



CONSERVATION COMMISSION joint PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES –June 6, 2022

Present: Crystal Kelly – Chair, Carolyn Nielsen -Vice Chair, Nina Villanova, and Bob Mosher - Commissioners, Emily Sullivan-Conservation Officer

Absent: Bob Hidell and Tom Roby

The remote meeting was held via Zoom with Dial in #929-205-6099, Meeting ID # 899 9736 0348 Passcode: 231134

The Conservation Commission joined the Planning Board meeting at 8:06 PM.

Planning Board members present: Chair Kevin Ellis, and Members Gordon Carr, Gary Tondorf-Dick, and Judith Sneath
Also Present: Emily Wentworth, Community Planning Director; Michael Silveira, Senior Planner; Susan Murphy, Town Counsel.

Meeting Documents & Exhibits: *Raymond Design Associates, Inc. Permitting Overview, dated May 31, 2021*

Planning Board Chair Ellis introduced the topic of the meeting, the Foster School Elementary project, and explained that the pre-application meeting had been requested by the applicant.

Linda Hill, Chair of the Foster School Building Committee (FSBC), gave a brief overview of the project, the condition of the existing school and reviewed the process to date. Susan Murphy, Town Counsel, clarified the Planning Board and Conservation Commission relative jurisdictions and scopes of review for the permitting process in this matter.

Gene Raymond, of Raymond Design Associates, Inc, introduced members of the team and explained they had a short slide show to present as team members spoke on the project. He described net zero ready plans for the 3 story replacement school, the anticipated timeline, floodplain considerations both current and future, site issues as well as opportunities, alternative site options, and touched on the existing conditions and resource areas.

Andrew Street, civil engineer from The Vertex Companies, Inc, described; the existing conditions and current lack of stormwater controls, site survey work done, wetlands flagging, each of the resource areas, buffer zone impacts, utilities and proposed mitigation. Conceptual Option F was shared to the screen.

Lynne Giesecke, of Studio 2112 Landscape Architects, described the proposed plans for the exterior including site accessibility, hardscaping, landscaping, areas intended for community use, and access drives for vehicles.

G. Raymond described; the proposed phasing for the project, how to build the new school while the old school is still in use, cut and fill analysis, traffic impacts (traffic study by Bryant Associates), roadway operations during construction, and elevations. G. Raymond concluded his presentation and the Conservation Commission was invited to comment.

Chair Kelly thanked the applicants for their preliminary review of the project. She stated that the Commission would want to see plans showing the floodplain, elevations and extent of proposed grading, and how it would be affected by the anticipated 2070 floodplain. She asked for a team member to speak on the Kleinfelder report.

Ray Estes, Vice Chair of the Foster School Building Committee, explained that the Kleinfelder report was the first report commissioned by the town and the findings in that report are similar to the Woods Hole Study. Andrew Street noted that the Kleinfelder report specifically looked at Foster School.

The Conservation Commission asked questions related to stormwater management; utility storage, rain garden use, and location of the stormwater system. Responses included; there would be no basement and pumps for heat pumps would be on the second floor, and that rain gardens are under consideration for treatment. L. Giesecke noted that there is one currently.

Chair Kelly commented, in regards to the extent of fill in the floodplain, that the Commission would really want to see the anticipated floodplain delineated, and know what the effects of that would be. Comm’r Hidell, not able to attend the meeting, had provided comments via a letter expressing his concern regarding the saturation and stability of

the soil being used as fill, given the increased frequency of storms, as well as the proliferation of pests as the world gets wetter.

Chair Kelly commented that, on the slide showing alternative designs, Option H was very far away from flood concerns. L. Hill stated that Option H would have a huge impact on the forest and an impact on the neighborhood. R. Estes added that the option had been dismissed conceptually because it would essentially destroy Otis Hill and that resource for the neighborhood. G. Raymond concurred with R. Estes, adding that it didn't work with exterior play areas.

Chair Ellis invited the Planning Board to comment.

The Planning Board commented on the complicated site circulation, construction impacts, stormwater management, sea level rise, student enrollment numbers, off hours use of outdoor facilities impact on neighbors, wetland area expansion, saturation and impact of fill, provision of a site plan and report on storm surge and inundation model and what would that look like beyond 2070, security and student safety, tree removals and mitigation, proposed wall details, traffic flow, queuing, and impacts to play areas and sidewalks during construction. The team responded to a few of the comments and the board suggested that further details and answers on others could be provided at a later date.

Chair Ellis stated that there would be no public comment at this time as no formal application had been submitted; public comment could be submitted in writing or taken during the permitting process.

Motion: Comm'r Mosher moved to adjourn the Conservation Commission meeting at 9:32 pm.

Second: Comm'r Nielsen

Roll Call: Comm'r Kelly: aye, Comm'r Nielsen: aye, Comm'r Villanova: aye and Comm'r Mosher: aye

Submitted, _____
Sylvia Schuler, Administrative Assistant

Approved on September 12, 2022

This meeting was recorded. To obtain a copy of the recording please contact the Conservation office.