



PUBLIC HEARING MEETING MINUTES

20 Holt Street

8-Unit Multi-Family Housing Project

July 22, 2020

Members Remote: Paul Anderson (Chair), Marc Frieden, Vincent Vignaly, Sarah Miles, Rajeshkumar

Members Absent: None

Attendees Remote: Wayne Amico (VHB); Paul Lenkarski, Sr.; Paul Lenkarski, Jr.; Brian Milisci (Whitman & Bingham); George Tignor (Building Inspector)

The Chair opened the remote continued public hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Brian Milisci (Whitman & Bingham) said they have updated the site plans and revised the stormwater report per comments from VHB and the public hearing since the last meeting. Town Counsel provided a response today. The question asked of Town Counsel was does the building as being proposed with the foundation connection meet the “single habitable dwelling per lot” limitation of the bylaw. The Building Inspector interpreted that it did; Town Counsel agreed that it was not an unreasonable interpretation and that the Planning Board may add a condition in the approval to include community uses for this “common area”. Mr. Vignaly was unsure how it would work with the access from the two end units. There needs to be a stipulation in the Homeowners Association documents that will be submitted for approval to the board with advice from Town Counsel. Mr. Anderson asked what it would be. Mr. Vignaly said we have not seen a plan for the area yet, but it has to meet the standards that the Building Inspector requires; he approves the building design. Ms. Miles says that clarification could be made in the Zoning Bylaws in the future. For now, the opinion is fine and the board has the right to make conditions that the common area is truly a common area and accessible to all. Mr. Lenkarski had not received a copy of the opinion and would like to see Town Counsel’s response before commenting.

Mr. Milisci received responses from VHB, the Water Department and the Fire Chief. Outstanding issues were addressed. VHB asked if a separate waiver letter had been provided to the board. Mr. Milisci said it had not because at this time they do not know if one will be needed. Regarding additional spot grade elevations, they will be provided on a revised plan. Deep hole tests were done as close to the stormwater basin area as they could; they did not do perc tests. Regarding only two test pits being done at the site, Mr. Milisci said in the area where the proposed basin is proposed there is more material to be removed; he is comfortable with the material that is there, but if the board would like a confirmatory test once the pile is removed, it can be made a condition. The SE and SW corners of the stormwater basin appear to still have steeper slopes. VHB asked that they revise the grading in these two areas or provide method of stabilization of those slopes. Mr. Milisci said they regraded the 1-1.5:1 slopes around the detention basin area to provide 2:1 slopes. The two small slopes in the southeast and southwest areas will be rip rapped. Mr. Amico said he only sees 1-1.5:1 rip rap. Normally if you go steeper than 1-1.5:1 you need Geotech information to support a 1:1 or steeper. He asked if they could make it work with 1-1.5:1 slopes Mr. Milisci said the slopes are short enough that they could.

Mr. Vignaly asked how they proposed to stabilize the 2:1 slope areas. Mr. Milisci said loam and seed; jute matting or another erosion control would be used on the slopes steeper than 3:1 until healthy vegetation could be established. Mr. Amico was comfortable with jute matting with mesh. Mr. Vignaly said they have the stormwater basin with wicks. The the bottom of the wicks need to be checked to be two feet above the seasonal high groundwater elevation. Mr. Milisci will check it. VHB made a comment that they typically like to see stormwater pipes analyzed with StormCAD. Mr. Milisci said they use HydroCAD for pre and post runoff. He asked if the board accept the HydroCAD. Mr. Amico was fine with that given there are only two catch basins in the project. VHB noted there was not a signed illicit discharge statement. Mr. Milisci said it is not signed because there is no HOA. It was included on the plan sheet, but Mr. Milisci will make it a standalone document in the HOA.

Regarding the proposed water service, the Water Department responded today (Mr. Milisci read Mr. Coveney's email). A review of the proposed fire protection system by a licensed professional will be provided. The plan indicates a fire hose connection at each unit. The District is concerned with this idea as it could create a backflow issue into the water system without the proper separation or backflow device. A fire hose connection outside of a single residential unit is not common and if this method is used a testable backflow device will need to be installed in each unit and tested by a licensed professional twice per year. Mr. Milisci said the fire protection drawings and report will be part of the plan. He will provide information for comments 4 and 5 at the building permit stage. Mr. Vignaly said they have to satisfy the Water District and the Fire Chief before receiving approval from the board. The board wants to make sure their concerns are addressed early on in the process so there are no changes later.

Regarding the cut and fill analysis, Mr. Milisci said it had not been generated because the property is undergoing an earth removal operation, and to perform the calculations now would be premature. VHB recommended surface comparison of existing and proposed grades can be prepared at this level of the design and submitted to the board for their review and record; however, they know that the Planning Board is aware of the large cuts and the applicant is working with the Earth Removal Board. Mr. Vignaly said there are proposed elevations on the plan. The applicant has already received an Earth Removal Permit, so did not think the board would need the cut/fill volume. The Earth Removal Bylaws requires they stay ten feet above the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation; once you go below you can't come back. That is part of the Earth Removal Permit but not sure that it was included in the packet to the Earth Removal Board before their permit was approved. Mr. Milisci said his firm did not do the application but did confirm on site that the lowest point where they did the test holes, they are thirteen feet above the estimated seasonal high-water table and said the applicant has adhered to the application. Mr. Vignaly said to talk with the Earth Removal Board so they understand what is being removed.

A gravel turnaround was added for emergency vehicles or trash trucks on the plan. Mr. Milisci read the email from the Fire Chief. He will follow up with him and will report back to the board. Mr. Vignaly asked if they could use drivable grass since the vegetation changed from all woods and grass to rock slopes and would rather not have gravel in that area as well. They would have to look at the vehicle size and make sure it gets plowed in the winter. Mr. Milisci will discuss it with the Fire Chief and revise the plan. The subject property is currently undergoing an earth

removal operation and they don't know exactly where the future stockpiles will be. Mr. Milisci will revise the standard notes.

Mr. Rajeshkumar asked about the hours of operation because it is a regular complaint with the neighbors. Mr. Vignaly said 7AM-6PM Monday-Saturday; no construction on Sundays or holidays. Mr. Amico said to specify "federal holidays". Mr. Rajeshkumar asked how they will control the dust. They have been watering the driving lanes. Mr. Vignaly said the retaining wall on the east side was adjusted; it looks like it is 5'-6' high and not sure if it is considered a structure and may have to set back 10' off the property line; the Building Inspector will check the Building Code; he thinks it is considered a structure. Mr. Frieden asked if there was any consideration with screening at the entrance for the neighbors. Mr. Milisci said their plan shows a robust perimeter screening program for the development. Mr. Frieden asked to hear from the public if that was a concern. He said the direction that the headlights would be going is away from the building (north) and asked if it would be going into an uphill slope. Mr. Milisci said driving north and pulling into the development near the street is fairly level; 30-40' into the development is where the 3:1 starts on the abutters' side. He can add screening further along. Mr. Vignaly asked about trash and did they determine if it was private trash pick for condos. Mr. Lenkarski has emailed the DPW and has not yet heard back. They think it will be curbside pickup on Holt Street. Mr. Milisci said they did add an area where they can put the barrels and mailboxes; they are set for either option. Mr. Rajeshkumar noted that he has asked this question recently and was told that condominiums need to have private haulers and pick-up within their property. Having an affordable unit was briefly discussed but Mr. Lenkarski, Sr. said he did not intend to include any. Mr. Frieden asked if they had talked with the neighbors to resolve their issues. Mr. Lenkarski, Jr. said they had met and there is now a better understanding of the project; it has been resolved on their end.

Mr. Anderson asked for public comment. Hearing none, Mr. Vignaly made a motion to continue the public hearing to August 12th at 7:05 p.m.; Ms. Miles seconded; roll call vote: Frieden-yes; Miles-yes; Rajeshkumar-yes; Vignaly-yes; Anderson-yes; motion approved.

Date Accepted: _____

By: _____
Vincent Vignaly, Clerk

Submitted by: _____
Melanie Rich