



GAC Minutes  
Approved  
10/15/20

# Town of Northborough

Office of the Town Engineer

63 Main Street

Northborough, Massachusetts 01532-1994  
(508) 393-5015 Office (508) 393-6996 Fax

## Groundwater Advisory Committee

September 8, 2020

Remote Zoom Meeting

6:00 p.m.

**Present (Remotely):** Jason Perreault (Board of Selectmen), Amy Poretsky (Planning Board), Bryant Firmin (Water and Sewer Commission), Theresa Capobianco (Board of Health), Diane Guldner (Conservation Commission)

**Members Absent:** None

**Attendees (Remotely):** Peter Beemis (Engineering Design Consultants); William Poutre; Randy Waterman (WDA Design); Tom Reardon; Matt Pisani (Matec)

Mr. Perreault called the Zoom meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. and announced that the meeting was being conducted remotely consistent with Governor Baker's Order of March 12, 2020 due to the current state of emergency in the Commonwealth due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 virus. In order to mitigate the transmission of the virus, we have been advised and directed by the Commonwealth to suspend all public gatherings and, as such, the Governor's Order suspends the requirements of the Open Meeting Law to have all meetings in a publicly accessible physical location. Further, all members of public bodies are allowed and encouraged to participate remotely. The Order on the posted Agenda allows the public bodies to meet entirely remotely so long as reasonable public access is afforded so the public can follow along with the deliberations of the meeting. This meeting will not feature public comment. The process for the meeting was explained.

Member and Staff roll call was taken: Jason Perreault; Amy Poretsky; Theresa Capobianco; Bryant Firmin; Diane Guldner; Fred Litchfield (Town Engineer); Melanie Rich (Committee Secretary)

To consider the petition of William and Christine Poutre for a Special Permit per Groundwater Protection Overlay District, to construct a two-family dwelling at 399 Hudson Street, Map 30, Parcel 81 in the Residential C District and located within Groundwater Protection Overlay District Area 3.

**Applicant:** William and Christine Poutre

**Representative:** Peter Bemis: Engineering Design Consultants, Inc.

Peter Bemis (Engineering Design Consultants) and William Poutre participated remotely. Mr. Litchfield said a duplex is proposed at 399 Hudson Street on a piece of vacant land. The parcel meets the criteria for a Special Permit. There is a review memo with some items missing. Mr. Litchfield contacted Mr. Bemis and was told they could address the areas of the review memo that need to be submitted within the next few days.

Mr. Bemis explained it is a 30,000 square foot lot that was part of an ANR subdivision. The parcel was made large enough for a duplex configuration; the SAS (Soil Absorption Systems) will be supported by each unit; there will be town water and public utilities on site. It is a fairly level lot with some grading to the south, very little earth needs to be removed. The soil is suitable for infiltrative drainage. The roof runoff will be infiltrated and the driveway runoff treated and infiltrated as well; there are two separate systems. Plan details include the infiltration systems as well as contact treatment systems. They will need a Special Permit from the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Litchfield's comment letter had nine items to be addressed (many of which have been addressed). The drainage calculations were inadvertently omitted, but they are prepared and will be submitted. Regards Mr. Litchfield's September 3, 2020 review letter, (#1) a statement is required by a technically qualified expert certifying that the quality and supply of the underlying groundwater resources will not be degraded to the point whereby a hazard to the public or ecological damage results; Mr. Bemis said it will be provided. (#2) The lot is 30,000 square feet and allowed is 660 gallons of effluent to be discharged; there will be two 330-gallon SAS systems. Mr. Bemis said the impervious cover will not be exceeded. (#3) The comment letter recommended the driveway opening on Hudson Street be reduced from 48-feet to 24-feet. Mr. Bemis submit a revised site plan. (#4) They are suggesting a condominium form of ownership which would make it easier to maintain the drainage system; the responsibilities would be the Homeowners Association. (#5) Permeability testing was done where the SAS is proposed in the reserve area, not where the leaching area is proposed for the stormwater. (#6) Based on the SAS testing, there will be more than a minimum of 2-foot offset to groundwater. (#7) An O&M plan will be provided. (#8) Final plans will be submitted prior to the start of any site work. (#9) As-built plans will be submitted prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr. Litchfield said the drainage calculations is the main item missing. The water quality certificate is done by the professional engineer who provides the drainage calculation. He did not have any other outstanding items. The size of the lot does support the two 3-bedroom units (no more) so there should be some type of limit in any recommendation to the ZBA and/or Planning Board that there be no more than 6 bedrooms between the two units. If the outstanding information is received within the next few days, he will have time to review and recommend approval to the ZBA should the Committee make that recommendation contingent upon that happening.

Mr. Perreault asked for the board's comments. Mr. Firmin had no questions at this time. Ms. Guldner asked the exact location of the units. Mr. Bemis explained where they were; she was satisfied. Ms. Poretsky asked if it would be oil or gas. Mr. Bemis said if there is natural gas available it will be gas, otherwise it will be propane. She commented that the SAS is for up to 6 bedrooms. The plan shows an office and exercise room upstairs and asked if the system could handle 8 bedrooms in the future. Mr. Bemis said the site could, but it will be restricted; the language will be explicit; it will be 3 bedrooms only. She asked who enforces it if it is not upheld. Mr. Litchfield said if it comes to the attention of the town, it would be a zoning violation and enforced by Building Inspector.

Mr. Litchfield had not reviewed the impervious cover, but Mr. Bemis had confirmed earlier today that they propose to recharge 100% of the impervious cover; there will be 0% impervious cover in the post-condition. Mr. Firmin did have a concern about the number of bedrooms because the exercise room and office have a closet, window, and the minimum required square footage for a bedroom (he assumed the Board of Health had reviewed it). If there is going to be more bedrooms, he would ask for a breakout of the system to the south. He wants to make sure the Board of Health is comfortable with the enforceability of six bedrooms total. Mr. Poutre said he would be fine removing any closets to alleviate the concern; it is not the intent to add more bedrooms; there is nothing devious in any way. Mr. Litchfield said even if the septic systems were designed for more than 6 bedrooms, the deed restriction and Special Permit will limit it to 6 bedrooms total for the two units. He will make sure it is listed on the Occupancy Permit as well. Ms. Capobianco said from the Board of Health's perspective, only the Health Agent reviews the septic design; the board itself does not necessarily get involved in every application. She had not seen this application yet so she could not speak as to what the Health Agent has or has not done. Her only concern

was the 3 bedrooms identified, plus an exercise room and an office and also understands that the way we are all living today there is the need for extra rooms in our houses. She would be comfortable removing the closets. Mr. Perreault said if it was designed for storage that perhaps it could be designed another way; it would eliminate the concern that the rooms are readily available or convertible to bedrooms. Mr. Litchfield said they could remove the windows. Mr. Poutre had no issues with removing the closets, but would with the windows from a marketability standpoint. Mr. Perreault said it would be left to the Town Engineer and Building Inspector as to what types of restrictions will be put in place and what kind of enforcement takes place to ensure that the capacity is not exceeded as intended.

Regarding the impervious cover, Mr. Perreault asked Mr. Bemis what the percentage is relative to the lot according to the design. Mr. Bemis did not see it on the recap but was assured they were under the requirement; he will make sure it is included on the plan. Mr. Perreault said the original driveway was proposed at 48-feet. Mr. Bemis said Mr. Litchfield recommended 24-feet. Mr. It will now swing in from the north and south ends or east and west ends of the lots. Mr. Litchfield told Mr. Bemis that the fact he is indicating 100% recharge, to make sure to add that to the revised plan on how he will capture all the roof runoff. If it is put in the permit that he is proposing 100% recharge, we want to make sure all the water can get into the infiltration areas, both from the roof and the driveway.

Mr. Litchfield suggested the following conditions from the items in his comment letter: #1 the applicant needs to address the five items that are required for every Special Permit (in this case most of them are not applicable because it is a residential property to be used as a residential property), but the water quality certificate needs to be submitted as well as the impervious cover calculations, providing it is under the 15%; #2 talks about the 220 gallons per 10,000 square feet and the 6 bedrooms; that condition can be expanded to further clarify that a deed restriction should be required and the Occupancy Permit should limit the number of bedrooms in total to be 6 bedrooms, #3 reducing the driveway will require revised site plans and confirmed to be less than 48-feet. The ownership is something we generally recommend and then the permit granting authority can require it in the decision so there are documents recorded at the Registry along with the Special Permit that clarify ownership and maintenance of certain aspects of the building and the property; a minimum of one permeability test in each infiltration area will be required; the revised site plan should be able provide the soil testing information to verify that the bottom of the infiltration area is 2-feet above the groundwater; Stormwater and O&M Plan outlining ownership and reports coming to the Town Engineer for verification that maintenance has been done and what is happening with any material that is removed; #8 #9 #10 the final set of plans with any changes would be reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer prior to the Building Permit; the as-built plan is received prior to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit. Ms. Capobianco made a motion to recommend approval of the application subject the Mr. Litchfield's conditions; Ms. Guldner seconded. Ms. Poretsky asked the applicant to provide the information to Mr. Litchfield as soon as possible so it can be reviewed before the Planning Board meeting. Roll call vote: Firmin-aye; Guldner-aye; Poretsky-aye; Capobianco-aye; Perreault-aye; motion approved.

To consider the petition of NB Real Estate LLC., for Site Plan Approval and a Special Permit per Groundwater Protection Overlay District, to reconstruct an existing building at 56 Hudson Street, Map 54, Parcel 84 in the Downtown Neighborhood District and located within Groundwater Protection Overlay District Area 3.

**Applicant:** NB Real Estate LLC

**Representative:** Ken Bishop: Matec and Randy Waterman: WDA Design Group

Matt Pisani, Tom Reardon and Randy Waterman (WDA Design Group) participated remotely. Mr. Litchfield explained that it is an existing industrial building; there have been changes over the years, including a zoning change in 2009 from Industrial to Downtown Neighborhood. There were a number of items that were not submitted with the original application in July. He did receive the list of chemicals

and MSDS sheets last week (which he has reviewed) but there are still a number of questions about the drainage and impervious cover as well as containment of the chemicals and how they are stored within the building

Mr. Waterman said the application is to rebuild a portion of the existing building closest to Hudson Street. He explained the location and said approximately half of the building would be taken away and rebuilt on essentially the same footprint with the exception of a small section (10-feet wide) on the south side of the building that will connect to the other existing building to make a completely enclosed building. A small section closet to Cold Harbor Brook will be pulled about 6-feet away from the brook. Currently it is two stories with a 6,500 square foot footprint on each floor. The new building would be three stories to make the operation more efficient and make the rooms large enough to accommodate what is being manufactured. There will be no additional employees and no additional parking or tree removal. The small section behind the building is crushed stone; there is no natural vegetation; the permeable surface is not changed. The buildings cover 25,000 square feet and parking 12,000 square feet; 50% of the site is impervious and 46% is open space. The new addition is under 1,000 square feet increase in impervious surface on the entire site. Drainage calculations were not submitted because the drainage had not changed and there was some infiltration provided from other additions. The engineer is running the existing conditions and the proposed hydrology to show there is essentially a net zero change. The building at the NW corner has a loading dock; the corner of the building is approximately 8.5-feet off the street frontage which is non-conforming today. They are proposing to turn it and have a small bump-out in the front setback to 8.2-feet instead of 8.5-feet. A variance is included in the application because the building is currently non-conforming because of front yard setback.

Mr. Litchfield said items #1-#5 that are required with every Special Permit were not submitted. The list of chemicals, quantities and volumes have since come in and he has reviewed them. He indicated the number of gallons that would need to be stored, but there is missing information regarding how they are stored, where they will be stored, and what can be stored next to each other (because some may not be suitable to be stored side-by-side); he asked that the applicant research that more. The containment cabinets need information regarding the size and specification and how many gallons they can store within the cabinet itself. If anything is not stored within the cabinet and potentially allowed to mix with sprinkler water, there could be an issue if there are floor drains in the building. We need to make sure that anything stored will not mix with sprinkler water or get into the groundwater. Stormwater calculations are needed so they can be reviewed before the ZBA meeting. Regarding any existing floor drains and proposed sprinklers, the infiltration bed is shown on the plan but there are no calculations or indications of the size or stormwater O&M plan that may have been in place previously and does not have any reports showing maintenance has been done. The project will require an Earthwork Permit and approval from the Conservation Commission. The Building Inspector's Zoning Interpretation called out three different sections: expansion of non-conforming use; commercial development as allowed in the underlying district; and commercial or industrial activities which involve accessory uses of manufacturer storage of chemicals. An as-built plan will be required showing the changes inside and outside the building on site.

Mr. Pisani said there are no floor drains. There is a containment cabinet in the existing building for certain chemicals. He was asking for feedback from the Committee or the Fire Department as to which chemicals should be stored in the containment cabinet and which were safe to be outside; they have an open floor plan. The first floor NW corner of the new building was going to be designated for containment. Mr. Litchfield said the list of chemicals on the shaded part of the chart needs to be contained. We will need specifications on the size and type of cabinet and the containment it provides within the cabinet itself. There will be sprinklers in the building. If anything is exposed to sprinkler water in case of fire, the water could get outside and mix with drainage in the parking lot; the drainage calculations and stormwater management would take that into account. Mr. Litchfield will work with the Fire Department to see what can be stored together. Mr. Waterman said drainage calculations along with the Stormwater O&M plans

could be provided by the end of the week. He does not have any O&M maintenance records. An analysis of the system will need to be done to see if it is working properly since there are no records available. We need to know how it is working now, does it meet the drainage requirements for stormwater, and what needs to be done to improve it.

Mr. Perreault asked for the board's comments. Mr. Firmin had no issues. Ms. Guldner had no issues. Ms. Poretsky asked if the amount of chemicals was the same as before or were there added chemicals. Mr. Pisani assumed they were the same since nothing has changed as far as machines, processes, etc. They do not make chemicals. The largest volume they have is a coolant; other than that, it's paints, cleaners, things of that nature. She asked if a tight tank is required for sprinklers or containment. Mr. Litchfield said they are connected to town sewer; generally, floor drains can be connected to town sewer, it depends on what is stored within the building. Some of the MSDS sheets submitted with the chemical list said they should be kept from sewer, drains and waterways. If there is an issue with sprinkler water mixing with the chemicals a tight tank might be needed.

For the board to better understand, Mr. Pisani gave an explanation of what Matec does and how it works. They build non-destructive ultrasonic testing equipment, primarily for aerospace customers (Boeing, Cessna, Lockheed, all major airlines); they work with defense and military bases. The part is already made and they need to know that the integrity of it is good. Matec builds the system for the customer that will allow the customer to inspect their parts; it shoots sound through the part so it can find any defects or voids in the part before it goes for the final use. They have a machine shop; software team; everything is done in-house. Because they build specifically to the part, every system is a new system.

Ms. Capobianco had no issues. Mr. Perreault said some information/details are needed before the Committee would feel comfortable recommending approval. Mr. Litchfield said the additional information required is noted in his comment letter of September 3<sup>rd</sup> and said it should be continued to the next meeting in order for him to work with the applicant and engineer. Ms. Capobianco made a motion to continue the review of NB Real Estate LLC's application for 56 Hudson Street to October 13, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.; Ms. Guldner seconded; roll call vote: Firmin-aye; Guldner-aye; Poretsky-aye; Capobianco-aye; Perreault-aye; motion approved.

**Old/New Business:**

Ms. Capobianco made a motion to approve the July 14, 2020 meeting minutes as amended; Ms. Poretsky seconded; roll call vote: Firmin-aye; Guldner-aye; Poretsky-aye; Capobianco-aye; Perreault-aye; motion approved.

October 13, 2020 was confirmed as the next meeting.

Ms. Capobianco made a motion to adjourn; Ms. Poretsky seconded; roll call vote: Firmin-aye; Guldner-aye; Poretsky-aye; Capobianco-aye; Perreault-aye; motion approved. The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melanie Rich  
Committee Secretary