

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

TOWN HALL • 525 WASHINGTON STREET • WELLESLEY, MA 02482-5992

RICHARD L. SEEDEL, CHAIRMAN
J. RANDOLPH BECKER, VICE CHAIRMAN
DAVID G. SHEFFIELD

LENORE R. MAHONEY
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
TELEPHONE
(781) 431-1019 EXT. 2208

ROBERT W. LEVY
WALTER B. ADAMS
DEREK B. REDGATE

March 15, 2018

Juliani Meeting Room
Town Hall

Zoning Board of Appeals Members Present: Richard L. Seegel, Chairman
J. Randolph Becker
Walter B. Adams

Present on behalf of the Town of Wellesley:
Thomas Harrington, Esq.
Judi Barrett
David Hickey, Town Engineer
Meghan Jop, Assistant Executive Director
Michael Zehner, Planning Director

Present on behalf of Delanson Realty Partners, LLC:
Bob Engler
Victor Sheen
Brad McKenzie

ZBA 2018-24, WELLESLEY PARK LLC, 148 WESTON ROAD

Mr. Seegel said that the Board would open the public hearing and continue it to Tuesday, March 20, 2018. Mr. Seegel moved and Mr. Adams seconded the motion to continue the hearing to March 20, 2018. The Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing.

ZBA 2017-99, DELANSON REALTY PARTNERS LLC, 8 DELANSON CIRCLE

Presenting the case at the hearing were Victor Sheen, Delanson Realty Partners, LLC and Brad McKenzie, McKenzie Engineering. Mr. Sheen said that they were prepared to talk about revised drainage and site related items. He said that they would give a brief overview of the changes from the previous proposal. He said that the building has been shifted slightly to accommodate the site. He said that the major change has been a shifting of the driveway from Hollis Street to the curb cut on Linden Street. where pedestrian entrance used to be. He said that the residential entrance has been shifted to the Hollis Street side. He said that they widened the access drive for emergency vehicles, as well as providing a separate loading and service area. He said that the courtyard will now be accessed internally from the building. He said that they are now proposing a porte cochere structure on Hollis Street for drop off for

residents. He said that the number of units will remain at 90 but the number of bedrooms has been reduced from 155 beds to 136 beds. Mr. Seegel asked if any of the three bedroom units had been eliminated. Mr. Sheen said that there are still nine three bedroom units.

Mr. Sheen said that their Parking Consultant will come back before the Board at a later date. Mr. Seegel said that the Board will review architecture on March 29th and traffic and parking on April 12th.

Mr. Sheen said that their Traffic Engineer submitted a memorandum addressing some of the comments from the BOS and ZBA consultant's.

Brad McKenzie described the design revisions that have been made since the first plans were submitted in November, 2017. He said that some subsurface investigation was done on site since then. He said that the Geo-Technical Consultant, KMM, and members of McKenzie Engineering were on site to perform test borings and observe deep holes for purposes of structural design for the footings for the building and the stormwater management system to confirm the depth of ledge, as well as groundwater conditions. He said that they modified the entire site design to result in a plan that better comports with the existing topography and takes in to consideration the ledge outcrops and groundwater conditions. He said that the building has moved 16 to 17 feet away from Hollis Street and about six feet away from Linden Street. He said that what drove the change in location was the presence of a lot of rock on the left side of the site. He said that the basement slab was raised four feet to reduce the amount of rock that needed to be excavated. He said that the first floor elevation was increased from 170 to 178. He said that the garage slab was increased from 160 to 164. Mr. Sheen said that they reduced the floor to floor height for the residences to account for the delta. Mr. Adams said that it is raised about 4.5 feet.

Mr. McKenzie said that generally the results of the deep hole testing indicated the presence of ledge anywhere from six to ten feet below ground surface. He said that encountered no ledge on some of holes or the right side of the site.

Mr. McKenzie said that there was an infiltration component to the retention basin design in the plan that was submitted in November. He said that they eliminated that because it was a cut into bedrock, so it was not going to offer much infiltration. He said that the basin has now been designed as a standard infiltration basin, located primarily within the footprint of the existing family home so as to not disturb a stand of mature trees. He said that most of the subsurface infiltration facilities have been relocated to the right side of the site. He said that the system will intercept the runoff from Oakencroft Road to a series of subsurface infiltration units to recharge the runoff and provide some storage capability. He said that by the time the stormwater is discharged back toward the municipal system, the peak rates of runoff for post-development will be less than the pre-development condition. He said that George Saraceno mentioned in his March 6, 2018 letter that there is a very small increase in runoff volume directed to the Town's system. He said that they are in the process of modifying the design to add a few more chambers to completely mitigate the increase in volume so that there will be no increase in stormwater peak rates or volume direct to the town system at Linden Street.

Mr. McKenzie said that they met with Engineering on March 2, 2018. He said, subsequent to that, they submitted plans that were addressed in George Saraceno's March 9th letter. He said that they are in the process of reviewing all of the comments in the letter. He said that the additional items that Engineering requested include a CMP, cross sections through the site to illustrate the earth work cuts and fills, the ledge profile, how much rock will need to be removed, an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, a construction phase and long term BMP Operation and Maintenance Plan, a plan and profile of the connections to the municipal drain and sewer systems. He said that some of the items can be easily addressed. He said that some items could be conditioned to be provided in the final construction plans, such as the hazardous materials survey prior to demolition of the five houses on Delanson Circle which has not been completed but is typically required prior to the demolition permit. Mr. Harrington asked Mr.

McKenzie to identify where in the letter the items are discussed that might be subject to conditions. Mr. McKenzie said that one of the items is found on page 2 of the letter under general, #17.

Mr. Adams said that DPW mentioned that there is a discrepancy in the height of the elevation in the parking garage. Mr. Sheen said that is being addressed. He said that 12 feet has been provided. Mr. Adams confirmed that the architectural set is the condition that is proposed.

Mr. McKenzie said that another item that could be conditioned is the pre-blast survey, which is something that the Applicant would have to do prior to construction. He said that it is discussed in #5 under general. Mr. Seegel said that would be something that the ZBA would want to see prior to reaching its decision. He said that with all of the ledge in the area, the Board would want to see what the blasting plans are, where the veins are, where there might be weakness going up in the hill, and the kinds of steps the Applicant will take to work with the neighbors to offer them the opportunity to survey their properties in case there is damage. Mr. McKenzie said that his understanding of the pre-blast survey is to get permission to go onto private property to survey it. He said that the CMP can probably delve into the procedures that can be undertaken and the methods for removing ledge.

Mr. Seegel said that the Board has not seen a CMP that comes close to what is required. Mr. Adams asked when the Applicant expects to have a contractor or consultant who will have a reliable idea about staging this. Mr. Sheen said that, given the scheduling for the architectural and traffic components, they will then have a better sense about the process of construction. He said that they should be able to address that in May. He said that they are working with a number of contractors but have not selected one at this point to provide construction process information but they will commission a CMP either through a contractor or a third party consultant.

Mr. Seegel confirmed that the revised plans show all of the borings. Mr. McKenzie said that the results of the borings were submitted in connection with the Drainage Report. Mr. Becker said that what is in the report relates to the infiltration rates and variables of the soil that are important to the drainage system. He said that it does not talk about where the ledge is, the properties of the materials and how they are distributed. He asked if another geo-technical report will be submitted that talks about that. Mr. McKenzie said that KMM submitted a Geo-Technical Report on January 12, 2018. He said that McKenzie did deep holes for permeability of soil, depth to groundwater, and bedrock for purposes of designing the stormwater management system. He said that is what is in the drainage report. Mr. Seegel said that the Board told Mr. Sheen that the other report that was submitted in January was not helpful. He said that there needed to be additional borings. He said that there is so much ledge there and it is very uneven. He said that the Board needs to know where the ledge is and how far it goes down. He asked how the Applicant can give a definitive drainage plan when they do not know where the ledge is and how deep it goes. Mr. McKenzie said that in areas where they are proposing subsurface infiltration systems, they have quite a few test holes. He said that based on the soil testing results, they relocated the infiltration systems to provide at least a four foot separation from the bottom of the system to any ledge.

Mr. Adams said that DPW commented that the retention systems are close to the foundations of the building. Mr. McKenzie said it is located 10 feet off of the building and 10 feet off of the property lines, which meets State codes.

Dave Hickey said that the stormwater system has improved from the first generation of the plan. He said that it has been moved to an area that has less ledge via the test pits and is in areas where he thinks it has a better chance of functioning. He said that he is still concerned that some chambers might be added to accommodate DPW's concern about increased flood volume. He said that those chambers are pretty close to Hollis Street, which is private way as well as close to a building. He said that cross sections would help DPW a great deal to get around the concept of where the basement, walls and foundations are so that

they can get around concerns about constructability and where, as groundwater floods in bigger events, it is likely to impact.

Mr. Hickey said that one of the things that has been confusing to DPW is the location of the foundation and its ability to accommodate the parking. He said that there appears to be a four foot separation between something that has pervious pavers/grass and might be being counted as pervious in the drainage calculations. He said that there is a concrete deck that is probably water proofed underneath. He said that DPW wants to make sure that they have that clear.

Mr. Hickey said that another concern in with the fairly deep borings. He said that groundwater was not found in any of the six borings. He questioned whether any of them should have been changed unto observations wells where DPW could go back and see the groundwater. He said that, based on his experience in Wellesley and on a video that they saw at their last meeting, DPW is suspicious that the groundwater could be high at times.

Mr. Hickey said that putting a garage structure and foundation of this magnitude, it probably will have some de-watering. He said that there is no information on how and where that goes.

Mr. Hickey said that between 10,000 and 15,000 gallons a day of sewerage will come off of the site. He said that DPW has profiled and started video of both stormwater and sewer as it goes down Linden Street. He said that the section of sewer from the site to the Linden Store has an 8 inch pipe and is very flat at less than half of a percent. He said that they are still trying to get some monitoring information. He said that they are concerned about the sanitary sewer impact because that one link is weak enough that this could create a surcharge situation due to the less than optimal diameter and slope.

Mr. Hickey said that DPW continues to be concerned about Hollis Street. He said that even though the dominant vehicle access has been moved to Linden Street, the emergency access, drop off/loading and pedestrian drop off are on Hollis Street. He said that the street is very narrow. He said that the paved width is less than 25 feet. He said that the ability to turn a car there is concerning. He said that the ability to have emergency vehicles get up and down there is concerning. He said that one vehicle misplaced on that street stops the street from functioning.

Mr. Hickey said that the last concern is constructability. He said that there needs to be a CMP that talks about staging, cranes, and stacking being contained on the site.

Mr. Sheen said that their traffic engineer will provide an analysis of the turning radius by Monday or Tuesday, well in advance of the traffic presentations. He said that once they have the footprint of the building set and understand the site constraints and solutions, they will provide information on that as part of the CMP.

Mr. Adams asked if they changed the presumption of what the construction type will be when they changed the design. Mr. Sheen said that there will be a steel deck that separates the parking levels from the residential levels and the rest will be wood frame.

Mr. McKenzie said that Mr. Hickey asked how the courtyard was modeled. He said that there is two to four feet of soil between the top of the parking deck and the finished courtyard surface. He said that the calculations that were submitted did model it at 98 percent impervious. He said that they considered the whole courtyard as being paved. He said that Mr. Hickey was going to get more information about the drainage system at the front of the site and they will work on that further. He said that they are in the process of developing the sections.

Mr. Seegel asked if Mr. Hill or the Engineer from Tetra Tech was present at the hearing. A representative from College Heights Association said that they were not present.

Mr. Becker said that the summary of the drainage system is helpful. He said that the drainage areas that were included in the analysis for pre- and post-operation includes areas of Wellesley that are outside of the site. He asked how it was developed that water comes onto the site from those areas. Mr. McKenzie said that they obtained some off site topographic information and made assumptions. He said that they drove the Oakencroft Road neighborhood. He said that they determined that the limit of the watershed is the paved limit of Oakencroft Road, understanding that there is curbing on Oakencroft that directs water southerly down to Linden Street.

Mr. McKenzie said that there is a wedge that they assumed would be tributary to the site. He said that it is included in the pre and post-development conditions. Mr. Adams confirmed that the assumption is that the stuff on the street will not flow over as it did occasionally and that the design is based on the assumption that if it fails it will get repaired. Mr. McKenzie said that they feel fairly confident that the purpose of the basin is to mitigate and capture the runoff and prevent it from spilling over the walls into the courtyard area. He described the overflow system. Mr. Seegel asked if it will be gravity flow or pumped. Mr. McKenzie said that there will be no pumps.

Mr. Becker said that it appears from the Drainage Report that not 100 percent of the water that goes into the basin will come out through the connection that Mr. McKenzie described. He said that the report looks like it is 46 percent impervious, not 100 percent impervious. He asked about water inflow and what happens to the parts of the water. Mr. McKenzie said that it is a typical extended detention basin. He said that the calculations do not take credit for infiltration. He said that looking at peak rates, not volumes, the purpose of the stormwater detention basin is to retain the water for a period of time and release it at a slower rate than it enters. He said that the peaks will occur at different times in the watershed. Mr. Becker asked where the water that enters the detention system and infiltrates will go. He asked about the impact, if any, on the retaining walls. Mr. McKenzie said that they can look at that but they do not think that there will be a lot of infiltration there. He said that right now it is within the footprint of the home and the elevations are going to be pretty similar. He said that some soil will be removed. He said that if the soil is not suitable, additional soil will have to be brought in. He said that, as a precautionary measure, they can add a poly barrier to prevent the water from interacting with the footing or the face of the wall. He said that is something that they can look at in connection with the Geo-Technical Engineer. Mr. Becker said that the Board does not have enough detail about the geo-technical things that are happening in that area to understand that. He said that this is new information for the Board and it is anxious to see the confirmation.

Mr. Adams asked if the Cultec Infiltration System is designed to withstand the weight of a fire truck. Mr. McKenzie said that it is. Mr. Adams asked if the Applicant reviewed the 16 feet of fire lane with the Fire Department. He said that typically it is 18 feet. Mr. Sheen said that they initially went to the Fire Chief with a 14 feet fire lane and it was signed off. He said that it has been increased from 14 to 16 feet. Mr. Harrington said that the Fire Chief submitted a more recent letter wanting additional detail. Mr. Sheen said that his team did meet with the Fire Department and got signed off on the original plan. Mr. Adams said that the width of the fire lane typically accommodates the width of the fire truck plus the outriggers. He said that this will be wood structure, so it is a concern. Mr. Sheen said that he would look into that.

Mr. Becker said that when the Board first looked at drainage, it appeared to be based on assumptions that on the properties of the soil. He asked Mr. McKenzie to describe what they discovered in the test pits, how it varied across the test pits and what impact it had on the design. Mr. McKenzie said that seven test pits were excavated, witnessed by a DEP licensed soil evaluator. He said that the results were pretty much in line with the assumptions, based on the soil surveys for the site. He said that the soil is a loamy sand and the parent C-1 layer is very permeable. He said that assumptions for infiltration are somewhat

conservative for the soils that were encountered. He said that the soils were granular in nature. He said that Test Pit 1, which is in front of the site, went down 84 inches. He said that there was no sign of groundwater and they did not hit rock. He said that they hit ledge or boulder at 62 inches in Test Pit 2. He said that granular soil was prevalent there and there was no groundwater. He said that Test Pit 5 was 68 inches to boulder or refusal and was loamy sand. He said that Test Pit 6 was 47 inches to boulder or ledge and was loamy sand.

Mr. Seegel asked if all of the old site conditions could be eliminated from the plans to just show what is proposed. Mr. McKenzie said that when you show proposed grading on a plan, you need to see the contours. He said that they can do it for C-1, which is the Site Development Plan, so that you do not see the existing structures. He said that they can do that for Plan C-2 as well.

Mr. Becker questioned the difference in output of the system at DP 1 in the case of a short intense storm versus a long slow storm. Mr. McKenzie said that he did not have the numbers for a 100 year storm. He said that his recollection is that it is somewhere between two and three cubic feet per second at each discharge point, which would not cause a huge surcharge. He said that typically closed drainage systems are not designed for 100 year storms. He said that they are designed for 10 or 25 year storms. He said that it would not be unusual to see most part of the town's systems surcharged with water coming out of the catch basins in a 100 year storm. He said that he did not think that there would be an issue with a 10 or 25 year storm. He said that they are reducing the rates of runoff to the system at DP1. He said that the only difference now is that, in the present condition a lot of the runoff is sheet flowing down to Delanson through the lots onto the street instead of being put underground through closed drainage directed to the town's system. Mr. Becker said that because they are only using a half inch of water, it makes it sound like there will never be a problem but in long slow storms when there is a lot of volume, there is a lot of water to get rid of and you cannot get rid of all of it. Mr. Seegel asked at what point it would start surcharging. Mr. McKenzie said that if it is not a storm that has a great rainfall intensity, the surcharging would occur downstream and gradually make its way up to the site from wherever the town's restriction was.

Mr. Adams said that the retaining wall design was changed as part of the revised plan. He asked how that will get constructed. He said that he was referring to the series of walls on the northwest side of the property where the earlier plan showed a concrete block system and now it is a reinforced concrete retaining wall system that are seven feet in height. He said that some of the walls will be close to the property line. He asked how they envision constructing those walls. Mr. McKenzie said that it is proposed to be a cantilever concrete wall. He said that it was right on the property line in the previous version of the plan. He said that they pulled it off of the property line about four to five feet. He said that at one point it will be 9 to 10 feet in height and transitions down to two feet. Mr. Adams said that the cantilever is under what is retained. He said that they will have to dig down in order to be able to build the horizontal slab that creates the cantilever that can support the vertical concrete wall that will retain the earth. Mr. McKenzie said that they feel like it can be built using sheeting or shoring without disturbing the adjacent property. Mr. Sheen said that constructability and sequencing will be addressed in the CMP. Mr. Seegel said that when the Applicant goes to apply for a building permit, if he cannot prove it to the Building Commissioner, they will not get a permit. He said that it has to be done early in the process. Mr. Sheen said that they are familiar with construction in urban environments. He said that the site in Brookline was tighter. Mr. Seegel asked about drainage behind the wall. Mr. McKenzie said that there will be weep holes near the bottom with three-quarter inch stone on the earth side of the wall to facilitate movement of water. Mr. Adams said that Plan L-2 shows drainage that could be within a few feet of the property line. Mr. McKenzie said that is an underdrain for the footing. Mr. Seegel asked how they will excavate without disturbing adjacent property. Mr. McKenzie said that they will do it by sheeting or shoring.

Mr. Becker said that the access road on the northerly side of the site rises 14 feet from Hollis Street to the courtyard level. He said that from the courtyard level there is a walkway that goes along the left side of the building that terminates at a 16 foot retaining wall. He asked what happens to surface water that goes down the road and the walkway. Mr. McKenzie said that within the courtyard are a couple of catch basins that convey flows to the closed drainage system. He said that the access road pitches down to a catch basin near Hollis Street and then into the subsurface system. Mr. Becker asked about surface water on the walkway that is to the left of the building from Linden Street. Mr. McKenzie said that he will review the Watershed Plan to get that information. Mr. Becker said that it takes some time to figure out how the pieces fit together because the site is not flat. Mr. McKenzie said that it is somewhat confusing because the parking is underneath.

Mr. Becker asked about drainage within the garage. Mr. McKenzie said that there should be floor drains that go to the sanitary sewer system, per Plumbing Code.

Mr. Adams asked if all of the roof drains go into the retention system. Mr. McKenzie said that they do. He said that they do not have finished plans MEP Plans but they have made assumptions in certain locations within the building, as shown on Plan C-2. He said that if the locations change in the final development plans so that the sub-catchment is directed somewhere else in the drainage train, they will have to modify the calculations.

Mr. Adams asked about the parking plan. He said that the square foot area of the garage appears to be reduced. He asked if there will be three levels of stacking cars. Mr. Sheen confirmed that is the case. He said that they will be discussing that as part of the traffic and parking presentation. He said that additional stackers will allow them to get to a 1.4 parking ratio. Mr. Adams asked about the floor to ceiling height in the garage. Mr. Sheen said that it is 12 feet.

Mr. Adams asked if there has been any discussion with the town about reconstruction of Hollis, at least for the length of the property. He said that the Board is hearing that the street is not as wide as it is identified as. Mr. Zehner said that it is a private way as well. Mr. Sheen said that any improvements from the center of their portion of Hollis Street onto the site. He said that there will be no expansion of Hollis Street beyond the centerline. He said that they will not encroach on neighboring property. Mr. Zehner said that the Planning Board has asked for a legal analysis regarding rights to Hollis Street. He said that they expect to have that provided before the April 12th hearing. Mr. Adams said that if there were a way to widen it for at least the length of the property, that would benefit the project. Mr. Sheen said that typically when they do a project that disturbs the roadway, they do not just pave to the middle. He said that they pave the whole width. Mr. Adams said that there may be areas where neighbors are using parts of the road and it might be a hardship to give it up. Mr. Seegel said that the Applicant will have to see if they can pave from side to side, from a legal standpoint. Mr. Sheen said that they will have that information for the April 12th hearing.

Mr. Becker asked what the single last impediment to completion of the design is. Mr. McKenzie said that they are working diligently to address George Saraceno's March 9th letter. He said that he did not see any impediments. He said that they need to look at a few things with their geo-technical consultant, one of which will be the upper basin and the retaining wall. He said that they heard the Board's concern about the need to see more borings to better approximate the profile of the ledge. He said that they are preparing the cross sections that they hope will provide more information and detail and take away some of the speculation about the earthwork impacts and the blasting that might be required. He said that they feel very comfortable with the redesigned stormwater system. He said that they have enough test pit information along Hollis and Linden Streets. He said that they are waiting for information from Dave Hickey on the sewer system.

Mr. Seegel said that he was not happy that the neighbors hired an engineer who was not present at the hearing when he was supposed to be. He said that it is not helpful.

Anne Marie Towle, 7 Oakencroft Road, said that the neighbors hired an engineer who did a study based on the original plans. She said that when the new plans were submitted, the engineer was going to redo his analysis based on the revised plans. She said that he was supposed to be here tonight. She asked if the engineer would be allowed to speak at a subsequent hearing. Mr. Seegel said that he will have that opportunity.

Ms. Towle said that the retaining wall was described as going from a low of two feet at the Hollis Street end to a high of nine feet at the half way point in her backyard. She said that she was talking about the retaining wall along the fire lane on the northerly side. She said that it appears that half of the length of her back yard will have a retaining wall up against it, anywhere from five to nine feet high. She said that she did not understand how they can construct a retaining wall that high three feet from the property without impacting the property. She said that she has a retaining wall in her front yard. She said that her house sits four feet below the street. She said that her retaining wall holds up the road. She said that she replaced the retaining wall about 12 years ago and was told that the retaining wall had to be backed up at least four feet from the road and there had to be at least a four foot fence for safety. She said that the proposed retaining wall will be over twice that height. She said that there is a line on the plan that talks about a safety fence. She said that it will not be a privacy fence, it will be a safety fence. She said that there will be a nine foot drop off. She said that she is concerned about how it would be possible to build that high a retaining wall butting up against her property and Mr. Fitzpatrick's property. She asked the Board to look closely at that issue.

Mr. McKenzie said that with a wall that varies in height from two to nine feet, a safety fence will be needed on top. He said that they will revise the plans to show that. Mr. Adams said that the current plan shows the retaining wall to vary from three to four feet from the property line. He said that the biggest issue will be the depth of the footing, which the landscape plan shows going deeper for a footing as required for a cantilevered retaining wall. He said that this will be an engineering challenge. He said that the neighbors should carefully document the condition of their property because the developers of this site are obligated to maintain neighboring property in its current condition. He said that is true of blasting damage as well.

Bill Fitzpatrick, 12 Hollis Street, said that there is a big tree at the end of the driveway at 12 Hollis Street. He said that the tree would have to be taken down to make way for the fire lane and the wall. Mr. Zehner said that the plans show the tree on Mr. Fitzpatrick's property. Mr. Sheen said that the tree is going to be protected. Mr. Zehner asked Mr. McKenzie if they will have to cut half of the roots out of the tree. Mr. Seegel said that the Board will wait to get the plans.

Mr. Seegel said that Mr. Sheen was spoon feeding information to the Board with a baby spoon. He said that Mr. Sheen should be delivering facts and information. He said that he did not think that Mr. Sheen had been helpful in giving the Board all of the information that he has. He said that the Board wants all of it. He said that he mentioned early on that the parking ratio for this project is not satisfactory. He said that a ratio of 1.4 is not satisfactory. He said that they will have to get that up to 1.5 to 1.7. He said that he wants to have a draft CMP at the next meeting. He said that he does not want any further delays. He said that they need to figure out how they will manage this site and have a draft CMP to the Board in two weeks. He said that if they are unsure about what has to be in there, they should consult with DPW. He said that there have been some major projects constructed in town over the past seven years. He said that they can look at those CMPs in the Zoning Board office. He said that they will have to demonstrate how large trucks will access and maneuver on the site, and where materials storage and layout will be located. He said that this is an almost impossible site to work with to manage construction vehicles and the building materials. He said that they cannot have anything on Hollis or Linden Streets. He said that the

CMP may be one of the most important documents that has to be submitted to the Board. He said that any submittals to DPW should be sent early enough to allow for response time from the engineers and the developer has a chance to make changes before coming back before the Board. He said that if the developer gives the Board everything that it asks for, the Board will get it done. He said that if this starts to drag out, they will have to come back in the fall because he goes away for three months in the summer.

Mr. Harrington said that the next meeting is March 29th. Mr. Seegel said that, in addition to architecture, the Applicant should be prepared to discuss traffic and parking. He said that the Board needs to cover more ground at the hearings. Mr. Sheen said that they were able to confirm their traffic engineer's availability for April 12th. He said that he will check their availability on March 29th. Mr. Seegel said that if they are not available, Mr. Sheen should get some other part of the program in here.

Mr. Adams moved and Mr. Becker seconded the motion to continue the hearing to March 29, 2018. The Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing.

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the hearing was adjourned at 9:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lenore Mahoney
Executive Secretary

DRAFT