Town of Norfolk
Zoning Board of Appeals
One Liberty Lane
Norfolk, MA 02056

May 30, 2018

Zoning Board Members	Others
Chris Wider – Chairman ---------- Present	Devin Howe - Associate Member --------- Present
Michael Kulesza – Vice Chairman --- Present	Medora Champagne – Assoc. Member --- Present
Donald Hanssen – Clerk ---------- Present	Amy Brady – Administrative Asst. - ------ Present
Joseph Sebastiano –Clerk ---------- Present	Atty. Dan Hill
Robert Luciano – Full Member ------- Present	

The duly posted meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals convened at 7:00 P.M. in Room 124 of the Norfolk Town Hall.

APPOINTMENT

Bisher Hashem, developer for 84 Cleveland Street, to discuss construction request – Mr. Hashem passed out a diagram showing blasting that was done, down to 20' deep; elevations are at 112', 102' and 93'. Mr. Hashem is concerned about stability, and would like permission to pour all 32 foundations to stabilize the project. He said it is also better to have all of the utility work done before some units are finished, and people start moving in while all that construction is going on. Although foundation work may pause while blacktopping is done, no one will move in before all 32 foundations are poured. This would not be allowed per the current bylaw, but Mr. Hashem spoke with Bob Bullock, Zoning Enforcement Officer, who believes this is a good solution in this case, and suggested that Mr. Hashem speak to the Zoning Board. All blasting has been done at this point. Mr. Kulesza stated that he believes this is a reasonable request for a development of this size, though maybe not for a large one. Water is done, drainage is done, drainage ponds are done and seeded, and stone retaining walls are being built; only sewer and paving remain. In accordance with the Comprehensive Permit, no house construction can be done before the road is paved and a bond is posted.

Mr. Kulesza made a motion *to make a minor modification of the Comprehensive Permit for 84 Cleveland Street, Lakeland Farms to allow for the construction of 32 foundations at one time; building permit issuance will be at the discretion of the Building Inspector.* ***Mr. Sebastiano seconded*** *the motion;* ***the vote*** *on the motion was unanimous.*

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Village Green – The Enclave – (hearing continued from 4/26/18)

Present were William McGrath, BETA Group, Inc.; Thomas DiPlacido, DiPlacido Development Corp., Project Manager; John Smolak, Attorney; Matt Mrva, Bohler Engineering; William Scully, Green International Affiliates, Inc.; Jason Plourde, BETA Group, Inc.; Glen Fontecchio, architect;

Plans and documents presented and referred to were a PowerPoint presentation by Matt Mrva of Bohler Engineering, entitled "The Enclave at Norfolk, Zoning Board of Appeals, May 30th, 2018."

Mr. Wider called the continued public hearing to order and recognized Atty. Smolak, who ran through the areas expected to be covered tonight. Mr. Plourde explained that the traffic engineers had been working back and forth, and were down to a few issues for which BETA was looking for more input: Saturday traffic data, width of the roadway, pedestrian walkways, sight distances, and the impacts at Cleveland Street and Rockwood Road. Non-age-restricted methodology showed exceedance of the 10 second standard at the intersection, which would

require mitigation, but age-restricted methodology resulted in only a 5 second delay; Mr. Plourde said that a monitoring study one year after buildout may be required. Atty. Hill asked Mr. Plourde to comment on his experience with the lengthy one way in/one way out layout; Mr. Plourde said that having the loops is better than just a straight-in/straight-out situation, but perhaps it could be widened at the mouth of the single access point.

Mr. Scully responded that they are still doing field work, looking at layout lines, sight distance, etc. Many factors depend on what the final project will be. Mr. Scully said that the access point had been changed to a "boulevard" type road, with a central median; he also mentioned that Village Green is a pre-existing road with one way in and one way out, and the proposed project is not as long as Village Green.

Mr. Mrva referred to the recent work session where various concepts were discussed, and a preferred concept was agreed upon. Mr. Mrva presented the new concept plan. The road has a loop, but no homes front on the loop. But rather it's green space for the leaching field, a gazebo, mailboxes, and some guest parking, which had been doubled to about 30. Alignment on the front, north side of the development was kept intact, as much effort had been put in to reach agreement with abutters. The new main roads are 24' wide, with 4 "driveways" into "clusters" that are 18' wide. One story units were used at the perimeter of the project, and two story units toward the back. A portion of a plan from the Village at River's Edge (VRE) was shown for comparison of density. The linear detention area has been consolidated, and the green extended. Interior sidewalks have not been designed for this concept yet.

Mr. Kulesza expressed disappointment with the new plan; road widths, accessibility, walkability. Mr. DiPlacido expressed his understanding that favorable remarks regarding the VRE had been made by the Board members at the last meeting, and the aim of this plan was to make it look similar; he made comparison with Village at River's Edge as far as road and driveway widths, front, side and rear setbacks, etc., and said that 18' driveways were within the Planning Board Rules and Regs; if the goal is to reduce the number of units, then they will have to go back and look at doing that. He mentioned options such as tri- and quadplexes, two story vs. one story.

Mr. Kulesza said he is comparing it to the other 40Bs that have been done in town, and this one is higher density; he also feels that the separate "clusters" are not appealing. Atty. Smolak emphasized that the layout is very similar to VRE, which was approved under MGL 40A; and his understanding that the concern was more of the linear look, which they have redesigned to have more visual interest. Mr. Fontecchio said he was not present at the meeting prior to the work session, and his impression was that the point was to reduce the look and feel of high density, and not necessarily to reduce the number of units. In that respect, he felt the linear look had been reduced, but perhaps there was more opportunity for re-orienting for better appeal; garage doors not facing the roadway is an improvement; he would want to be sure fire trucks can navigate the small loop, and was not satisfied with the location of visitor parking. He felt that traffic flow was improved over the previous plan, but eliminating a couple of units would allow the roads to be stretched out and could further improve traffic flow.

Mr. Kulesza said that he is looking to get to 40 units in 20 buildings. Mr. DiPlacido said unit count alone can be deceiving; square footage of each building would make a big difference, as would tri- and quadplexes, which he would not want to do. If the number of units were drastically reduced, perhaps a non-age-restricted development would work. The age-restricted concept was offered in order to reduce school age children, minimize increased traffic, and to offer one-level downsizing opportunities for current Norfolk residents. At this point, Mr. DiPlacido said he would need more direction on which way the Board wanted to go.

Mr. Fontecchio said the 18' driveways proposed for this project are more navigable than the 18' driveways at VRE. Atty. Hill warned against comparing projects too much, as circumstances and conditions to the previous project are not known to this group at this time. Atty. Smolak disagreed, stating that it is appropriate to look at other development patterns in town, and that is a goal of DCHD with 40B projects.

In response to a question from Mr. Luciano, Mr. Mrva outlined the conservation buffer zones, and said that the Conservation Restriction being offered must meet a certain minimum number of acres in any future iterations of the development plan. Mr. Wider referred to the Davis Square review proposed by Atty. Hill, and suggested another working session including them; he also suggested a site walk. Mr. Luciano suggested also driving through VRE to get a feel for the layout. Mr. Mrva said that in the next couple of weeks, they could mark out a centerline to give orientation when walking around the site, prior to a meeting between the site architects. Mr.

Kulesza restated that he is not in favor of this iteration. Mr. DiPlacido said he will have to check in with the owner, Samuel Mermelstein of Norfolk Holdings,` to see if the $195/hr for Davis Square is acceptable. Mr. DiPlacido suggested that perhaps it would be better to wait until a concept is approved before marking the property for a site walk, and there was general agreement to wait.

Mr. Sebastiano made a motion to hire Davis Square Architects to review the design layout for The Enclave; Mr. Luciano seconded the Motion; the vote on the motion was unanimous.

Details of the scope for Davis Square were discussed: $195/hr to review, attend work session, write review letter, attend ZBA meeting. Total is expected to be in the $5,000.00 vicinity. Mr. Howe noted the main road upon entering the development still has a very linear aspect to it, and requested that the consultant address that.

Mr. Kulesza made a motion to continue *the public hearing for The Enclave to Thursday, July 12, 2018, at 7:00 P.M.in Room 124 of the Norfolk Town Hall;* ***Mr. Sebastiano seconded*** *the motion;* ***the vote on the motion*** *was unanimous.*

Mr. Wider next presented wooden bowls made by a gentleman on Lake Street from locally sourced materials, to thank the Board for their efforts over the last year.

Mr. Hanssen asked if Board members needed to do anything with legal papers served on them, other than informing Town Counsel. There is a form to fill out and return stating that you received them, but otherwise, just inform Town Counsel.

Mr. Sebastiano made a motion to adjourn *the meeting;* ***Mr. Kulesza seconded*** *the motion;* ***the vote*** *on the motion was unanimous.*

The meeting was adjourned *at 8:45 P.M*

Mr. Joseph Sebastiano, Clerk

In accordance with the requirements of G.L. 30 § 22, approval of these minutes by the Board constitutes its certification of the date, time and place of the meeting, the members present and absent, the matters discussed, and the action taken by the Board with regard to those matters (if any). Any other information contained in these minutes is included for context only. Notes memorializing deliberation or discussion of any matter are in the summary form and may include inaccuracies or omissions. Where proof of the content of a statement is required, a tape recording or transcript should be consulted, if available.