Ms. Malcolm and Mr. Busby:

The Sherborn Board of Selectmen has received a copy of the application for Site Approval of 59 North Main Street Village submitted by Mr. Vin Gately. The Board of Selectmen supports development locations close to the Town Center, such as this site. However, the Board requests that MassHousing defer site approval until more information is provided as to the feasibility of this proposal at this density and location. There has also been a site walk attended by members of various Sherborn boards and commissions, and a discussion with Mr. Gately at a Board of Selectmen meeting. We have received comments on this project from relevant boards and commissions. Specifically, please see the attached documents from the Conservation Commission, Board of Health, and Fire & Police Departments. In addition, I am providing additional comments below that express concerns raised by members of the Sherborn Board of Selectmen and Planning Board:

1. The Planning Board commented on the site being well-located. There is, however, a concern about the market need for ownership units. The current 40B project, Whitney Farms has sold only a single house after several years of construction and marketing. The developer of 59 North Main is proposing pricing in the $900’s which is the price of a home at Whitney Farms. A lower market price would be preferred by the Planning Board members. Other concerns are screening, lighting, stone wall construction and a version of pedestrian paths and trails to the Town Forest land that abuts the property.

2. The Board of Health concerns center around the project’s water supply & wastewater management. Lack of information about the project size, septic location and public water supply possibilities are listed in their comments.

3. The Conservation Commission cites the incompleteness of the Preliminary Site Plan, stormwater management, and alterations to the wetland buffer zone and riverfront impacts.
4. Fire Department & Police Department concerns are over curb cuts, parking, unit separation, access for emergency vehicles, and fire protection, both for dry hydrant and residential systems.

5. Sherborn also has a scarcity of rental units in its housing inventory, and almost no rental apartments. According to the U.S. Census American Community Survey, between 2010 - 2014 there were only 167 renter-occupied units and the median rent was $2,000 per month. Most of these rentals were relatively short-term and almost all were for single family homes. Rental apartments would help diversify our housing stock to serve multiple generations and economic levels.

6. The Town has other general operational concerns such as the impact on local schools, traffic, infrastructure (roads, water, sewer), and demands on Fire Department and Police Department. The Town is prepared to work with the developer on identifying and estimating the fiscal impacts of such demands as the project develops.

7. Other concerns that have been expressed that will eventually need to be looked at further as the project review proceeds are concerns regarding project density, impact on wetlands, water quality, and other topographical limitations.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David R. Williams
Town Administrator
E: dwilliams@sherbornma.org
MEMO TO:  David Williams

FROM:  Gino D. Carlucci, Jr., Town Planner

DATE:  December 14, 2016

SUBJECT:  Comments on proposed 59 North Main Street 40B

At its meeting of December 6, 2016, the Planning Board agreed on the following comments on the proposed 12-unit 40B project by Vin Gately of 59 N. Main Street Village, Inc. and Heritage Properties:

1. The site is well-located, a short walk from the Town Center and there is an existing sidewalk in front of the property to provide pedestrian access to the Town Center.

2. The applicant proposes retaining tree significant trees on the property. The Planning Board supports protecting those trees.

3. There is concern about the market need for ownership units. A current 40B project in Sherborn (Whitney Farms) has sold only a single house after years of construction and marketing. The developer is proposing pricing in the $900's. A lower market rate price would be preferred.

4. While 2/3 of the units are proposed as 2 bedroom dwellings, the average size of nearly 2500 square feet size lends themselves to creating a third bedroom from the loft, study or walkout basement space. Therefore, the septic system should be designed to accommodate three bedrooms per unit.

5. The Planning Board supports the developer's effort to position the unit closest to the street on the south side of the project such that it faces the street and is of a design compatible with other houses in the neighborhood. However, the unit closest to the street on the north side should be similarly situated and designed. Along with landscaping to help screen the 10 units further back, such a design will soften the aesthetic impact of the project on the neighborhood.
6. The developer proposes to construct a stone wall along the frontage of the site. We encourage that stone wall to be a dry wall to be compatible with the historic stone walls along Sherborn's scenic roads.

7. The current plan indicates land to be conveyed to neighbors on both sides of the project. The Planning Board strongly supports this proposal that should also be accompanied by adequate screening for each.

8. No sidewalks are proposed. The Planning Board supports some version of pedestrian paths connecting the project to the sidewalk along the frontage. The Board also supports trails from the housing units to the Town Forest that abuts the project on its north side.

9. The Planning Board supports "Dark Sky" compliant lighting on the site. At a minimum, there should be no light trespass off the site.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Sherborn Board of Selectmen
FROM: Daryl Beardsley (Chair) on behalf of the Sherborn Board of Health
DATE: December 30, 2016
RE: Comments to Mass Housing on the Proposed 59 North Main Street Development

At its December 21, 2016 meeting, Sherborn’s Board of Health discussed information pertaining to the multi-unit 40B development project proposed for the property at 59 North Main Street in Sherborn, Massachusetts. A summary of the Board’s comments is presented below. The comments are largely based on review of the proposal to Mass Housing. Additionally, two Board of Health Members and one Health Agent attended the Mass Housing sponsored site walk that was conducted on December 5, 2016, at which the Members and Agent had the opportunity to share several of these comments with the project proponent.

1. Insufficient Information About Project Size and the Associated Provisions for Water Supply and Wastewater Management (i.e., Septic System)

The general and preliminary project information that has been provided thus far is not sufficient for even a preliminary evaluation of project viability with respect to issues that fall under the Board of Health’s jurisdiction. For example, the residential capacity of the project has not yet been precisely defined, which is important because the number of potential residents is key to sizing both water supply and wastewater systems. In addition to a lack of design information for these systems, they have not yet been included on the site plan. At a minimum, it must be demonstrated that the positioning of these systems meets state and local separation, set-back, and other spatial requirements, both within the confines of the site and relative to surrounding properties and features.

Granting a Site Approval before the rudimentary ability of the site to safely support the water and septic needs of the potential future residents has been assessed is not advised.

2. Acreage May Not Be Sufficient for MassDEP’s Title 5 Nitrogen Loading Standards

The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) has established limits on the volume of residential wastewater that can be discharged to the ground per acre. Preliminary estimates of the project’s wastewater design flows suggest that additional acreage will be needed. This issue has been discussed with the applicant.
3. No Subsurface Investigation in Area Anticipated for Septic System

Although not yet on the site plan, the applicant indicated during the site visit that the interior of the driveway circle might serve as the septic system’s effluent discharge location. Based on the Health Agent’s knowledge of soil testing that has occurred at the site, a subsurface investigation to determine the suitability of that location for a septic system has not yet been performed. The lack of soil information along with the missing information identified in [1.] above means that the basic feasibility of installing a properly functioning septic system is not known.

4. Preferred Operation of Water Supply under MassDEP’s Public Water Supply Regulation

The project is expected to be able to house at least 25 people, which is a size that ordinarily qualifies for regulation by MassDEP as a Public Water Supply (PWS). Due to the risks to drinking water posed by the density (volume-wise and in terms of total loadings of contaminants) of the project’s septic discharges, the Board of Health strongly recommends that the water supply be governed by MassDEP as a PWS because the testing regime associated with PWS regulations will help to identify water quality issues in a timely manner, thus offering a greater degree of health protection to the residents.

5. Healthy Community Features

The Board notes that pedestrian walkways are not planned for the project. Including features that promote safe and athletic travel options both on-site and to nearby off-site locations would be in keeping with healthy community principles and goals.

If the project eventually comes before the Board of Health, the water supply and septic systems will be examined in technical detail beyond that suggested for this preliminary evaluation. For example, the hydrogeological dynamics of groundwater withdrawals (for drinking water and other residential uses) and septic effluent discharges to the ground will need to be assessed to identify whether there are quantity and quality risks to the project’s own wells and/or to neighboring wells. Another reason for the heightened concern with this density of project, which is atypical for areas served by both on-site wells and on-site septic systems, is that the needed water yields and septage contaminant cleansing may exceed the natural capacities and thus not be sustainable.

Please be aware that there are no municipal water or sewer services to resort to if this project’s systems fail.
This memo contains comments from the Sherborn Conservation Commission regarding the recently proposed 59 North Main St., Sherborn MA 40B Development. The comments follow a review of the proposal to Mass Housing and the Mass Housing sponsored site walk that was conducted on December 5, 2016.

Issues and Concerns

- **Incompleteness of Preliminary Site Plan:** Given that the site plan lacks fundamental information regarding location of wells, stormwater system, and wastewater treatment (as well as type of wastewater treatment system), the Commission is greatly impeded in providing preliminary comments to allow Mass Housing to perform its “evaluation of the site, the design concept...and the appropriateness of the proposal in relation to local housing needs and strategies.” Because of this, the Commission recommends against providing Site Approval until such time as site plans with enough information to address the issues raised above are submitted.

- **Water Quality & Quantity/Pollution Prevention and Stormwater Management:** As per Sherborn Conservation Commission Policy, water quality and quantity is of particular importance due to Sherborn’s complete reliance on groundwater for its water supply. Residual stormwater contaminants may be problematic to nearby and planned on-site drinking water wells. Most wells in Sherborn are in bedrock and fed by fissures, some of which connect to overburden groundwater. Given the new onsite-generated contaminants, both from the new residences as well as the increased traffic along the private way, the Commission is concerned about stormwater management. On the preliminary site plan, there is no stormwater management depicted, therefore its location, size and other details must be articulated before review of the system’s adequacy can proceed. Stormwater infiltration and the employment of stormwater quality BMPs will need to be included to ensure their ability to uptake pollutants and limit the release of potential contaminants into surrounding resource areas and groundwater.

- **Wetland Resource Buffer Zone and Riverfront Impacts:** Based on the Preliminary Site Plan, there appear to be some additional alterations to the wetland buffer zone beyond already alternations grandfathered by past recent permits (as noted below). These
alterations may trigger adverse impacts to the adjacent wetlands. An assessment of the potential impacts is needed and will require full plans with all work in the buffer zone and possibly related stormwater and septic system work.

- **Local 50-foot No Alteration Zone (NAZ):** Sherborn has a 50-foot NAZ as part of its local wetlands regulations (Section 3.4 of the Sherborn Wetland Regulations). The current plan proposes work within the NAZ, including construction of wells and small portions of buildings. The plan submitted is not complete and does not show the full extent of work in the NAZ. The NAZ is of particular local interest to Sherborn because of its value to the wetlands and in turn the wetlands value to state law interests especially water quality and quantity, which are important due to, as noted, the town’s reliance on private water supplies.

- **Wetland Hydrology Impacts:** Water drawdown or other alterations in groundwater quality, quantity and/or flow direction will need to be assessed given the project’s proximity to resource areas. The Commission recommends that a groundwater study be conducted by the Applicant.

- **Septic/SAS Interaction with Wetland Resources:** The preliminary site plan does not show the location or type of septic SAS. Depending on the location and/or direction of groundwater flow, the potential for interaction between wastewater and the wetland resource area and possible adverse impacts will require review.

- **Wildlife Habitat and Riverfront Impacts:** Some disturbances, including new structures and therefore new impervious surface, are proposed within the Riverfront Area. Other associated appurtenances or landscape changes may also be under consideration within the Riverfront Area. These alterations may have adverse impact on the value of the Riverfront Area to function as a wildlife habitat corridor and should therefore be addressed and mitigated in the application.

**Permitting Issues**

- **Notice of Intent (NOI):** Due to the proposed project design including wetland-related impacts a NOI will be required. As part of the NOI, a Stormwater Review will be required to ensure that the proposed system meets the Massachusetts Stormwater Management Standards. Such a review will require a peer reviewer/engineer with the appropriate stormwater experience.

- **Certificate of Compliance (COC):** Two existing Orders of Conditions (OOCs) were issued for the property; DEP File Nos. 283-0363 and 283-0364. These OOCs should be closed out with receipt of COCs prior to filing a NOI for the development as proposed.

- **Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation (ANRAD):** An Order of Resource Area Delineation (ORAD) was issued confirming the wetland delineation on December 23, 2014, DEP File No. 283-0361. ANRAD’s are valid for a period of three years but may be extended by the issuing authority (Sherborn Conservation) for a period of one or more years for a period of up to three years, as stated in 310 CMR 10.05 (6)(a)3. (d). The applicant may choose to extend the ORAD prior to its expiration on December 23, 2017 to aid in final design.

- **An Application for an Administrative Approval (AA) or a Request for Determination:** May be required for any ground disturbance outside of the NOI scope, such as soil testing.
December 4, 2016

David Williams, Town Administrator  
Sherborn Town Offices  
19 Washington Street  
Sherborn, Ma  01770

Re:  59 North Main Street Village development

Dear David,

I have had a chance to review the initial plans shared for the development at 59 North Main Street. While we understand that this is the initial review, we wanted to proactively provide you with a list of fire protection concerns.

1)  Unit Separation and Access

Many of the planned buildings will have minimal separation and distance between them. This creates (2) significant fire protection issues. 1) It will allow a fire in one of the buildings to quickly spread to other buildings. 2) Access to the rear of the buildings will be limited and possibly blocked due to fire which may prevent us from getting critical firefighting equipment to the rear of the building to extinguish the fire.

The current plan only allows for access to 1 or 2 sides of the structures which creates a hazard in itself.

2)  Parking

On street parking could create significant access challenges for the fire department. The "on street" parking should be designed in a way that will not significantly impede fire department access. The information submitted in this proposal does not detail proposed parking, so a full evaluation was not completed.

3)  Cul-de- Sac Design

The cul-de-sac on the North end of the project appears to be oddly shaped and it will likely not provide adequate access for fire department apparatus. It may prevent us from properly accessing buildings (5, 6 7 &7) in the event of a fire. It may also cause other large vehicles to back out of the cul-de-sac and potentially on to North Main Street. This design will also make snow removal more difficult.
4) **Road Width**

We strongly recommend that the roads are designed to have an adequate width to accommodate resident parking and fire department access for fire suppression activities.

The town of Sherborn has a ladder truck. This truck is 8 ft wide and it has outriggers that extend out 4+ feet on each side of the vehicle. The total operating width of these trucks is 16 ft. If this is combined with an average mid-size car/ small SUV that is 6ft. wide and parked on the street then the combined width will be 22 ft. This does not take into consideration that neither vehicle will park exactly at the edge of the curb, and that road widths are reduced in the winter months due to snow.

5) **Water Source for fire protection**

We believe the applicant may be required to comply with the Planning Board Rules & Regulations 5.3.8 titled “Fire Protection”.

This will require the developer to install a water tank and corresponding dry hydrant for the purposes of fire protection.

6) **Residential Sprinkler System**

We strongly recommend that a residential sprinkler system be required for this development. We have identified access issues, and nominal unit separation concerns that will impact our ability to provide fire protection. We believe that the installation of a sprinkler system would significantly enhance the safety of the occupants and the improve the fire protection at this location.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Sincerely,

Neil W. McPherson
Acting Chief
December 12, 2016

David Williams, Town Administrator
Town of Sherborn
19 Washington Street
Sherborn, MA 01770

Re: 59 North Main Street development

Mr. Williams,

I have had a chance to review the development plans for 59 North Main Street and at this time have a few recommendations from a public safety point of view.

1) Curb Cut- Entrance and Exit to/from North Main Street

I would recommend that the line of sight be considered and tree/shrub planting, fencing or other structures not be permitted that will limit sightlines while residents are exiting the development onto North Main Street.

2) Parking

While the plan calls for 4 parking spaces per unit I would recommend that additional parking areas be added for times when residents have guests, contractors working or snow plowing.

I would suggest either an overflow lot be added or the road is built wide enough to allow parking around the inside of the circle while still not impeding the space needed for fire apparatus to respond as requested by Chief McPherson.
3) Elevator Safety

I would recommend units having the optional elevator should be required to have a phone jack installed for the purpose of calling 911 in case of an emergency. I did ask our Building Commissioner if this was a state requirement and he is researching it.

4) Unit Numbering

Although we already have a by-law in town requiring house numbering be displayed I would suggest with a cluster of housing like this we should make sure the numbering/lettering is large enough and prominently displayed for emergency responders.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.

David T. Bento
Lieutenant