

Wakefield Conservation Commission – Minutes – February 24, 2022

Wakefield Conservation Commission (Commission) – Minutes – February 24, 2022

Attendance: Chairman Jim Luciani, Vice Chairman Bob Romano; Ken Alepidis, Peter Miller; Teresa Belmonte; Silvana Bouhlal

Absent: Frank Calandra

Rebecca Davis, Judy Green

1/27/22 open session minutes – Ms. Bouhlal made a motion to approve the 1/27/22 open session minutes.

Mr. Luciani made a second to the motion. After polling the Commissioners individually, the motion passed unanimously. (Ms. Belmonte was not present for the vote.)

1/27/22 executive session minutes – Mr. Alepidis made a motion to approve the 1/27/22 executive session minutes.

Ms. Bouhlal made a second to the motion. After polling the Commissioners individually, the motion passed unanimously. (Ms. Belmonte was not present for the vote.)

2/10/22 minutes – Mr. Luciani made a motion to approve the 2/10/22 minutes.

Ms. Bouhlal made a second to the motion. After polling the Commissioners individually, the motion passed unanimously.

DEP#313-613 – 2 Clyde Court – Notice of Intent – John Cullen – continued public hearing – Paul Finocchio of PJF Associates was present for the applicant. A revised site plan was submitted for review this evening. The following changes have been made:

- 8' at the rear of the house will be a grassed area.
- Proposed plantings have been noted on the revised plan. Planting locations will be submitted prior to the next meeting.
- The planting area will be extended beyond the 25' buffer.
- New hay bale line and proposed fence have been located.
- The marking posts will be either metal or granite.
- The deck will not be changed as it is needed as a second means of egress.
- The deed restriction will be reviewed and approved by the Conservation Agent. No access will be allowed in that area. It will also state that the fence cannot be removed.

Ms. Belmonte felt that the Commission should not vote on issuance of an Order of Conditions until the next meeting. This will allow time for submission of outstanding items.

This matter was continued to 3/10/22.

138 Salem Street – tree removal request – Matt Callahan, homeowner was present. He stated that he was attempting to convert this home into condominiums. He noted that his neighbors had verbally consented to the tree removals.

Mr. Luciani noted that the trees appear to be healthy.

Ms. Bouhlal asked how many would be removed.

Mr. Callahan stated that he was not sure, possibly 10-12 mature oaks.

Ms. Vreeland stated that most of these trees are within the riverfront.

Mr. Luciani asked why he proposed removal of trees at greater distance from the house.

Mr. Callahan stated that it was because the representative from Keith's Tree Service informed him that he could remove as many trees as he'd like as they would be there for the entire day. He added that he would like to remove the trees closest to the house.

Mr. Luciani stated that he did not have an issue with removal of trees close to the house.

Mr. Romano also asked about removal of trees furthest from the house.

Mr. Callahan stated that he would like to remove them as well.

Ms. Vreeland stated that she had conducted a site visit and observed that they were all mature oaks with healthy canopies. With the exception of the tree at the front of the home, they all appear healthy.

Mr. Callahan stated that he would be willing to plant small trees that he could prune.

Ms. Vreeland would like to deter from the Tree Removal Policy to allow the homeowner to obtain a letter from an arborist to determine which trees pose a hazard. She noted that if all trees within even a chance of striking the house are removed, the entire lot would be clear cut.

Mr. Callahan felt that this request was a conflict of interest as the arborist works for the tree removal company. He will however request a written evaluation.

DEP#313-608 – 200-400 Quannapowitt Parkway – CCF Quannapowitt Parkway Co LLC – continued public hearing: Notice of Intent – Mr. Alepidis recused himself from this matter. Mitch Maslanka and Scott Goddard of Goddard Associates, Nick Dellacava from Allen & Major and Matt D'Amico from CC&F were present for the applicant. Matt Burne, the Commission's peer reviewer from BSC Associates was also present. A revised plan was submitted for review this evening.

Mr. Dellavaca stated that changes were made to the storm water system in response to peer review comments. Wet basins have been removed from the buffer. Six forebays will now be placed in the buffer at the lowest points along Quannapowitt Parkway. He stated that they are limited as to runoff treatment options. No changes are proposed for the interior of the parkway. Also provided were photographs of other projects undertaken by Allen & Major showing similar best management practices.

Mr. Luciani asked how the bioretention systems work.

Mr. Dellacava stated that the surface areas sheet flow to the bioretention areas. Water will then infiltrate into the ground. During large storm events they will overflow back into the chambers.

Mr. Romano asked how roof runoff would be captured.

Mr. Dellacava stated that it would be directed from the drains to the individual chamber systems.

Mr. Luciani asked if they anticipate water being held in the bottom of the basins.

Mr. Dellavaca stated that they should remain dry. They will be constructed with a layer of sand atop the soil.

Mr. Luciani asked for specifics regarding the wetland seed mix, specifically whether yearly re-planting would be needed.

Mr. Maslanka stated that plantings would be added in the re-seeding areas in addition to the wetland mix. These plantings are proposed throughout Quannapowitt Parkway along the wetland side. He did not feel that re-planting would be necessary.

Mr. Goddard stated that in the area to be left in a natural state, the herbaceous cover would occur within one growing season.

Mr. Burne suggested that the Commission require monitoring for invasives in these areas longer than the two years that are proposed.

Mr. Goddard stated that these areas would be monitored only until receipt of a Certificate of Compliance.

Mr. Luciani stated that these areas should be monitored for three growing seasons.

Mr. Goddard agreed to three-year monitoring.

Mr. Burne asked what the long-term plan was for maintaining plants in the basins and landscaped areas.

Mr. Goddard stated that this is covered in the landscaping plan.

Ms. Vreeland stated that following review of the Town assessor's mapping, it appears that the applicant actually owns land on the other side of the stream.

Mr. Dellacava stated that this was incorrect. That area is owned by 100 Quannapowitt Parkway. A copy of the applicant's deed will be provided.

Mr. Luciani asked how they arrived at the pollutant load removal number.

Mr. Dellacava reviewed the provided table outlining the methodology.

Mr. Luciani asked how important the plant value was to this outcome.

Mr. Dellacava stated that as long as they are designed according to the storm water handbook, they are assumed to be effective.

Mr. Luciani asked if density of plant spacing played a role in effectiveness.

Mr. Dellacava stated that this would be detailed in the landscape plan. The landscape architect would take that into account.

Mr. Luciani expressed concern regarding plant die-off and its effect on pollutant removal. He asked how they would insure that this would not happen.

Mr. Dellacava stated that this could be added as a special condition. He noted that this would be a “high end” development. He felt that the occupants would demand upkeep.

Mr. Burne submitted a review letter today outlining three main points for review:

1. Tree removal policy needs to be met.
2. Review of work in the riverfront.
3. Review of work in the buffer zone.

He noted that although the applicant has adjusted the plan, he continues to disagree regarding regulatory criteria. Regarding the \$1.3 million commitment to Main Street corridor/Clean Lake Program, Mr. Burne suggested that the Commission be provided with a clear outline and timeframe in the Order of Conditions specifying terms for fulfillment.

Ms. Belmonte asked if this proposal was in writing as the Commission had not been apprised of it.

Mr. Dellacava stated that the applicants entered into a legally binding agreement with citizens group Friends of Lake Quannapowitt, (FOLQ), not the Town itself. He will forward this agreement to the Commission for review.

Mr. Luciani asked why this agreement was not made instead with the Town.

Mr. Dellacava stated that FOLQ is an important constituency.

Mr. Burne felt like this is a good opportunity to provide real stream improvements and ecological restoration. He added that work in the buffer zone could’ve been an opportunity to remove the parkway from the buffer. He questioned if the wetland is better protected by placing storm water management in the buffer in order to treat runoff from Quannapowitt Parkway.

Mr. Dellacava stated that the applicant is one of three property owners along the parkway. Reconfiguration of the roadway cannot be undertaken by them alone.

Mr. Romano expressed concern for the effect the increased traffic would have on the parkway. He felt that treating the sediment would be beneficial.

Ms. Belmonte asked if the proposed scaled-back treatment version is sufficient.

Mr. Dellacava stated that the forebays would only provide sediment removal. The wet basins were to provide a decrease in nutrient load. He noted that the revised option would maintain 85% nutrient load removal as required by the Town Engineer.

Ms. Belmonte asked for the applicant's response to Mr. Burne's comments.

Regarding stream clean up, Mr. Dellacava stated that they could clean up existing conditions which would result in a substantial improvement. He added that they would also be able to make progress on all three points.

Mr. Goddard stated that there are no changes proposed for the riverfront. He added that he does not feel that Mr. Burne's other two comments require a response. Further comment would not be forthcoming.

Ms. Belmonte would like to see a longer monitoring schedule for the plantings. She also asked if there would be ecological restoration as suggested.

Mr. Goddard contended that this was achieved under the current proposal. No further changes will be made.

Mr. Burne suggested improvements to the stream channel.

Mr. Goddard stated that he has spent hours reviewing this issue. He has concluded that the main problem is the diversion canal on the other side of the highway. He felt that the outflow boards do not allow proper flow. In addition, the catch basins along the highway are not maintained by Mass. Highway. He does not believe that improvements on this project are warranted. He felt that the Town, FOLQ and the Town of Reading need to collaborate on a solution.

Ms. Belmonte stated that she would like to wait to close the hearing until after the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) has finalized their decision.

Mr. Dellacava stated that the plans currently before the Commission coordinate with the ZBA's plans.

Mr. Luciani felt that the details of the applicant's agreement with FOLQ should be included in the Order of Conditions.

Ms. Vreeland expressed concern with snow removal. She noted that removal of snow off-site following large storm events tends to be problematic and not readily adhered to. Snow tends to

be piled wherever there is room until removal several days later. She asked how the applicants would enforce.

Mr. Dellacava stated that as these would be “high end” owners, they would not tolerate large mounds of snow.

Ms. Vreeland is concerned that snow will be pushed into the buffer zone. She noted that contractors are not always the same and are therefore unaware of standards.

Mr. D’Amico stated that they would employ one contractor who would be accountable to these requirements.

Mr. Miller asked if there was any discussion regarding potential noise mitigation due to the proximity to Route 128.

Mr. D’Amico stated that there was nothing proposed. He added that this would be handled through the design of the building.

Ms. Vreeland noted that the Town Engineer has not issued a final sign-off. This is required prior to closing the hearing.

Dennis Cloherty – Harvest Lane – suggested a condition that the Walkers Brook dam be removed. He felt that this would be a once in a lifetime opportunity.

Mr. D’Amico stated that the majority of the stream is owned by 100 Quannapowitt. He added that they would be willing to remove the sediment in the culvert.

Mr. Goddard did not feel that this would make any difference. He does not think this requirement should be part of this project.

This matter was continued to 3/10/22.

DEP#313-602 – 237 Water Street – Notice of Intent – continued public hearing – this matter was continued to 3/10/22 at the applicant’s request.

94 Butler Avenue- this matter was continued to 3/10/22.

New Salem Street culvert- this matter was continued to 3/10/22.

Stream setback bylaw letter- The Commission was asked by the Planning Board for comment on the zoning bylaw regarding a 50’ stream setback. It was decided that although the bylaw defers to the Commission for a determination on an embankment, this cannot be provided as it is not within their purview under the Wetlands Protection Act.

Ms. Belmonte made a motion to approve issuance of the letter.

Mr. Alepidis made a second to the motion. After polling the Commissioners individually, the motion passed unanimously.

DEP#313-452 – 134 Greenwood Street – Request for Certificate of Compliance – Ms. Vreeland conducted a site visit. As-built conditions complied with the proposed plan.

Mr. Luciani made a motion to issue a Certificate of Compliance.

Mr. Alepidis made a second to the motion. After polling the Commissioners individually, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Miller made a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Bouhlal made a second to the motion. After polling the Commissioners individually, the motion passed unanimously.