sheet 26 of 57 shows a trench length of 70 feet yet the stormwater report shows credit for 30 feet.

The dimensions for Infiltration System IS-2 found on the summary table on Sheet 27 match the dimensions presented on page 65 of the Hydro CAD proposed conditions found in Appendix B of the report therefore the design and the calculations are consistent (both 70 feet).

Engineering Division follow-up: Item Completed.

17. Is Basin 14-2 taking credit for the golf course sand trap? It would appear to be connected to 5 Units currently (according to sheet 21 of 57) or are Units 17-21 connected into it as well (10 Units total)?

No, Basin 14 does not include the golf course sand trap, which is approximate in shape and location and does not include grading. Precise location, shape and depth will be determined by the golf course and will remain separate from the depression for 14-2. Per Sheet 25, units 17 to 21 (5 units) flow overland to Basin 14-1 while units 22-26 (5 units) flow underground via a closed pipe system to Basin 14-2.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed.

18. How is impervious area being calculated on sheet 2?

The impervious area was calculated by totaling areas created in AutoCAD and then comparing this total to the lot total to express as a percentage.

Engineering Division follow-up: Our question was whether the entire golf course area was being used for the calculation or just the lot for the development.

CMDL follow-up comment: Per the table found on Sheet 2, impervious areas have been calculated for each of the lots individually as well as the entirety of the project.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed.

19. The existing conditions plan sheet 4 does not show the ANR change to the property at 192 Edge Hill.

The existing conditions plans for the project represent a snap shot in time prior to the project commencing with the dates of all actual ground survey efforts stated therein. Changes to the ANR for 192 Edge Hill are therefore not included in these reference plans and do not affect the proposed layout modifications to Phases 2 through 4 of the project.

Engineering Division follow-up: The Planning Board will need to decide whether waiving this is acceptable. It does not appear to alter the design of the subdivision itself. However, the "snapshot" is not for the time of the plan filing.

20. The plans do not include the easement along Tiot Street for the Sharon drinking water pump station.

The existing conditions plans for the project represent a snap shot in time prior to the project commencing with the dates of all actual ground survey efforts stated therein. The creation of an easement along Tiot Street for a Sharon drinking water pump station is therefore not included in these reference plans and does not affect the proposed layout modifications to Phases 2, 3 and 4 of the project. That said, the Applicant has committed to granting an easement to the Town of Sharon through the Select Board, in an Agreement dated March 22, 2017, which is not a part of the Site Plan Review. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, it is not necessary to show this Easement on the Site Plan.

Engineering Division follow-up: The Planning Board will need to decide whether waiving this is acceptable. It does not appear to alter the design of the subdivision itself. However, the "snapshot" is not for the time of the plan filing.

CMDL follow-up comment: The Easement Agreement and final plan is a separately negotiated understanding between the Town of the Developer. Those negotiations are currently being finalized with Town Counsel and the Developer's Legal Counsel.

Engineering Division follow-up: Since current negotiations have not been completed between Town Counsel and the developer's legal counsel, it is requested that the Planning Board consider completion of the writing and recording of this easement as a condition of approval of building permits. Town Counsel may have comments on this item.

21. Phase 2 and 3 utilities show water mains and electric four feet apart. I don't think separation is suitable when duct bank width is taken into account. Many plan sheets have missing sewer force main lines.

The duct bank detail has been updated and depicts a width of 21", see Sheet 51, therefore the separation shown on the plans is appropriate. Sewer force main lines are now shown on all utility and profile plan sheets.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item completed.

22. The lift station shown on sheet 42 "To be designed by others" should be included on the plan. Also, the structure should continue to the surface. The structure is 14 feet deep and will require a detail drawing. The Board will need to decide whether they wish to wait for this important detail to be provided at a later date. If so, this condition of approval should require that this detail be added to the site plans on the profile sheet and on the detail sheet for final approval by the Board or Town Engineer. 4397 i requires site plans that show the sanitary sewer system.

The initial Planning Board Decision dated April 5, 2018 in the Site Plan Review and Approval – 4397 section I, specified that "...The detailing of the sanitary sewer collection systems and wastewater treatment systems including septic systems in compliance with Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and Sharon Board of Health Regulations, if and as applicable, are required pursuant to Condition No. G.1., hereof.", meaning that these requirements must be met prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Compliance for any Town House Unit. The Applicant is requesting a similar provision in the Modified Decision for any re-located Townhouse Unit constructed pursuant to the Modified Decision.

In addition, the sewer collection system has been modified to include a pump station at sewer manhole nine (9), elimination concerns for depth of the excavation at sewer manhole seven (7). Once completed, the Wastewater Treatment Plant Permitting Plans, will be forwarded to the Planning Board when submitted to Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, the same process done with the original submission/approval.

Engineering Division follow-up: This must be a condition of approval that must be met prior to issuance of building permits.

CMDL follow-up comment: Please see Condition FF.2 of the Modified Decision which requires compliance prior to issuance of a Certificate of Compliance for a Building Permit.

Engineering Division follow-up: Agreed. Item completed.

23. Please review and edit sheet 42 and other applicable plan sheets. The roadway intersection is a conflict area of various utilities. It appears that electrical lines go through the drainage manhole that is described as 4 on the plan sheet and 5 on the profile. Sewer lines are also missing on this sheet and many others.

The utility plans have been reviewed and revised as required, see Sheet 42. All sewer lines are now show on Sheets 36 through 39.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item has been addressed.

24. The duct bank detail on sheet 51 does not specify width and height of each layer.

The duct bank detail has been updated, see Sheet 51.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item has been addressed.

25. The lot areas to be altered for the ANR reconfiguration are still unclear and this needs to be resolved. If approval is provided, the applicant must file a new ANR plan as a condition of Planning Board approval.

These detailed plans have now been presented to the Planning Board, and a final stamped lot layout plan will be included in the revised site plan set. Furthermore, an endorsed ANR Plan will be a condition of the recording of the Modified Site Plan Approval. See Condition I.C of the Initial Site Plan Approval dated April 5, 2018, and Condition II.3. of the Modified Decision.

Engineering Division follow-up: This item needs further discussion.

CMDL follow-up comment: See Condition No. II.3, of the Modified Decision which requires the filing of an ANR Plan with the recording of the Site Plan Approval Decision.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item has been addressed.

26. The proposed cul-de-sac roadway has a five or six (5' or 6') foot drop-off to the golf course. It is necessary that the roadway have guardrail, since there is no proposed roadway shoulder and golfers will be at the tee and at the base of that slope during golf season.

220 linear feet of guardrail has been added to the layout plan at the toe of slope to protect the adjacent tee boxes.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item has been addressed.

27. There should be a STOP sign and crossing signs for the crosswalks and cart path crossings that are not shown near unit 44 on sheet 22. In short, all crosswalks require crosswalk signage and all cart crossing do as well. All intersections need STOP signs.

Agreed. Signage has been added to the layout plans as suggested.

Engineering Division follow-up: Each crosswalk must have crosswalk signs and not just crosswalk ahead signs.

CMDL follow-up comment: Signs have been added to each crosswalk on the Revision 2 plan set.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item has been addressed.

28. Please respond to all of PSC drainage comments delineated in their review dated February 24, 2020.

CMLD has responded under a separate cover to the PSC comments.

Engineering Division follow-up: We will defer to PSC on stormwater review comments and whether they have been addressed. Item 21 regarding treatment of basins as impervious will need to be addressed and included as a condition of approval to be met prior to ANR filing and issuance of building permits.

29. There isn't any street lighting proposed. The additional roadway length and the remoteness of the new "finger" makes street lighting of some type a necessity.

A waiver from Section 4397.f Traffic Control and Light Sheet was requested and granted as part of the previously approved Site Plan Application Decision. The newly proposed road, Fairway Drive, is a private way in the middle of a golf course, with no through traffic. The introduction of street lighting along this road will serve no purpose from a safety standpoint but instead introduce light pollution to what is presently a dark area at night. Instead, the project proposes to utilize driveway light posts at the townhouse driveways, which were previously approved for the other Phases of the project. The applicant will therefore request the same waivers for the modifications to the approved site plans.

Engineering Division follow-up: The Planning Board will need to vote to decide whether to provide a waiver for this item.

CMDL follow-up comment: Please see Waiver Request 1 on page 3 of the Modified Decision which pertains to a Waiver of Section 4397. F. Traffic Control and Lighting Sheet. This Waiver was granted in the Original Site Plan Approval Decision.

Engineering Division follow-up: The Planning Board will need to vote to decide whether to provide a waiver for this item

30. Please show the proposed location for above ground electrical transformers, CATV boxes and telephone boxes.

The design and location of all electrical transformer, CATV boxes, and telephone boxes including size, type, number, and location will be provided by the utility purveyor of each utility service. Any design document received from a utility company can be submitted to the Town Engineer for record if required.

Engineering Division follow-up: All of these utilities must be shown on an as-built plan, as a condition of approval. Any conflict of these utilities with proposed roadway or utility infrastructure that is shown on the approved design plans, that require plan modification, must be approved by the Town Engineer or his assignee.

31. Sheet 44 indicates condominiums on top of a septic field. This appears to be a drafting error.

The plan set has been revised accordingly. See Sheet 44.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item has been addressed.

32. Section 4397 f. of the Zoning By-Laws requires a traffic control sheet and a lighting sheet. Neither of these sheets have been provided. Please place proposed roadway signage on the traffic control sheet.

Traffic Control Sheet

During the initial Hearings the Applicant requested a "waiver" of the "Traffic Control Sheet" requirement, which was granted because adequate measures are to be established without such Traffic Control Sheet. Please see the "Waiver" Section, page 3 of the April 5, 2018 Planning Board Decision.

A similar waiver will be requested to allow a waiver of the requirement to include a Traffic Control Sheet because there is no traffic control for construction at this time, and during the construction of Phase III, vehicle traffic will be routed through the existing parking lot.

Lighting Sheet

During the initial Hearings the Applicant requested a "waiver" of the "Lighting Sheet" requirement, which was granted because adequate measures are to be established addressing the concern of street lighting. Please see the "Waiver" Section, page 3 of the April 5, 2018 Planning Board Decision.

Roadway Signage

Standard traffic control type signage will be added to the layout plans as previously stated in response to comment 27.

Decorative and Information Signage

During the initial Hearings the Applicant submitted all directional and Traffic Control signage, as they are shown on the Overall Site Plans. But the Applicant did not present "decorative" and "informational" signage. It was requested to not require strict adherence to the requirement that "decorative" and "informational" signage be submitted because these plans have not been yet developed. Such a "waiver" was granted as Applicant has not yet applied for "decorative" and "informational" signs. Applicant will present application (s) for approval for such signage, which shall comply with Section 4393. B. (8) prior to installation. Please see the "Waiver" Section, page 4 of the April 5, 2018 Planning Board Decision.

Engineering Division follow-up: Planning Board will need to decide whether to provide relief on these required items.

CMDL follow-up comment: Please see Waiver Request 1 on page 3 of the Modified Decision which pertains to a Waiver of Section 4397. f. Traffic Control and Lighting Sheet. This Waiver was granted in the Original Site Plan Approval Decision.

CMDL follow-up comment: Please see Waiver Request 2 on page 4 of the Modified Decision which pertains to a Waiver of Section 4397. t. Sign Package. This Waiver was granted in the Original Site Plan Approval Decision.

Engineering Division follow-up: Planning Board will need to decide whether to provide relief on these required items.

33. 4397 k. requires that waste disposal facilities and dumpster locations be shown.

The dumpster location(s) were previously depicted on the plans, see Sheet 11.

Engineering Division follow-up: Sheet 11 was not submitted to this department.

CMDL follow-up comment: Sheet 11 is included in the Revision 2 plan set.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item has been addressed.

34. 4397 n. requires that all components of the multi-use clubhouse be shown on the plan – see section for requirements.

The previously proposed/approved components to the multi-use clubhouse which are now complete have been added to the plan set.

Engineering Division follow-up: Item has been addressed.

35. 4397 O requires earthwork quantities be submitted.

Earth quantities were submitted for the previously approved layout. The project has not changed significantly with respect to the overall area of disturbance and filling requirements therefore the previously submitted quantities are an excellent estimate and should suffice. No material will be removed from the site. CMDL can, if requested, provide updated earthwork calculations at a later date for record. A waiver has been requested, see the Cover Sheet.

Engineering Division follow-up: The applicant had previously promised that this calculation would be done. Relief from earth removal requirements must be provided by the Board of Selectmen, as required by the by-law. The Engineering Division recommends that the applicant provide the required calculations.

CMDL follow-up comment: The project will not require a Special Use Permit for earth removal; see Chapter 141, Earth Removal, sections one through five. The proposed project is a fill site as depicted on the Grading and Drainage Plans, Sheets 1 through 4.

Engineering Division follow-up: Grading and Drainage Plans do not suffice as calculations to demonstrate accurate earthwork quantities to and from the site. The Town Engineer cannot waive a requirement to be decided by the Select Board. Please provide calculations as a condition of approval.

36. 4397 p. requires all lighting fixtures and that they be dark skies compliant.

There are no street lights proposed but instead driveways will be lit with a single lamp post positioned to the side of each driveway. If applicable, these fixtures will be dark skies compliant.

Engineering Division follow-up: Any lighting fixture must be dark skies compliant.

Agreed. Please see subparagraph "p." of the Site Plan Review and Approval – 4397 Section of the Modified Decision on page 11 which addresses "dark skies principles".

Engineering Division follow-up: Item has been addressed.

Additional Engineering Division Comments

A. Unit 26 is not connected to the proposed force main.

Unit 26 is connected to the gravity portion of the proposed sanitary sewer collection system. No further action is necessary.

B. It appears the force main as delineated on the plan set zig zags at right angles behind the tennis court instead of sweeping turns and clean outs. Why are no service clean outs proposed?

Agreed. This section of force main has been revised and is now a sweeping curve with no angles. Clean out of the section of pipe can occur from either the building or the tank.

C. The proposed structure at 19+00 on sheet 42 of 57 is covered by a label on the plan view and no invert into the structure is shown.

Agreed. Label has been moved.

D. The stormceptor at 17+00 on sheet 42 of 57 has no labeling or inverts.

The proposed stormceptors are labeled on the grading and drainage plans (sheets 24 – 27). These labels are now also shown on the plan view on the plan and profile sheets 41 through 44.

E. The water main needs insulation at 17+25 where the drain line crosses the water service.

A note has been added requiring insulation, see Sheet 38.

F. DMH-4 crosses water main at about the same elevation as the water main.

The proposed water main has been revised, see Sheet 42.

G. The hydrant located at 17+00 is too close to the water quality unit.

Agreed. The hydrant has been relocated and is now an adequate distance from the proposed water quality unit.

H. Roadway bond will be required to ensure roadway completion for each phase.

Please see the introductory paragraph to Condition No. FF of the Modified Decision, which incorporates Original Condition No. F.4 which establishes the manner and method to provide for Sureties or bonding.

I. The roadway for this project must be bonded by the applicant to ensure roadway completion.

Please see the introductory paragraph to Condition No. FF of the Modified Decision, which incorporates Original Condition No. F.4 which establishes the manner and method to provide for Sureties or bonding.

J. There must be language in the Decision that requires owners in the new phases to be members of the HOA.

Please see the introductory paragraph to Condition No. BB of the Modified Decision, which incorporates Original Conditions No. B.1, B.1 (a), B.1 (b) and B.1 (c) which establishes the manner and method of each of the townhouse Units to be part of the Condominium Association, the WWTF Sharing Agreement and the DCCR.

K. The applicant will need to address all comments provided by PSC of Foxboro, the Planning Board's consultant for drainage and stormwater on the project.

Agreed. CMLD is working with PSC to address all outstanding comments.

L. All applicable conditions from the April 5, 2018 Planning Board Decision, should be included in the modified Decision wherever applicable. Please see attached Decision document.

Not engineering related. Applicant's Attorney is coordinating with the with Town on the final language for the Decision document.

M. The applicant has still not provided an approval of this project modification from MEPA. The project cannot proceed with phases 2-5 without this approval.

Agreed, applicant will provide project modification approval from MEPA to the Board and is requesting this to be a condition of approval. Also, per Condition No. CC.1, of the Modified Decision compliance with MEPA is required to the extent necessary.

All completed items were reviewed and open items were discussed. Some conversations included:

#20 needs votes by the Board. It is connected to the site plan review but not germane to this decision.

#21 Mr. O'Cain had an outside source review the calculation # to effect the storm water basin site and they agreed with the Town.

#22 conditions approved re: DEP letter

#32 is on the decision

#33 Board to provide relief.

Mr. Shelmerdine then commented on Mr. O'Cain's comments and made his own comments.

#19 There is an ANR change to 192 Edgehill property. There will be a plan for the entire site and this will be captured on it.

#20 is not part of site plan review but will be done relatively soon.

#22 Mr. O'Cain said need condition of approval because we do not have the DCR approval.

#28 is related to making a plan change and will be on the decision.

#29 waivers asked for in original decision.

#30 is utilities and is an as built plan request.

#32 there will be a waiver request for traffic signage and lighting.

#35 earth work quantity. There is nothing left site phase 1. It is all filled. There are no cuts on the site. Mr. O'Cain will verify this on the plan and get back to Mr. Oates.

Mr. O'Cain asked Mr. Shelmerdine to create one more easily usable document that will help Mr. O'Cain and the Building Inspector with enforcement and permitting. Mr. Shelmerdine said he will comply and this second modified decision only pertains to the 26 town homes.

Mr. Maidman said he wants a clear concise easy to read document which will guide everyone going forward. A layman needs to understand it.

Mr. Pannone, Ms. McLaughlin and Mr. Blaszkowsky said they had no further comments. Mr. Yu said he has no questions but disagrees with Mr. Shelmerdine's position that Mr. O'Cain's comment on #20 is not germane. He said it is foundational to our approval. Mr. Shelmerdine said it's not part of the original site plan review or decision. It is an arrangement outside of the site and this decision.

Mr. Houston said his focus was on stormwater and he worked his way through all the issues.

Mr. Maidman commented that #29 is a waiver for traffic control and light sheet. #32 is a sign package. Mr. O'Cain said technically they should have done an ANR Plan but Mr. Shelmerdine put in a decision as a condition. Mr. O'Cain asked if this is a waiver. Mr. Shelmerdine said he will look at it.

Ms. Nelson asked where the decorative signage was going.

Mr. Oates said all traffic control is shown on the layout plan. The decorative is put in place in case a sign is needed at the entrance wall or on each unit.

Ms. Nelson commented that the driveway light post lighting is distractive to drivers on Tiot Street in the dark. Mr. Maidman asked Mr. Shelmerdine to verify the wattage.

Ms. Nelson commented that she met with Mr. Shelmerdine regarding her buffer and is satisfied with the result.

Mr. Shelmerdine commented that the new home that is built is 194 Edgehill Road. The new lot with a just a foundation is 190 Edgehill Road.

Mr. Maidman commented that that he would like to see billboard informational research in the draft decision. He also asked if this was vetted by Town Counsel. Mr. Shelmerdine said it was not vetted as the original was vetted by Lisa Whalen. The structure came from the original decision.

Mr. Maidman said he is concerned this decision is not vetted by Town Counsel. He said as no Town Meeting date has been set, it is important that all members read the document and it be vetted. He suggested the vote be deferred to the next meeting.

Mr. Shelmerdine said the draft decision was floating since 3/16/20. He was hoping to close the meeting tonight. Timing is at the crucial mark. He doesn't think there is much more to do. He believes one additional continuance of the meeting is okay. He can circulate the draft. He wants Peter O'Cain to be comfortable with the document.

Mr. O'Cain said he sent the decision to Town Counsel. He thinks there are a few minor things but we are close.

Mr. Maidman said the goal is to vote in two weeks after Town Counsel reviews.

The Pubic Hearing for the Cape Club was continued to 5/28 at 7 PM

Future Agenda Topics

Review of Post Office Square Design Guidelines

Discussion on the need for a Town Planner

Future Scheduled Meetings

6/18

Adjournment

The Board voted 5-0-0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 PM