

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

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

J. RANDOLPH BECKER, CHAIRMAN
RICHARD L. SEEGEL
DAVID G. SHEFFIELD

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

ROBERT W. LEVY, VICE CHAIRMAN
WALTER B. ADAMS
DEREK B. REDGATE

May 16, 2019
7:30 pm
Juliani Meeting Room
Town Hall

Zoning Board of Appeals Members Present: J. Randolph Becker
David G. Sheffield
Walter B. Adams

ZBA 2019-53, CEDAR PLACE LLC, 3 BURKE LANE

Mr. Sheffield moved, Mr. Adams seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing to Tuesday, June 4 at 7:30 pm.

ZBA 2019-54, HYMAN FELDMAN FAMILY TRUST & DANIEL KARP, M.D., 170-184 WORCESTER STREET & 7 BURKE LANE

Present at the public hearing were Dennis Dischino, Property Manager, Hyman Feldman Family Trust, Dr. Daniel Karp, Trustee, and John Federico, Civil Engineer, Guerriere & Halnon, Inc.

Mr. Dischino said that the Trust owns the property at 170 to 184 Worcester Street and the adjacent abutting lot at 7 Burke Lane. He said that 7 Burke Lane was rezoned last year at Town Meeting to a Residence A District to allow commercial parking. He said that the purpose of buying the land is to expand the parking lot. He said that there was an eminent domain taking 20 years ago out front. He said the parking was greatly reduced on the site. He said that the hope is that by expanding the parking at the rear they will be able to introduce some landscaping at the front, which will increase the curb appeal and contain all of the parking on site.

Mr. Dischino said that currently there is parallel parking at 170 to 184 Worcester Street on the Route 9 side. He said all of that will be removed and replaced with landscaping. He said that, on the east side of the building, the existing angled parking will be removed and replaced with three parallel spaces. He said that it will be made one way coming around the property. He said that there will be a sidewalk along Burke Lane connecting 7 Burke Lane to 170 Worcester Street to Route 9. He said that currently there is no sidewalk on Burke Lane to get to Route 9.

Mr. Dischino said that they laid out a parking plan for the property at the back. He said that they revised the plans in response to Planning Board comments. He said that they are scheduled to go before the Design Review Board (DRB) on May 22, 2019.

Mr. Dischino said that they added landscaping along the southern, western, and eastern borders. He said that they extended the five foot sidewalk all the way to the west. He said that they eliminated a parking spot in the middle to create another access point for pedestrians to the walkway. He said that there will be a retaining wall that will be under five feet.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the number of existing parking spaces. Mr. Federico said that there are 46 existing spaces and will increase the number of spaces to 85. He said that there are two to three handicapped stalls. He said that three handicapped stalls are proposed. Mr. Sheffield asked how many total spaces are required. Mr. Dischino said that it is 3.2/1000. Mr. Becker said that it is 150 square feet of the footprint or 3.2/1000 of the square feet in the building. He said that he said the calculation of 77, based on 150 square feet of footprint but did not see the 3.2/1000 square feet of the building. He said that 170 Worcester Street has two floors and the other two have single floors. Mr. Dischino said that the medical building has 12,500 total square feet, split evenly over two floors. Mr. Becker said that the Development Prospectus lists the required number of spaces at 77. Mr. Federico said that the three proposed handicapped spaces will be in front of the Vision Medical Center. He said that a total of 85 spaces is proposed, which is 8 spaces over the requirement. Mr. Dischino said that there is no off-street parking here and there is no public nearby. He said that they will have an exercise/fitness business going into 184 Worcester Street and they want to make sure that they have enough parking to meet the demand on site. He said that they want some extra room in the winter for snow storage. He said that they do not want any overflow onto Burke Lane.

Mr. Sheffield said that he did not like the three cars parked on the east side of the building. He said that it would be better to not have them there, which would allow for an increased depth of the buffer along Burke Lane, which is the entrance to a residential area. Mr. Dischino said that they can accommodate that.

Mr. Adams said that the plans do not identify the handicapped accessible spaces. Mr. Federico said that they will revise the plans to show the handicapped spaces. Mr. Becker said that they also add a legend for the symbols used so the Board can figure out what is underground and what is marked on the pavement. He said that he was not able to get a strong sense of the vehicle or pedestrian circulation and what their separation will be.

Mr. Adams confirmed that the parking is all for the property that faces Worcester Street. He asked how you get from the new parking on the currently vacant lot to the building. Mr. Dischino said that they will put a five foot wide sidewalk around the building. Mr. Sheffield said that there is a truncated sidewalk on the south side of the building. He said that they are proposing a sidewalk along the east side that goes the length of the building and brings the circulation from the parking lot to the front of the building. Mr. Adams said that Plan 3 of 6 shows a sidewalk on the back side of the two-story building that extends slightly beyond it. Mr. Dischino said that the Planning Department staff recommended that the sidewalk be extended all the way to the west to the last parking stall so that when people pull in and park in the west stalls, there will be easy access to the sidewalk that will take them all the way to the 170 building where they can walk across.

Mr. Adams asked if getting to the cross hatched spot that shows on the plan is an accessway for accessible parking or are all of the accessible spots in front. Mr. Dischino said that the accessible spaces are shown in front of the Wok restaurant. He said that there will be one or two handicapped spaces in the new lot. Mr.

Adams said that the spaces should be as close as possible to the entrance to the building. Mr. Dischino they will put handicapped spaces on both sides of the building.

Mr. Adams asked about access to the Vision Medical Center. Mr. Dischino said that it is currently on the east side. He said that there is an option for them to put one on the south side. Mr. Adams said that the most efficient way to arrange the handicapped parking spaces is to have two on either side of the access walkway.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the cross hatching shown on the drawing are paint markings on the pavement. Mr. Dischino said that they are.

Mr. Sheffield asked about crosswalks on the west side at the boundary between the Worcester Street property and the Burke Lane property. He said that a sidewalk is shown at parking spaces 26 to 30. He said that sidewalk will never be used. Mr. Dischino said that was eliminated. He said that it is supposed to be replaced with landscaping.

Mr. Sheffield said that the cross hatching that is meant to extend the proposed sidewalk that runs east/west in front of parking spaces 31 to 49. He said four spaces are to be removed. He asked what happens on the west side of the oriental rug gallery where there is a fair amount of paving space and it is vacant. Mr. Dischino said that is existing and there nothing proposed to change there. He said that they will repave it with porous pavement. He said that there is a guardrail that separates the property, adjacent to the stairs.

Mr. Sheffield said that people parking in spaces 31 to 39 will go to the west side of the building and go around. Mr. Adams said that there should be safe passage. He said that they will be ripping up all of the paving to handle the drainage issues. He said that he was concerned about parking in front of the Wok. He said that there does not appear to be a wide enough sidewalk there to provide a reasonable path for people to come and go from the restaurant. Mr. Dischino said that the challenge there is having enough room for the parking spaces and the landscaping out front. He said that he is trying to bump up the curb appeal. He said that there are only four or five spaces there. Mr. Adams said that it may be best to have a sidewalk that runs along the front of the building so that you could get from one business to another without having to squeeze between the bumper of a car.

Mr. Dischino said that there is a sidewalk in front of the 184 Worcester Street building. He said that they are working with the tenant in the 184 Worcester Street building. He said that they will be doing a major renovation of the building and they may eliminate the stairs. He said that could make space for a sidewalk along the western side.

Mr. Sheffield said that there is a lot of space there that could be used for landscaping and parallel parking. He said that parking space 67, the most westerly space on the Worcester side of the building, is hanging out. He said that there is a fair amount of landscaping and design work that needs to be done here.

Mr. Becker said that the circulation is not readily apparent. He said that signage is needed to help the driver to figure out where they are supposed to go and park. He said that when you turn into the first driveway off of Worcester Street, the view of what happens behind the building is obscured by 184, so you do not really know that there is parking in back of the building. Mr. Sheffield confirmed that there will be two way circulation on the west side of the building. He said that the only one way circulation is from west to east on the front of and the east side the buildings. Mr. Becker said that the plan is not tight for the number of spaces to comply and there is plenty of open space west of the building. He said that circulation for pedestrians and vehicles is important and is not apparent on the plan.

Mr. Becker said that there was no information about the retaining walls, what they will look like, how they will sit in relation to the lot lines, how it will be constructed, or the construction process. He said that that it is important for the Board to understand the permanent impacts with respect to circulation and the retaining walls and the temporary impacts in the Construction Management Plan (CMP). Mr. Dischino said that currently the first floor of 170 Worcester Street and 184 Worcester Street will also be vacant. He said that this summer would be the best time to do the work. He said that no new tenants will move in until it is finished. Mr. Sheffield said that trucks will be entering and leaving the site and there will be a lot of excavation. He said that the trucks will have to be cleaned before going off of the site. He said that there will have to be wheel washes. He said that there is going to be a series of complicated CMP issues that will have to be addressed.

Mr. Becker said that the places that the Board has seen permeable pavement used before had perforated pipes in the gravel base so that when you had larger or sequential storms there is an overflow. He said that it is not clear if that is happening here. He asked about plans to accommodate stormwater. Mr. Federico said that the plan is to incorporate a 100 year storm into the pavement and hold there. He said that he will look into the overflow.

Mr. Adams said that the Board received comments from people in the neighborhood who said that the property has not been fully maintained. He said that trash and unkempt areas on the property seem to exist, which is of heightened concern with permeable paving, which needs significant maintenance. He said that it takes more than having a set of instructions. He said that if you do not follow through, the pavement could clog up and the water will drain off of the site. Mr. Dischino said that they will only use salt in the winter, no sand. He said that the existing conditions on the outside of the building have been left in their present condition because it was a long process to acquire the additional land and go through Town Meeting to get it rezoned. He said that it will all be ripped up. He said that there will be a lot of investment in the hardscape around the property. He said that the landlord recently renovated the entire second floor of the office. He said that there was no sense in putting money into hardscape now when it was all going to be ripped out. Mr. Adams said that if you own a property, you are obligated to maintain it. Mr. Dischino said that is the goal with the redevelopment. He said that the landlord wants to improve the curb appeal of the property so that he can finish out the leasing. He said that having additional parking is key to the project. He said that it should be a big improvement to the neighborhood. He said that he liked the idea of taking away three parking spaces and adding landscaping on the east side. He said that on the west side of 184 Worcester Street, with the tenant that they have lined up, the loading dock and stairs will go away and they will be able to put a walkway and landscaping there. He said that they will look into putting a sidewalk in front of the Wok so that they connect all around the buildings.

Mr. Becker said that with porous pavement you do not have the same means for trapping oil, grease and salt to keep them from getting to the groundwater. He said that the Board will need to see a plan that shows how that will be dealt with. Mr. Dischino said that when they looked at pervious pavement, they made sure that this was an appropriate site to have it. He said that there is a lot of sand under the site, which is good drainage material and an ideal condition for pervious pavement. Mr. Becker said that the three test pits are all on the south side. Mr. Dischino said that at the northeast corner of the 170 Worcester Street building, which was built in the 1960's, the building started to sink. He said that they had to drive a steel column down to shore up the building because of soil conditions out there.

Mr. Adams said that the Board will need to see a lot more information. He said that existing parking spaces 80 to 85 have no dimensions that show the depth of the spaces and the space between them and the back of

the building. He questioned whether those spaces will work well once they are constrained by a sidewalk on the south side. He said that he did not have a clear idea of what is happening with the sidewalk along Burke Lane. He said that there is a four foot retaining wall there and on the high side of the retaining wall is a travel lane for cars. He asked what will happen between the top of the retaining wall and the sidewalk four feet below to make sure that pedestrians on the sidewalk are not terrorized by vehicles traveling next to them four feet higher. Mr. Becker said that they need to figure out where they will need separation for pedestrian and vehicle circulation. Mr. Dischino said that will be addressed.

Mr. Adams said that the Applicant needs to figure out how many spaces he is obligated to provide in accordance with the local bylaw and the Access Board regulations.

Mr. Sheffield asked where the dumpsters will be located. Mr. Dischino said that they will stay where they are with trees and landscaping in front of them and possibly some fencing. He said that they are currently located at the back of the 170 Worcester Street building, behind the Wok Restaurant, away from the residences. Mr. Sheffield asked if the trash vendor truck will have enough room for circulation on the site. Mr. Dischino said that the truck currently backs up to the dumpsters.

Mr. Becker asked about the two squares on the plans at the lower southwest corner. Mr. Federico said the hatched area will be used for snow storage. He said that the hatched area by parking space 70 to 80 is pavement that they can use for additional striping or can be landscaped.

Mr. Becker discussed bylaw requirements for certain percentages of landscaping. He said that the Board will need to see something that shows that the requirement is met.

Mr. Sheffield said that there are a number of opportunities to improve the plans for the benefit for all who see it and the residents of Burke Lane.

Mr. Adams said that there will be some spillover to the south of 0.3 foot candles of light. He said that is residential property and it is reasonable to try to limit the spillover of light. Mr. Dischino said that there will be a six foot fence, a retaining wall and landscaping. He said that there will be a lot more landscaping on the back side of the fence to protect the residences.

Mr. Sheffield said that Mr. Dischino should speak with the neighbors to discuss the plans. Mr. Dischino said that he owns the residential property next door. He said that one of the major concerns for the neighborhood is overflow parking on Burke Lane and another is making the entrance onto Burke Lane look better. He said that he will keep the plantings low out front to preserve visibility of the ramps. Mr. Becker said that the Board receive two letters from neighbors on Burke Lane, both of whom seem angry.

Mr. Dischino said that there will be a new owner of the restaurant. He said that there have been issues with the tidiness of the property but that will change with the new owners. Mr. Adams said that it is the property owner's responsibility to keep it cleaned up.

Mr. Becker asked if there was anyone present at the public hearing who wished to speak to the petition.

Gary Miller, 192 Worcester Street and 150 Cedar Street, said that he is the abutter on the western side. He said that he has not seen the revised plans. He asked how far the area of parking spaces 30, 29, 28, 27 will be from the property line. He asked if the grade will stay the same. Mr. Federico said that the new parking will be a little higher than the existing lot. He said that the elevation of the existing parking is 107 and the

new lot will be 109, or two feet higher. Mr. Miller said that there is a driveway that goes uphill parallel to parking spaces and there will be an approximately 42 inch difference in height from the corner of the parking space. Mr. Federico said that they are not proposing to change the grade very much. He said that there will be retaining wall that will make up the vertical difference between the existing and proposed grades. He said that the concrete retaining wall will be one foot thick and four feet tall from proposed finished grade. Mr. Miller said that there is no guardrail. He said that the existing guardrail stops at the boundary stone. Mr. Federico said that revised plans can show the grades to the driveway. Mr. Miller said that it could be a very hazardous condition there in the winter if it is icy.

Mr. Miller asked about the location of the light pole. Mr. Federico said that the light pole will be brought 3.5 feet further away from the driveway and closer to the parking spaces.

Mr. Miller asked what will happen to the porous pavement when the ground is frozen underneath. Mr. Becker said that the water does not go into the ground directly. He said that there is a layer of crushed stone that has a specified number of voids and the water fills into the voids and infiltrates into the soil over time. Mr. Federico said that they have proposed 24 inches of recharge reservoir, which has been sized to retain and hold up to 100 year storm events.

Mr. Sheffield asked about water freezing in the porous pavement. Mr. Federico said that he will look into that. He said that he will follow up with the porous pavement contractor and a professional engineer.

Mr. Miller asked about illumination of the parking lot at night. Mr. Sheffield said that the Board will not allow the lighting to stay on all night. Mr. Adams said that lighting is typically limited to business hours.

Mr. Miller asked if the area parallel to Worcester Street that is labeled "Proposed Landscaping Area" is State property. Mr. Federico said that it is located in the right of way. He said that, as part of the project, they are making arrangements with the State. He said that area was taken by eminent domain. Mr. Adams said that the State will have to approve any of the work there.

Brita Heimark, 24 Burke Lane, said that asked about circulation of traffic coming off of the on ramp from Worcester Street. She said that she did not see any arrows for circulation there. Mr. Becker said that that Board asked for signs or pavement markings to direct traffic. Ms. Heimark that plans shows all traffic exiting onto Burke Lane. Mr. Sheffield said that they can go back through the lot where it is two-way to get back onto Worcester Street. Ms. Heimark said that it is important to indicate that exiting onto Route 9 is possible, otherwise it looks like all of the traffic will go out onto Burke Lane. She said that the on ramp to Route 9 is already fast moving and busy where accidents have occurred. She questioned how traffic will work if people parking in the 85 spaces at the back choose to exit onto Burke Lane. She said that Burke Lane is a tiny road that has a ditch on the side. She said that the Developer purchased the land next door at 3 Burke Lane. She said that between 3 and 7 Burke Lane, there will be a lot of traffic coming out onto Burke Lane, which is a very small street that ends up on the on ramp to Route 9. Mr. Federico said that a traffic study was done for the project at 3 Burke Lane. Ms. Heimark said that adding parking for the two projects together yields approximately 100 parking spaces. She said that the vehicles will all come out onto a very small area of the street that either goes down a curved road where there are no sidewalks or onto the on ramp to Route 9. She said that the amount of traffic should be taken into consideration. She said that it would not be convenient for traffic to go all the way around the buildings to access the on ramp to Route 9. Mr. Becker said that is the better way to access Route 9 West. He said that there is a traffic study that the Board will review. He said that the proposal before the Board is not for a change of use. He said that it will be a repaving of the parking lot, so there will be no additional traffic beyond what the building is allowed. Ms.

Heimark said that the way that it is now there is no way that 80 people can park there. She said that this plan encourages 80 people to park there. She said that currently there are 10 people parking in front of the Wok. Mr. Becker said that they are trying to comply with the bylaw for the building that they have. Ms. Heimark said that she understands that the owner wants to have parking for the building but it needs to be figured out how that many cars will come out to that difficult zone.

Ms. Heimark asked about moving the left hand turn up to the exit so that you could legally turn left so that traffic could be removed from Burke Lane. Mr. Becker said that is not an issue that the Board has jurisdiction over. He said that is under the control of MA DOT. Mr. Adams said that the Board should consider whether there should be an allowable right hand turn onto Burke Lane.

Mr. Miller said that the entrance onto Route 9 from 170 to 184 Worcester Street does not allow a left turn.

Mr. Adams said that the Board needs to see a detailed set of plans that address all of the issues that were raised.

Mr. Adams moved, Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing to June 6, 2019.

ZBA 2019-49 TOWN OF WELLESLEY SCHOOL DEPARTMENT, 405 SCHOOL STREET (Sprague Field)

Present at the public hearing was Dave Hickey, Town Engineer.

Mr. Hickey said that the project involves tennis court reconstruction on Sprague Field. He said that DPW has done a few rounds of repairs. He said that issues with the paving continue to be problematic. He said that at some point the Middle School stopped using the courts. He said that they were able to get Community Preservation Committee (CPC) funds for the project approved at town meeting. He said that they worked closely with the Schools and they are supportive of this project.

Mr. Hickey said that they met with the Design Review Board (DRB) and went over issues that resulted in small changes relating to accessibility of the path as well as a little bit of bolstering of the landscape plan.

Mr. Hickey said that the project is to totally reclaim the existing courts, pulverize the pavement, re-compact and build a new base, put in two new layers of pavement, new paint, new fencing, and all of the pieces that go with tennis play. He said that the project will reorient the courts to as close as they can get to an east-west alignment to minimize sun interference. He said that the courts will be a little longer and more narrow. He said that they will have to remove a concrete block shed that is used for storage for the Middle School. He said that the proposal is to replace that with a container, which is what they have been doing there more frequently. He said that temporary, portable containers seems to make sense. He said that they are coordinating that with the Schools.

Mr. Hickey said that there is an existing buffer between the Sprague Complex and Highland, going toward Linden Street. He said that they will hold that corner and push things into Sprague. He said that there were some comments about buffering to the west.

Mr. Hickey said that there is a catch basin that is not too far away and is adequate to handle the flow. He said that because it will be clean water, they can put trench drains on each side to keep the base well drained,

to catch the storm water and run it through infiltrations. He said that they will be able to capture all small storms and take some burden off the stormwater systems downstream. He said that it will improve the quality of the water. He said that the submittal included the water testing, which substantiates the design.

Mr. Hickey said that there will be a lot going on at Sprague Field this year. He said that they are queuing up the turf field replacement piece to begin in June and be done in early August. He said that the projects may overlap. He said that they would like to get this project started at the beginning of August and expect that it will involve six to eight weeks of construction. He said that if it extends into the school year, they will coordinate with the school.

Mr. Sheffield said that on Sheet 4 of 9 there is a detail of a ball stop at either end of the courts and at the fence that divides the courts. He said that his experience working with colleges and universities on their tennis courts is that they usually do not have square corners. He said if any consideration was given to angling the four exterior corners of the fencing, which would relieve a little bit of the grading issue at the corner. Mr. Hickey said that all of the grading challenges were in the corners. He said that it seems like an easy thing for them to accomplish.

Mr. Sheffield discussed the door swings in the center fence. He said that door could be a danger to the players if it hangs out. He said that the doors should put in the corners. He said that the doors to enter the courts should swing out rather than in to prevent players on the courts running into the edge of a door if it was not closed. He said that there are a pair of double doors that separate the courts. Mr. Hickey said that the fence separating the courts will probably be locked because they will be used for maintenance work. Mr. Sheffield said that otherwise they may want to have the door in the far corners. He said that the door should swing out rather than into the courts.

Mr. Adams asked about regrading at the north corner. He confirmed that there will be no retaining walls there. Mr. Hickey said that there are no retaining walls proposed. He said that they looked at doing the sidewalk in different ways but did not like the idea of a wall beside the sidewalk or a small one beside the court. He said that, given the users here, it would be preferred to avoid walls.

Mr. Adams asked if the bituminous driveway will stay in its current location. Mr. Hickey said that it will.

Mr. Sheffield asked about seating areas external to the courts. Mr. Hickey said that there are no plans for that now but they put an area of extra bituminous at the main entrance for people to meet up. He said that they spoke with the Park Division about benches. He said that they did not include benches in the contract plans. He said that if there is a call for a bench in the future, DPW can purchase and install it at a later date in a location that is determined to be best. He said that they are willing to accept a condition regarding a bench.

Mr. Sheffield asked if the Town uses standard benches. Mr. Hickey said that the Town does for passive recreation. He said that there is a little mix of what they have used
Can purchase bench instead of contractor – see what the need is

Mr. Sheffield asked about drainage on the courts. Mr. Hickey said that the courts are moderately pitched, going on a plane from one end to the other, not in all directions. He said that it follows the land that is up there. Mr. Sheffield said that there are no catchments within the playing surface. Mr. Hickey said that there is a cut off trench at the end with a perforated underdrain that goes to the drainage system.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the process for cutting and patching to make all of the same surface again. Mr. Hickey said that they will be remixing what was once the foundation for the tennis courts. He said that they should be able to get it even denser than it is. He said that they will also be going into an area that used to be loam. He said that it is important that they excavate that down to a good gravel base underneath. He said that there will be some surplus because the court area going in the easterly direction will be reclaimed and brought in. He said that they expect to bring in 160 yards of import. He said that there will be loam coming out and gravel going in that may be remixed. Mr. Sheffield confirmed that the tennis court surface will not be cut and patch.

Mr. Adams confirmed that there will be no lighting.

Mr. Becker said that the submittal package was very complete. He said that in the project overview and one other place it noted that there is an Activity and Use Limitation (AUL). He said that the project documents state that this project will be outside of the AUL. He said that they will be breaking up pavement, so there will be vibrations. He said that there will be heavy vehicles coming in. He asked about considerations to decide that this project will have no impact on the AUL. Mr. Hickey said that they reviewed the AUL early in the project. He said that the AUL is eight to ten years old. He said that they reviewed the testing with that and the documents that guide what can and cannot be done. He said that the AUL has mixed trash under it. He said that there are no stipulations on the AUL now that say that is at a risk when you are near it or causing work above it or vibrating it. He said that for them it was a matter of reviewing it and making sure that the work is outside of the AUL. He said that if it was inside the AUL, it would have to be done under the guidance of a licensed professional.

Mr. Becker said that the question on pile driving in the Development Prospectus was answered affirmatively. He confirmed that action will not be taking place.

Mr. Becker said that there is an inconsistency in the submittal about increase in impervious surface. He said that the overview talks about a 498 square foot increase. Mr. Hickey said that there may have been versions of the plans that got them to no net increase but those plans were not updated.

Mr. Adams asked if the plane of the courts will slope towards the recharge area. Mr. Hickey said that the plane will go the other way toward Linden Street. He said that it will be very flat. He said that there will be trench drains on both sides. He said that the trench drain on the uphill side is there to pick up any groundwater or anything that might be detrimental to the subsurface. He said that they will pitch back and reverse direction. He said that it will not be very deep because the tennis court is fairly flat.

Mr. Sheffield said that the Design Review Board (DRB) suggested some additional white spruce. Mr. Hickey said that the original plan had six proposed trees. He said that two small trees have to come down. He said that the plans that were submitted to the Board should show 11 trees, which was in response to what the DRB proposed. He said that Cricket Vlass had some follow up discussions with staff at the Planning Board about species. Mr. Becker said that the plans show five junipers to screen 11 Oak Street. Mr. Hickey said that the change in species had to do with concerns about what would grow best there. He said that he was pretty sure that the message got back to the Planning Board and they were okay with it.

Mr. Becker read the Planning Board recommendation.

Mr. Adams moved, Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, and the Board voted unanimously to grant Site Plan Approval, subject to compliance with the recommendations of the DRB.

As there was no further business to come before the Board, the hearing was adjourned at 9:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lenore R. Mahoney
Executive Secretary

DRAFT