Melrose Conservation Commission

Minutes for February 3, 2011

Present: Susan Murphy, Kate Hickey, Kevin Anderson, and Joe Nerden

Absent: Richard Doucette and Steve Locke

Staff: Kathy Morgan

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM

Members of the Malden Conservation Commission present were Rob DiMarco, Chairman, Charles Franco, Mr. Laskey, Peter Santangelo and the agent Gary Stead. They opened their meeting as well.

Correspondence:

- Mass. Congress of Lakes & Ponds – Water Wisdom
- MACC Brochure
- Aquatic Control – Mass Permit Extension Act
- Mass Wildlife brochure
- UMass Amherst – Friend of Forest Conservation

Public Hearings

700 Broadway, Malden (217-xxxx) F.W. Webb showroom and facility

David Roache and Allay Braitsch were present from Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB) and Andy McBeth was present from JM Coull, Inc. The applicant proposes to redevelop the site at the former, Smyley Buick dealership. They will demolish the current building and construct a new building (59,220 s.f.), wholesale and distribution warehouse with a display showroom. The back portion of the property is in Melrose and the front is in Malden. As compared to the old building, the new building will be located further back from Broadway.

Ms. Braitsch explained the wetlands on the site. The parcel is 4.23 acres and is bounded by Mt. Hood Golf Course to the north, Broadway (Rt. 99) to the south, D & R paving Co. to the east, and Penny St. to the west. Elevations on the site range from 70' to 82' and flood insurance rate maps show that no areas of the site are subject to flooding during a 100 yr. storm. The wetlands were delineated in July 2009. Wetland resource areas include BVW and bank. Ms. Braitsch described the two wetlands. Wetland 1 is to the north in Melrose, which is a forested swamp and wetland 2 is an offsite stream channel originating at a culvert east of Broadway in Malden. Wetland 1 discharges to wetland 2 via a 36" pipe. An

intermittent stream flows through the wetland in a southerly direction and discharges to a culvert that goes underneath the site.

Along with demolishing the existing building and rebuilding a new facility, work will also include grading, landscaping, repaving, utilities, installation of stormwater management system, including the replacement of an existing headwall and a 36" pipe. The new headwall and 36" pipe replacement will be within the BVW to wetland 1 along with the placement of rip rap upslope of the drainage pipe in order to dissipate flows. There will be approximately 100 s.f. of work within the BVW at wetland 1. A portion of the work is within the 15' no disturb zone (860 s.f.) and the 20' no construction zone (1,400 s.f.) Mr. Roache said the project will result in a 2100 s.f. reduction of impervious surface, 20% being converted to landscaping and rain gardens installed as part of the stormwater management system. The front rain garden will have 4 bays prior to the rain garden and an under drain proposed under the rain garden. Mr. Roache said the soils are poor on site. Ground water is found only 4' under grade. There will be two small inlets to the rain garden at a higher elevation, two sediment forebays in front and one to the back of the parking lot. He said the rain garden is sized for treatment of a ½" storm.

Mr. Nerden asked for a more detailed plan of the storm drain inlet/headwall. It is shown on page C9 but doesn't show rip rap. Mr. Nerden asked if the D & R property drains into the 36" pipe. Mr. Roache said no. Mr. Nerden asked if there is a fence between the two sites. Mr. Roache said only at the storage area in the back. There will be approximately 50 parking spaces provided. Ms. Murphy asked if there is a chance to eliminate some in an effort to reduce the amount of pavement. Mr. McBeth said no because they will have training going on and may need the extra spaces. There will be a concrete curb outlining the pavement around the building. There will be a 6" drop on the D & R side of the curbing. Ms. Murphy commented on the snow storage. Snow storage is shown between the pavement and the rain garden. Ms. Braitsch said they could change that. Mr. DiMarco asked about the area to the left of the building and how runoff will flow. Mr. Roache said the land there is at a higher elevation and runoff will flow to the back and the front of the building. Ms. Murphy asked about a construction sequence and how they plan to protect the rain gardens. Mr. Roache said they will install haybales around the site to keep runoff out of the gardens. Mr. McBeth said the work is projected to be finished within 8 months, start to finish, and they hope to start in April. They plan to do de-watering during construction. Discharge water will be pumped into a basin consisting of a ring of staked hay bales overlain by non-woven geotextile filter fabric and crushed stone, and allowed to drain through the fabric onto a flat surface. Dewatering filter bags may be used in place of hay bale.

Mr. Paul Morgan asked if they have any ideas for the roof runoff, possibly a green roof garden. Mr. McBeth said heat pumps with a cooling tower, but a roof garden would be too expensive.

Members would like to continue the hearing for more information;

1) Provide pictures to show the area of where the headwall will be replaced, details showing elevation of pipe and topo of area.
(Ms. Braitsch said they need the rip rap below the headwall because it is so recessed there)
2) Snow removal or storage plan
3) Detail for curbing and fence with written condition on maintenance plan.
4) Confirmation that no drainage will come off the D & R property onto the FW Webb site.
5) Plantings at rain garden need to be more sturdy and visible.

Any repairs to sewer force main at border to D & R abutter not near rain garden.

Mr. Nerden moved to continue the Public Hearing to February 17, 2011, at 7:45 PM. Ms. Hickey seconded the motion and it was voted unanimously in favor.

The Malden Conservation Commission also continued their meeting to February 17th at 7:45 PM

Continued Public Hearing

350 Lynn Fells Parkway- Middle/High School Athletic Field

Nathan Collins, from Gale Associates and Denise Gaffey, from OPCD, were present. A revised plan, dated 1/26/11 was submitted and a report entitled Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. Mr. Collins said his office received a geotechnical report and as a result, they would like to raise the proposed field 1' higher to elevation 51. Mr. Collins said that the flood elevation from the Mother's Day storm was at elevation 49. Raising the field would result in filling 5600 yards. Mr. Collins said that even though they would be filling in the area, the original grade, he said, was 7' higher and has sunk, so they wouldn't really be filling. The DPW has found a plan dating back to 1973 that was used when the prior project at the school was done. No one from the DPW was present to discuss the plan in question. Mr. Nerden said at the previous meeting the floodplain was said to be 53. Mr. Collins said, that is correct, but then this plan from 1973 was found. The City has been using the football field for snow storage to the point that there is now an enormous pile compacting the field. Mr. Nerden said he would like to hear from a geotechnical engineer in a report saying what the settlement or surcharge will be at the site; or what will happen when the peat rebounds after the snow melts. Mr. Anderson said that taking data from 1973 is not what "existing conditions" means. He said he wouldn't want to waste time and money to go forward with that strategy. FEMA base elevation is elevation 53. Mr. Nerden said he wouldn't mind looking at the other plan, but agrees with Mr. Anderson that it doesn't represent existing conditions. The consensus of the members was not to go forward with research from the 1973 plan.

Mr. Collins was asked about permeable pavement. He said he wouldn't recommend in a floodplain and it raises the costs of the project.

Mr. Nerden moved to continue the hearing to February 17, 2011, at 8:15 PM until a report can be received from the geotechnical engineer and more information is received on cut and fill. Ms. Hickey seconded the motion, and it was voted unanimously in favor.

Adjourn

Ms. Hickey moved, seconded by Mr. Anderson, and voted unanimously in favor, to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 PM.