

Town of Norwell
BOARD OF APPEALS
Public Hearing Minutes
15 High Street
August 4, 2021

TOWN OF NORWELL
TOWN CLERK
2021 AUG 19 AM 11:54
RECEIVED

MEETING DATE:	Wednesday, August 4, 2021
TIME SCHEDULED:	7:00 P.M.
LOCATION:	Osborn Room at Norwell Town Hall, telecast via Harbor Media with Zoom option
PANEL MEMBERS:	Lois S. Barbour, Chair William J. Lazzaro Stephen H. Lynch
OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT	Ralph J. Rivkind, Clerk Nicholas K. Dean
MEMBERS ABSENT	Philip Y. Brown, Vice Chair Daniel M. Senteno
On behalf of the Board of Appeals	R. W. Galvin, Town Counsel John C. Chessia, P.E., of Chessia Consulting John G. Morgan Jr., PE, PTOE, of CHA
15 High Street 40B Representatives	Peter Crabtree, Senior Vice President of Northland Steve Gallagher, Development Manager of Northland Deborah W. Keller, P.E., Senior Project Manager of Merrill Engineering

CALL TO ORDER: The public notice for the continued public hearing of the 15 High Street Comprehensive Permit application was read at 7:30 PM with introduction of the panel, including Members Barbour, Lazzaro, and Lynch; Town Counsel R. W. Galvin; Peer Review consultant for civil engineering, John C. Chessia, P.E., of Chessia Consulting Services; and John G. Morgan, Jr., PE, PTOE, Peer Review consultant for traffic. Member Barbour previewed an outline of the evening's discussion, copies of which were also made available to attendees.

Architectural review discussion

- Street view concerns on the Wellesley project; fit on site
- Southern boundary of project
- Aesthetics, massing, and layout
- Cliff Boehmer scope of services \$10-16K
- Member Lazzaro in favor of review
- Member Lynch volunteered to work with Town Counsel and Applicant
- Upon a motion duly made and seconded, Members Lazzaro, Lynch and Barbour were individually polled and **VOTED** unanimously to authorize

Easement discussion

- 1987 plan
- 1961 plan found by the Applicant might be an easement
- Applicant believes screening can be installed if pipe is not disturbed
- Chair asked if this means the ZBA has more flexibility to allow screening
- Town Counsel concurred (51:52)

- Member Rivkind asked about a Title Search, which has been provided

Chair Barbour then turned the meeting over to the Applicant, which began with project team introductions, including Messrs. Crabtree and Gallagher, and Project Engineer Keller.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION: Senior Project Manager Deb Keller of Merrill Engineers and Land Surveyors discussed the Applicant's third PowerPoint presentation available at the ZBA's webpages specific to this application. Highlights of that presentation included:

Deb Keller presented slides showing

1. Project property and surrounding area
2. Existing Conditions with various zoning districts, including Residential B, District C-1, and majority Business B-4; slopes from northerly end to south/southwest corner; on-site soil testing by certified soil evaluator and witnessed by agent for the Board of Health
3. Overall Site Plan – Proposed: 10 residential buildings with 56 units; maintain side and rear setbacks of 20' with 15' on High Street; building coverage 23% with overall impervious 54% and almost 46% open/green space
4. Site Layout Plan: two main entrances with looped driveway access to all structures; 122 parking spaces including garage space and one in driveway with additional 18 spaces
5. Grading and Stormwater – Overview: comply with DEP Stormwater Rules and Regulations; closed drainage system, collecting street and driveway into catch-basin manhole pipe system and into pre-treatment structure and larger infiltration chamber system subsurface; treatment prior to infiltration; isolator row; meets water-quality treatment for DEP and Town regulations
6. Utility-Plan Overview: on-site septic system in closed drainage system; water; gas; electric; will be addressing peer review comments
7. Site Overall Cut and Fill: topography leveling and small area of fill; cut of 6,352 CY with 668 CY fill
8. Vehicle Turning Movements: discussion with Fire Chief on 3/9/21

Member Lynch asked about hydrant locations that must be approved by the Fire Chief.

TOWN PEER REVIEW CONSULTANT PRESENTATIONS:

Civil Engineering Peer Review by John C. Chessia, P.E. of Chessia Consulting Services

Comment letter, dated 7/12/21, highlights:

1. ANR plan should combine all lots
2. Landscaping plan fairly generic and screening should be reviewed by Board
3. Need plan showing abutting properties with drive-ways and houses, especially CVS
4. Grades and data beyond; contained sloping area
5. Tight site; SWPPP required; construction plan phasing; does it work;
6. Disruption during construction question how to handle
7. Smart Growth application?

RECEIVED

2021 AUG 19 AM 11:54

TOWN OF NORWELL
TOWN CLERK

8. Water pressure should be documented with adequate pressure and flow required
9. Septic sized just under treatment plant requirement; waivers requested that Board of Health should provide comments; Presby system; bedroom definition issue v. dens
10. Stormwater: soils are good for infiltration; most requirements followed, except recharge may be overestimated; roof runoff – how handled re: piping and pitch; must show that the plan is going to work; one catch basin may not be sufficient in certain area, so additional may be required
11. NPDES should be required before construction occurs
12. No storm sewer calculation to prove water is going to go where it's supposed to go and plan will work
13. Cable utilities: conduits; transformer positioning and how to fit? Designed by utility company; several transformers will likely be required and no space shown

Traffic Peer Review by John Morgan of CHA Consulting

Comment letter dated 7/26/21 to ZBA discussion

1. Applicant's report appears to be prepared in accordance with industry standards
2. Generally concurred with traffic volume
3. Crash analysis data questions
4. Sight distance questions; standards? Heights? Additional info requested
5. Capacity analysis; peak hour factors; requested to be checked
6. Comment 13 of memo: queues at intersection with difficulty turning left out of the site or not having a driveway closer to Washington Street; concern about collisions
7. Parking spaces: size 9x18 but 9x20 in code; aisle width of 20' but minimum 24' in code; minimal room between garage door and sidewalk; spaces exceed what is required with increase in impervious that may not be needed
8. Sight line easements? How to be maintained?
9. Emergency vehicle access template adequate and trash vehicles, as well?
10. Southern site crosswalk with two showing? Clarification needed
11. Stop sign size smaller than standard?
12. More crosswalk detail needed

BOARD COMMENTS/QUESTIONS:

Member Rivkind asked about School access questions not included in report; Member Barbour indicated that there are commonalities in 40Bs and that the Town's peer review consultants are reviewing and commenting on what has been submitted by the Applicant. Member Lazzaro is unclear about some of the information presented and what it means. Further discussion at next meeting on both traffic and engineering. Member Lynch is concerned about length of cars versus parking space allowed. Mr. Morgan responded that the size of the car is a concern as far as blocking the sidewalk. Member Barbour questions about traffic:

- Queuing issues and how many vehicles expected to go in each direction?
- Queuing issues from southbound traffic to High Street?

RECEIVED

2021 AUG 19 AM 11:55

TOWN OF NORWELL
TOWN CLERK

2021 AUG 18 AM 11:56

RECEIVED

- Conflicts with CVS not addressed?
- Thursday, 4/1/21, day before Good Friday that might skew data; also, COVID impacts on traffic? Factors adequate?
- School calendar data and coordination of data?
- Recent zoning changes that could impact traffic?
- 2010 Traffic Manual latest? When might next one be issued? Adequacy?
- Waivers about traffic need to be addressed
- Impervious surfaces increase by more spaces than required; Applicant should discuss how the number of parking spaces were arrived at
- Factors appear reasonable but Mr. Morgan suggests the Applicant should look at other traffic studies performed and historic data available within Rte. 53/Washington Street area

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

- Olivia Roberts of 105 High Street: total number of vehicles being accounted for including fire, EMT, ambulance in traffic study? What happens within the complex when there is a fire truck, emergency vehicle in there?
- Glenn Bernstein of 237 High Street: Most people drive large vehicles, including suburbans and SUVs; projected southbound traffic flows are not remotely realistic nor do they accommodate delays to merge into traffic safely at both ends of Oak or High St to the degree we experience as residents
- Matt Zayotti of 122 High Street: estimate of number of vehicular traffic as 35; how was that arrived at; reliability and validity? Response: Applicant's data; trip-generation data; not everyone leaves at the same time; not everyone is working; use of average rates; what is the total number of BR units including what are now being called dens? Capacity estimates includes those?
- Joy Lavery of 125 High Street: where are the school buses going to stop if they do? Where is a bus stop if kids are going to have one?
- David Hanley of 27 Millwood Circle: Applicant's data questions; construction activity and impact on area; construction heavy equipment, traffic; these projects require hundreds of loads of material and stock; this traffic will be an additional unplanned or projected burden on existing and projected local traffic flows for months from both Rtes. 228 and 53 – where will all that traffic be going and how will they move around inside the complex with the remainder of the existing traffic volumes without seriously impacting local flows and residents? Second point relates to the dust and noise that will be part of this work...this is a big project in a very small space with a lot going on around it already.
- Paul Savoy of 32 Ridge Hill Road: traffic backed up from Exit 13 to High Street recently; turning right out of project and he won't be able to get out of Ridge Hill Road; High Street area of town is taking it on the chin for development expansion
- Kevin Roberts of 105 High Street: only 25% counts for affordable? Response by ZBA is 100% for rental with 25% for homeownership

Prior to adjourning, Mr. Lynch recognized Zoom attendees and chat comments, recognizing difficulty of interaction but noted chat comments will be incorporated into the record for consideration.

Upon a motion duly made and seconded, Members Lazzaro, Lynch, and Barbour were individually polled and **VOTED** unanimously to continue the public hearing on the Comprehensive Permit application for the project known as **15 High Street** to 7:30 P.M. on September 9, 2021, at which time further traffic and engineering-related issues will be discussed.

Next Meeting and Topics: 9/9/21 at 7:30 P.M.: Further Traffic and Engineering discussion

Anticipated Future Meeting Topics:

September 28, 2021: Town comments and waivers?

October date TBD: Waivers and Conditions?

These minutes have been approved with reading of the minutes waived by unanimous vote of the Board of Appeals at a public meeting duly held on 8/18/21 in accordance with M.G.L. c40A, Section 11, and the Massachusetts Open Meeting Law.

Signed: _____


As Clerk/Assistant Clerk

Date: _____

8/19/21

Next scheduled public hearing on this project: TBD

RECEIVED
TOWN OF NORWELL
TOWN CLERK
2021 AUG 19 AM 11:55