

TOWN OF WELLESLEY



MASSACHUSETTS

## ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

TOWN HALL • 525 WASHINGTON STREET • WELLESLEY, MA 02482-5992

RICHARD L. SEEGEL, CHAIRMAN  
CYNTHIA S. HIBBARD  
DAVID G. SHEFFIELD

LENORE R. MAHONEY  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
TELEPHONE  
(781) 431-1019 EXT. 2208

J. RANDOLPH BECKER, VICE CHAIRMAN  
ROBERT W. LEVY  
DAVID L. GRISSINO

### Record, Decision and Site Plan Approval

ZBA 2010-60  
Petition of Town of Wellesley/Permanent Building Committee  
2 Municipal Way

Name of Record Owner of Title to Subject Property: Town of Wellesley/Permanent Building Committee

On June 28, 2010, the TOWN OF WELLESLEY/PERMANENT BUILDING COMMITTEE (the Petitioner) filed a petition for amendment of Site Plan Approval (ZBA 2006-69) that was granted on December 22, 2006 pursuant to the provisions of Section XVIA of the Zoning Bylaw to complete the consolidation of their facilities with the construction of an approximately 7,800 GSF administration building, adjacent to the recently completed garage and warehouse building and adjacent to the existing substation, on the municipal site on MUNICIPAL WAY. The two-story building will be connected to the garage and warehouse at the ground floor to meet the management and administrative needs of the Municipal Light Plant. Designed using factory-fabricated technologies to take advantage of construction and energy efficiencies, the administration building is intended to replace aged and inefficient facilities currently occupied on site.

### Public Hearings

The Board conducted public hearings on the Amendment of Site Plan Approval Permit on July 15, 2010, August 19, 2010 and September 8, 2010. The Board voted to grant Amended Site Plan Approval on September 8, 2010.

Presenting the case at the hearing were Michael Eby, Permanent Building Committee, Raymond Porfilio, Architect and Matthew Mullally Civil Engineer, AECOM, Richard Joyce, Debra Healy and Peter Bracken, Municipal Light Plant (MLP), and Phillip Gallagher, Project Manager.

Mr. Eby said that construction of two garages, one for MLP and one for the Department of Public Works (DPW) was granted under Site Plan Approval ZBA 2006-69. He said that DPW withdrew their plans for an office building. He said that the proposed MLP office building was not part of that application.

Mr. Eby said that the proposal is for a 7,800 square foot two-story office building. He said that there will be no change in the number of personnel utilizing the site. He said that the project includes relocation of 15 parking spaces, small changes to the hardscape and the softscape and reconfiguration of some of the walkways. He said that there will be a slight increase in impervious area.

The Board asked about the proposed use of the existing MLP Administration Building. Mr. Joyce said that no final decision has been made. He said that MLP would like to turn the building over to the Town.

Mr. Joyce said that they had looked at the cost of refurbishing the existing building versus the cost of construction of a new building. He said that the existing building could be used for temporary facilities but it would probably be a poor investment for long term use.

The Board said that there will be increased capacity on the site. Mr. Eby said that they do not have any way of determining what the use of the building will be if it is not demolished.

Mr. Porfilio said that on the application for ZBA 2006-69, the site was described as a single site with cumulative uses. He said that parking was based on full use of the site. He said that the proposal for the new administration building will not add staff or activities to the site. He said that the total number of employees has been reduced since the 2006 application.

Mr. Porfilio said that there are no anticipated increases in the number of staff. He said that the building will be located adjacent to the MLP garage, the substation and the storage yard. He said that connections between the buildings are anticipated. He said that the administration building will be accessible to the public through the front door.

The Board said that the plans should relate to the currently proposed project. The Board said that a formal Site Plan with setbacks must be submitted to the Board. The Board said that Site Circulation should be shown for the entire site, not just the area of proposed work. Mr. Porfilio said that Site Circulation has not changed since 2006. He said that there are no new entrances or exits from the site. He said that the only thing that will change will be the pedestrian route to the building. The Board said that it appears that activity will be moved closer to the main entrance. The Board said that there could be conflicts with people entering the site.

Mr. Porfilio said that traffic flow was reviewed by the Town's Traffic Consultant as part of the Project of Significant Impact (PSI) process. The Board said that documentation must be submitted.

Mr. Porfilio said that documentation of the Activity and Use Limitation (AUL) will be submitted. He said that there are no restrictions to the use. He said that if soil needs to be removed, it must be done under the supervision of a Licensed Site Professional.

Mr. Porfilio said that the Construction Management Plan (CMP) will be reviewed by the DPW and then submitted to the Board. He said that the plan will show construction fencing, staging and temporary parking. He said that the Fire Department asked that they make sure that there is access to the existing buildings.

Mr. Porfilio said that a Locus Plan will be submitted.

Mr. Porfilio said that they will provide plans for existing conditions as well as as-built drawings of the complete site. He said that the Site Plan with Existing Conditions will contain one-foot utility contours, property lines and Zoning Districts.

Mr. Porfilio said that a Proposed Contours and Grading Plan based on Town of Wellesley datum will be submitted.

Mr. Porfilio said that there are five existing parking spaces adjacent to the garage. He said those spaces will be relocated to be five feet away from the building.

Mr. Porfilio said that the wheel chair ramp will meet code requirements. The Board said that it appeared that two handicapped spaces would be removed and only one provided. Mr. Mullally said that there is currently only one wheel chair ramp. He said that they will make sure that two handicapped spaces are provided.

The Board said that pedestrian access was an important issue in 2006. The Board asked if there will be an occasions when the public will be invited to the proposed building. Mr. Joyce said he has been in the existing MLP building for the past 15 years. He said that they have never had held a public meeting there. He said that the issue in 2006 concerned public hearings in the proposed DPW Administration Building.

Mr. Porfilio said that there is an existing walkway along the north side of the substation. He said that is not a direct connection into the administration building. He said that they are proposing a short walkway that would lead out to an existing sidewalk.

Mr. Porfilio said that they are proposing to connect the front of the building to the existing sidewalk. He said that there are no plans to extend the walkway down the length of Municipal Way. He said that DPW felt that was satisfactory.

The Board asked about pedestrian safety and circulation on the site. Mr. Porfilio said that there is currently undifferentiated pavement. The Board said that it was concerned that the main entrance to the site will be located close to the building. Mr. Porfilio said that they will discuss with the Landscape Planner a potentially more desirable treatment at that location. He said that they are prepared to meet with the Town Landscape Architect and are willing to adopt her recommendations.

Mr. Porfilio said that said that there will be no reserved parking spaces, required or anticipated. . He said that it was imagined that parking at the front will be for the public and that employees will utilize the spaces within the yard.

The Board asked about increased intensity of parking since completion of the 2006 project. Mr. Porfilio said that there has not been a formal survey done. Mr. Joyce said that there has never been a problem with parking.

Mr. Joyce said that the Town's Traffic Consultant reviewed the Traffic Analysis in 2006. He said that the best example of the parking situation working was when the area was fenced off when the garage and warehouse were built. He said that they had reserved space at two off-site locations and never had to use either of the lots.

The Board said that an opinion from a Traffic Consultant stating that there is enough excess parking capacity on the site for the proposed building and the re-purposing of the existing building should be submitted. The Board said that the opinion should take into account the maximum permitted occupancy.

Mr. Porfilio said that a Plot Plan with setbacks, building dimensions, and property lines with bearings and distances will be submitted. He said that a Grading and Drainage Plan will be submitted. He said that DPW comments will be addressed on the Utility Plan.

Mr. Porfilio said that they used the most conservative approach for making stormwater drainage calculations.

The Board said that an updated Development Prospectus must be submitted.

The Board said that the statement that the proposed office addition should have minimal impact on pedestrian and bicycle safety did not suffice as an analysis. The Board said that the building will be relocated and pedestrian access will be changed. The Board said that the assessment should address pedestrian and bicycle safety on the site, not just the sidewalk conditions.

There was no one present at the Public Hearing who wished to speak to the petition.

### **August 19, 2010**

Presenting the case at the hearing was Matthew King, PBC. Also present were Richard Joyce and Debra Healy, MLP, Raymond Porfilio and Matthew Mullally, AECOM, Roger Gurney and Phillip Gallagher, Ryegate, and Kien Ho, BETA Group.

Mr. Mullally submitted revised plans.

Mr. Porfilio said that they met with the DPW and Cricket Vlass, Town Horticulturalist after the previous hearing. He submitted a revised Landscape Plan that addressed DPW and DRB comments. He said that the DRB expressed an interest in re-reviewing the Landscape Plan at the time that the project goes forward. He said that the Petitioner is comfortable with that.

Mr. Porfilio discussed DRB comments regarding grading and slope of sidewalks. He said that is an issue that the Applicant would like to continue discussing with the Building Department. He said that the Building Inspector has a statutory requirement to enforce ADA compliance.

The Board asked about accessibility from the parking spaces that will be located behind the Substation. Mr. Porfilio said that the parking behind the Substation will be within the yard and will not be for public use. The Board asked if there is any requirement to provide handicapped access to the Substation. Mr. Porfilio said that he was not aware of any requirement for that. He said that there are steps there now. He said that the use of the Substation will not change.

The Board said that it was comfortable with the plans that were submitted at this hearing that addressed DRB's concerns for an accessible route between the buildings.

Mr. Porfilio said that, after meeting with the Fire Department and the Building Inspector, the link from the Administration Building to the Substation was eliminated.

Mr. Porfilio said that a Traffic Plan was included in the latest submission. He said that the plan diagrammed the traffic flow on the site. He said that they also included a Construction Management Plan that showed the fenced areas and how the staging will take place during construction of the building.

Mr. Porfilio said that Kien Ho analyzed the parking data for potential populations for both the new building and the re-use of the existing building. He said that Mr. Ho's letter was included in the submittal package.

Mr. Porfilio said that they had referred to materials at the previous hearing that were from 2006. He said that the GeoTechnical Report was submitted as well as the full AUL as it relates to this site.

The Board said that it was concerned about the pedestrian walkway shown on Plan C-2 that will go from the existing DPW/MLP Building over to the parking area and the new building. The Board said that it will be a long walkway and the pedestrians will not be protected in what is already a chaotic area.

Mr. Porfilio said that the open double line that is shown on the plan going from the existing building to the striped area is how it is currently striped on the site. He said that area is currently used for parking. He said that the striped area is shown because previously that had been a concrete island. He said that DPW said that it would be preferable not to have an island there because it channeled some of the site drainage into particular locations. He said that having the striped area instead does make for a long walk across. He displayed on the plan an alternative walkway. The Board said that the alternative walkway is better.

Mr. Mullally said that the limits of work were extended because of an electric duct bank that they will be adding. He said that they will be leaving very little of the existing pavement markings. He said that his plan was to re-stripe the long pedestrian walkway and make it more clear that what was the raised island will now have pavement markings to make it a safer place for pedestrians to walk through. He said that he was open to the suggestion of moving the walkway.

Mr. Mullally said that he was concerned about the suggestion to have the pedestrians go around the corner of the existing building to access the walkway. He said that the tendency is to walk out from the corner of the building if traffic is clear.

The Board said that this area functions as the main entrance. The Board said that vehicles can turn in different directions and drivers will not necessarily be looking out for pedestrians. The Board said that moving the walkway back would interfere less with traffic circulation. The Board said that signage could be added or the walkway could start at the corner of the building. Mr. Mullally said that there are three designated parking spaces located in that area. He said that an alternative walkway could be striped almost at the midpoint of the existing building and then over to the garage.

Mr. Porfilio said that if the walkway is moved back, there should be a single stripe or a dashed stripe that runs along the edge of Municipal Way to define the roadway. He said that there should be something to alert drivers that they are crossing from a road into a parking area.

The Board said that the roadway should be delineated and the sidewalk should be striped around the corner of the existing building. The Board said that although pedestrians will probably still walk across from the corner, the location of the crosswalk should be officially designated. The Board asked if there could be signage at the entrance to alert drivers entering the site that there is a pedestrian crossing. The Board said that a sign could also direct people to various buildings on the site.

Mr. Mullally said that they are open to suggestions for improving site safety. He said that they can add a sidewalk along the front of the building, add wheelchair ramps on both sides of the crosswalk connection between the buildings, and move the three existing parking spaces closer to the front of the building.

The Board said that signage was an important issue in the 2006 Site Plan Approval. Mr. Porfilio said that in 2006, the DPW made representations of signage that would be added to the site. He said that there is a summary of the items that have been completed. He said that a few of the items are open. He said that if more signage is required, he would recommend that it be linked to the 2006 Site Plan Approval conditions.

The Board said that in AECOM's letter of August 3, 2010, #6 states that entry signage has been reviewed with the MLP. The Board said that Plan A0400 was not submitted to the Board. Mr. Porfilio said that plan will be submitted.

The Board asked if parking spaces #21 to #25 will have wheel stops since they will be five feet away from the building. Mr. Mullally said that they are not shown at this point but can be accommodated. He said that there is a concrete pad adjacent to space #21.

Mr. Porfilio said that there are currently 25 spaces in the vicinity of the building. He said that the intent was to not change the quantity of parking on the site. He said that any space that was displaced by the location of the building was accommodated elsewhere. He said that there will be 10 spaces at the front for the public area and the other 15 spaces have been located in the yard.

Kien Ho said that there are currently 25 to 30 parking spaces. He said that they did not count the parking spaces adjacent to the Fire Station. He said that the 30 spaces are being used by 35 employees at the existing MLP/DPW building. He said that he has visited the site several times and parking has appeared to be adequate.

Mr. Ho said that the number of parking spaces without the new facility is approximately 20. He said that 5 new spaces will be provided with the new facility. He said that looking at the ratio of the square footage of the existing building versus the square footage with the new building, it does not appear that parking will be an issue. He said that the 25 parking spaces will be in close proximity to the new MLP building.

Mr. Joyce said that the MLP employees will be moving to the new facility and the DPW employees will move to their own facility. The Board confirmed that parking at the existing building will be maintained.

Mr. Porfilio said that two of the spaces will be for handicapped parking. He said that they could designate four of the other spaces as visitor parking. He said that they can provide signage for that.

The Board discussed Plan TF0001a. The Board asked if there is a plan for pavement markings to show the exit route. Mr. Porfilio said that there was not. He said that they tried to limit their work to around the MLP Administration Building. The Board said that a condition of Site Plan Approval will be that there be signage and pavement markings.

The Board discussed Construction Management Plan, CM0001. The Board said that there was some discussion in the August 3, 2010 AECOM memo about keeping the area open. Mr. Porfilio displayed on the plan the location of an egress. He said that the Fire Department wanted that area kept open.

Mr. Gurney said that materials laydown area will be within the construction fence around the building. He said that the fencing will go around the garage and the substation. The Board said that the plan should show storage areas and materials laydown areas.

Mr. Gurney said that construction will consist of poured in place concrete foundation and modulares. He said that they will only be excavating for the foundation. He said that the modulares will be lifted off of trailers. He said that if the trailers show up ahead of schedule, they will be allowed to park in the lot. He said that, with the exception of the exterior façade, the units will be delivered with finishes already in them.

Mr. Gurney said that material will be stored on the site within the fenced area. The Board said that designated areas should be shown on the plans. The Board said that it is important to show that, if the materials will be near a catch basin, there will be erosion protection.

The Board said that PCB's and other contaminants have been found in the soil on this site. The Board asked if there is a Contingency Plan if contaminated soils are encountered. Mr. Gurney said that the borings that have been done in the area are consistent with the characteristics of the soil that were previously done with respect to bearing capacities. He said that PCB's were not found in that area.

Mr. Gurney said that suspect soil would have to be put under plastic and then tested. He said that it would not be moved until the test results come back. He said that is standard protocol. He said that is clearly stated in the contractors' bid packages. The Board asked if the contractors will be required to look for or test for contaminated soils. Mr. Bracken said that the AUL states that whatever soil is in the area must stay on the site.

Mr. Bracken discussed the Activity and Use Limitation (AUL). He said that it indicated that the soil conditions will not exceed the PCB's limitations. He said that sampling was done prior to the 2006 Site Plan Approval.

The Board said that reportable contamination was found at B5. Mr. Bracken said that B5 is an AUL 2. He said that the new construction is AUL 1. He said that A5 is located by the DPW Water & Sewer Building at the bottom of the hill and that is where the highest concentrations were found. He said that the area of contamination was removed and capped.

Mr. Porfilio said that they are not requiring the contractors to do pre-characterization of the soil because of the foundation type that they will construct. He said that because there will be no basement, a limited amount of excavation will take place. Mr. Gurney said that there will be approximately 100 yards of

excavation. He said that the soil will be loaded onto a truck and driven across the road and dumped in the parking area. He said that the soil will not leave Municipal Way.

Mr. Joyce said that MLP did some testing when they did the building demolition as part of their requirements for reporting to the Mass DEP. He said that they had to test 10 feet outside of the building perimeter. He said that they did extensive testing around the building footprint. Mr. Mullally said that the historic information comes up clean and indicates that there is not a problem in this location.

The Board asked about the direction of the groundwater flow. Mr. Mullally said that he did not have that information. He displayed the contours of the site and said that he assumed that the flow followed the contours.

The Board said that there needs to be clear directions for contractors and the CMP should include a Contingency Plan. The Board said that if contaminated soil is found, procedures for notification and handling must be spelled out in the CMP.

Mr. Porfilio said that the project is being procured under Modular Construction, so the contractor will have responsibility for the site.

The Board said that the CMP should be revised to show the modular unit storage.

The Board said that Plan CM0001 should show the wheel cleaning mat at the access gate.

The Board asked what precautions will be taken to prevent excessive amounts of dirt being brought out onto Route 9. Mr. Gurney said that DPW vehicles enter and exit the site constantly. He said that there was a significant amount of truck traffic during construction of both garages for hauling and bringing materials onto the site. He said that there were no problems with dirt being dragged out onto Route 9. The Board said that the CMP should include language for street cleanup on Municipal Way whenever there is any build up of dirt.

Mr. Gurney said that the intent is to work normal working hours. He said that it may be beneficial to lift the modulars off of the trailer and onto the foundation on a Saturday. He said that will allow them to set the crane when there is minimal construction traffic and without the traffic from the normal operations and the public. He said that all of the previous jobs that were done through the PBC required that the contractor notify and get permission from the Police Department to work on Saturdays. He said that is in the standard contract documents.

Mr. Porfilio said that the DPW submitted a letter on August 9, 2010 stating that they had reviewed plans dated August 2, 2010. He submitted a plan that shows the landscape changes that addressed DPW comments. He said that revised plans need to be reviewed by the Town Landscaper and the DRB.

The Board discussed Kien Ho's letter of June 8, 2010. Mr. Porfilio said that the 2006 Vanasse Report was based on the proposal that other Town Hall offices would be moving to this location. Mr. Ho said that that 2006 Report identified an additional 15 Town Hall employees and 30 visitors. He said that he compared what was done in 2006 with the new facility. He said that there will be fewer trips, 116 versus 150.

The Board said that an issue in the 2006 Report was the intersection of Route 9 and Route 16 and the Fire Station Driveway. The Board said that the Vanasse Report listed the intersection at a Level of Service (LOS) of D during the morning peak hour. The Board said that the intersection is projected to operate at an LOS of E. Mr. Ho said that the project will not aggravate the situation. He said that the peak hour for the MLP facility is 6:15 to 7:15 a.m. He said that the commuting peak is from 8 to 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Ho said that the Route 16 Bridge was improved with a traffic signal on the Route 9 on and off ramp. He said that will improve traffic operation and safety at the intersection.

The Board asked about the project timeline. Mr. Porfilio said that they that they are looking to be on-site in November. He said that because the bulk of the construction will take place off-site, the winter conditions will have minimal impact. He said that the modularity will be designed in the factory during November, December & January and will then be brought to the site.

There was no one present at the Public Hearing who wished to speak to the petition.

### **September 8, 2010**

Presenting the case at the hearing was Matthew King, PBC. Also present were Matthew Mullally and Raymond Porfilio, AECOM, Roger Gurney and Phillip Gallagher, Ryegate, Richard Joyce, Debra Healy and Peter Bracken, MLP.

Mr. Gurney discussed the CMP. He said that it was revised to advise the contractors that construction will be taking place next to a site where contaminated soils were found and have been cleaned up. The CMP states that, should the contractors encounter any contaminated soils, they are to notify the owner and handle it in the regulatory fashion to make sure that all materials are stockpiled.

Mr. Gurney said that a note was added in the CMP that the soil stockpile area will be located in the parking area across Municipal Way. He said that the intention is that excavated soil will be moved there and stockpiled. He said that the Construction Soil Surplus Area will be for all soils.

The Board asked about the procedure for the contractor to determine if soils are contaminated. Mr. Gurney said that borings and specifications information will be available to the contractors. He said that the MLP will have a Licensed Site Professional who will oversee that.

Mr. Gurney said that contaminated soil would be stored on a liner and covered. He said that erosion controls would be put into place, in accordance with all regulations. The Board said that language should be added to the CMP stating that contaminated soils will be stored in a manner that complies with regulatory requirements for cover and liners.

Mr. Gurney said that information was added to the CMP for trailer storage.

The Board asked about the number of truck trips for transferring soil. Mr. Gurney said that he recalculated the volumes of material that will be moved across Municipal Way. He said that there will be approximately 25 truck trips.

The Board said that more information was added to the CMP for street sweeping. The Board said that the stone wheel cleaning mat at the gates should be shown on the plan.

Mr. Mullally said that they met with DPW to discuss pedestrian and vehicular circulation on the site. He said that it was decided to extend the sidewalk along the existing garage, as shown on Plan C2. He said that it will be extended to a new pedestrian wheelchair ramp at the corner. He said that the pedestrian crosswalk will be received by the new wheelchair ramp and an existing crosswalk that is located next to the administration building. He said that wheelchair access will be at the back of the building as well as at the parking space. He said that the sidewalk had to be extended to the back and a new ramp was added at the back of the building.

Mr. Mullally said that the edge of travel line was added to the plan. He said that will encourage vehicles to stay on Municipal Way unless they intend to use the parking area.

Mr. Mullally said that there are five existing striped parking spaces that are perpendicular to Municipal Way. He said that he added those spaces to the base plan. He said that they will re-stripe those spaces from the new crosswalk to Municipal Way but only put back four of them. He said that the spaces can be moved a few feet back.

Mr. Mullally said that signage was added to the site. He said that they focused on having traffic utilize the lights at the side of the Fire Station. He said that he added a Sign Summary Sheet to show what the signs will look like. He said that there will be a sign at the Administration Building that directs traffic to Route 9. He said that if that sign is obstructed, he will relocate the sign to be perpendicular to the intersection.

Mr. Mullally said that they added signs in front of the stalls for handicapped van parking and visitor parking.

Mr. Mullally said that he and Mr. Porfilio discussed accessible routes with the Building Inspector. The Building Inspector told them that they did not qualify for the exception because of the separation between the sidewalk and the roadway. He said that in order to meet the greater than five percent exception to the accessible route requirement, they had to bring the sidewalk next to the roadway. He said that it is still not a place where they would want to promote handicapped traffic.

Mr. Mullally said that the Landscape Plan has been revised.

Mr. Porfilio said that the building lighting will consist of decorative fixtures adjacent to the entrance canopy. He said that they will be wall-mounted fixtures. He said that there will be shallow LED fixtures above the exit doors. The Board asked about timers. Mr. Bracken said that the building is seldom used after normal working hours. Mr. Porfilio said that there are no changes to site lighting anticipated.

There was no one present at the Public Hearing who wished to speak to the petition.

### **Submittals from the Applicant**

- Application for Site Plan Approval, dated 6-23-10, revised 8-2-10
- Project Overview
- Site Plan Approval Review – Plans and Submittal Checklist, revised 8-2-10
- Abutters List
- Memo to Planning Board, dated 4-22-10, re: Refuse Disposal Impact Analysis, from DPW
- Letter to Peter Bracken, dated 5-7-10, re: PSI Electrical Impact Analysis, from David Walkenstein, PE
- Letter to Peter Bracken, dated 5-10-10, re: PSI Traffic Impact Evaluation, from Dennis Flynn, P.E.
- Memo to Dick Joyce, dated 5-10-10, re: Limited PSI Submission, from Doug Stewart
- Letter to Peter Bracken, dated 5-11-10, re: PSI Building Occupant Life Safety Analysis, from Joel P. Goodmonson, PE, LEED AP
- Wellesley MLP Addition Fire Sprinkler Reports, dated 6-21-10, prepared by Architectural Engineers, Inc.
- Letter to Peter Bracken, dated 5-11-10, re: PSI Water Capacity Analysis, from Joel P. Goodmonson, PE, LEED AP
- Letter to Peter Bracken, dated 5-11-10, revised 6-23-10, re: PSI Water Capacity Analysis, from Joel P. Goodmonson, PE, LEED AP
- Letter to Peter Bracken, dated 5-11-10, re: PSI Sewer Capacity Analysis, from Joel P. Goodmonson, PE, LEED AP
- Letter to Peter Bracken, dated 5-11-10, re: PSI Storm Drainage Impact Evaluation, from Kathleen Schaeffer, PE
- Letter to Peter Bracken, dated 5-11-10, re: Building Occupant Life Safety Analysis, from Joel P. Goodmonson, PE
- Letter to Hans Larsen, dated 6-8-10, re: PSI-06-02 – Traffic Impact Evaluation, from Kien Ho, PE, PTOE
- Wellesley MLP Addition Fire Sprinkler Reports, dated 6-21-10, prepared by Architectural Engineers, Inc.
- Memo to Ray Porfilio, dated 6-23-10, Re: Drainage Calculations – roof runoff, from Kathy Schaeffer, PE
- Memo to Meghan Jop, dated 6-24-10, re: WMLP Administration Building Traffic Study, from Terrance Connolly
- Letter to Richard Joyce, dated 8-1-10, re: Traffic and Parking Evaluation, from Kien Ho, PE, PTOE
- Development Prospectus, dated 8-2-10
- Construction Management Plan, dated 8-2-10, revised 9-2-10
- Memo to DRB, dated 8-3-10, re: DRB Submission, from Ray Porfilio
- Traffic Impact and Access Study – Proposed Wellesley DPW/MLP Building Project, prepared by Vanasse & Associates, Inc.
- Subsurface Conditions Summary
- Report on Geotechnical Investigation and Foundation Recommendations, dated September 2006, prepared by Haley & Aldrich, Inc.
- Notice of Activity and Use Limitation, recorded at the Norfolk County Registry of Deeds on 4-20-10, Book 27604, Pg 241- Pg 261
- Project of Significant Impact Special Permit Decision, PSI-06-02, dated stamped 6-13-06

- Amendment to Project of Significant Impact Special Permit Decision, PSI-06-02, date stamped 6-30-10

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Drawing Title</b>	<b>Date of Issue</b>	<b>Prepared By</b>	<b>Date of Revision</b>
Sheet 1 of 21	Title, Index & General Notes	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 2 of 21	Existing Conditions Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 3 of 21	Existing Conditions Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 4 of 21	Existing Conditions Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 5 of 21	Plot Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 6 of 21	Overall Site Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 7 of 21	Parking, Layout & Materials Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 8 of 21	Parking, Layout & Materials Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 9 of 21	Parking, Layout & Materials Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 10 of 21	Grading and Utilities Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 11 of 21	Grading and Utilities Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 12 of 21	Grading and Utilities Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 13 of 21	Drain Profiles	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 14 of 21	Drain Profiles	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 15 of 21	Sewer Profile	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 16 of 21	Construction Details	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 17 of 21	Construction Details	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 18 of 21	Construction Details	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 19 of 21	Landscape Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
Sheet 20 of 21	Landscape Plan	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	

Sheet 21 of 21	Landscape Details	8-1-06	Stephen S. Fader, PE	
A0101	First Floor Plan	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10
A0102	Second Floor Plan	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10
A0400	Exterior Elevations	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10, 8-3-10
A0500	Building Sections	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10
REND	Renderings	6-10	AECOM	8-3-10
C-1	Proposed Site Plan (For PSI Permit Application)	6-23-10	AECOM	
C-1	Proposed Site Preparation and Demolition Plan	8-2-10	AECOM	8-24-10, 9-1-10
C-2	Propose Utility Plan (For PSI Permit Application)	6-24-10	AECOM	8-2-10
C-2	General Plan	8-2-10	AECOM	8-24-10, 9-1-10
C-3	Grading Plan	8-2-10	AECOM	8-24-10, 9-1-10
C-4	Utility Plan	8-2-10	AECOM	8-24-10, 9-1-10
C-5	Civil Details Sheet 1	8-2-10	AECOM	8-24-10, 9-1-10
C-6	Civil Details Sheet 2	8-2-10	AECOM	8-24-10, 9-1-10
C-7	Sign Summary Sheet	8-10	AECOM	8-24-10, 9-1-10
CM0001	Construction Management Plan	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10
	First Floor Plan	6-23-10	AECOM	
	Second Floor Plan	6-23-10	AECOM	
	Typical Building Section	6-23-10	AECOM	
	Exterior Building Elevations	6-23-10	AECOM	
EV-1	MLP Evacuation Plan	4-21-10	AECOM	
EX0001a	Existing Site Plan – Part 1	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10
EX0001b	Existing Site Plan – Part 2	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10
G0001	Title Sheet	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10
L-1	Landscape Plan	8-2-10	AECOM	8-24-10, 9-1-10
TF0001a	Traffic Plan – Part 1	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10
TF0001b	Traffic Plan – Part 2	6-10	AECOM	8-2-10

On June 13, 2006, the Wellesley Planning Board granted a Special Permit for a Project of Significant Impact, PSI-06-02, for the Municipal Facilities Project. On June 30, 2010, the Wellesley Planning Board granted an Amendment to Project of Significant Impact Special Permit Decision, PSI-06-02.

On July 9, 2010, George J. Saraceno, DPW, submitted comments to the ZBA.

On August 3, 2010, the Planning Board reviewed the petition and recommended that the requested amendment of Site Plan Review be granted.

On August 5, 2010, Francisco A. Frias, WMLP, stated that the MLP reviewed the information provided for the project and did not anticipate any problems with the new electrical load and demand of the proposed MLP Administration Building.

On August 9, 2010, Doug Stewart, DPW, stated that the applicant had addressed previous comments identified in the July 9, 2010 memo. He suggested that a street tree and shrub planting detail and proposed turf areas be identified on the Landscaping Plan.

On August 10, 2010, Adam Bossi, Wetlands Protection Committee, stated that the proposed project is located outside of areas subject to the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act, MGL Chapter 131, Section 40 and/or the Town of Wellesley Wetlands Protection Bylaw, Article 44.

On August 13, 2010, Lenny Izzo, Board of Health, stated that any concerns with possible soil contamination have and are being addressed at the site as part of the previous site work. He requested that the Health Department continue to be notified if any contaminated soils are uncovered and if any remediation is necessary.

On August 16, 2010, William Brooks, III, Deputy Police Chief, stated that he had reviewed the petition and had no issues with it.

On August 16, 2010, the Design Review Board completed its Final Review of the Municipal Facilities Project and recommended approval with conditions.

On August 16, 2010, Captain Fitzpatrick, Fire Department, stated that emergency vehicle accesses had reviewed and approved. He stated that the Fire Department reserves the right for final approval at time of issuing permits with a complete set of building documents.

The Board voted unanimously to approve the Amendment to Site Plan Approval (ZBA 2006-69), subject to the conditions listed below.

The Board's approval of the Site Plan for the Project is premised on the Applicant's and Project's compliance with the following conditions (the "Conditions"). All requirements imposed by the Conditions or this Site Plan Approval shall be applicable to the entity responsible for the administration of the Project regardless of whether the condition specifically identifies the Applicant, the responsible entity, or no entity as having responsibility for a particular condition. By accepting this Site Plan Approval, the Applicant agrees to the terms, covenants, conditions, and agreements contained herein.

### **CONDITIONS**

1. Site Plan Approval, ZBA 2006-69, shall be incorporated into this decision.
2. PSI 06-02 and Amended PSI 06-02 shall be incorporated into this decision.
3. The CMP shall be incorporated into this decision.

4. The CMP shall contain language that states that any contaminated soils shall be stored in a manner that complies with regulatory requirements for cover and liners.
5. Stone wheel cleaning mats at the gates shall be shown on the plan.
6. The Landscape Plan shall be re-submitted to the DRB at the time that the project goes forward.

APPEALS FROM THIS DECISION,  
IF ANY, SHALL BE MADE PURSUANT  
TO GENERAL LAWS, CHAPTER 40A,  
SECTION 17, AND SHALL BE FILED  
WITHIN 20 DAYS AFTER THE DATE  
OF FILING OF THIS DECISION IN THE  
OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK.

---

Cynthia S. Hibbard, Acting Chairman

---

Robert W. Levy

---

David L. Grissino

cc: Planning Board  
Inspector of Buildings

lrm