Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs MEPA Office

Environmental Notification Form

Executive Office of Environmental Affairs EOEA No.: 14224 MEPA Analyst: Holly Johnson Phone: 617-626-1023

For Office Use Only

The information requested on this form must be completed to begin MEPA Review in accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, 301 CMR 11.00.

Project Name: Woodland Meadows							
Street: 84_Turnpike Road							
Municipality: Southborough		Watershed: Sudbury					
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates:		Latitude: 42°17'36.2"					
N 4685180 E293290		Longitude: 71°30'27.5"					
Estimated commencement date: 4/01/09		Estimated completion date: 10/30/10					
Approximate cost:		Status of project design: 100 %complete					
Proponent: Woodland Meadows LLC							
Street: P.O. Box 745							
Municipality: Natick		State:MA	Zip Code:0				
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained:							
Meaghan Mayo							
Firm/Agency: Connorstone Engineering		Street: 10 Southwest Cutoff, Suite 7					
Municipality: Northborough		State: Ma	Zip Code: 01532				
Phone: (508) 393-9727 F	ax: (50	8) 393-5242	E-mail: Mtm	n@csei.i	net		
Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?							
□Yes (EOEA No) ⊠No							
Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before?							
Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) requesting: a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8))							
a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11)	Yes		No				

a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11) Identify any financial assistance or land transfer from an agency of the Commonwealth, including the agency name and the amount of funding or land area (in acres): <u>State subsidy under</u>

MassHousing (Housing Starts) or New England Fund.

Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: Local: *Comprehensive Permit (40B). Federal: NPDES*

RECEIVED

MAR 2 1 2008

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):

🗌 Land	Rare Species	🗌 Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands
🗌 Water	U Wastewater	Transportation
Energy	🗋 Air	🔲 Solid & Hazardous Waste
ACEC	Regulations	Historical & Archaeological
		Resources

Summary of Project Size	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits &					
& Environmental Impacts				Approvals					
	AND			Order of Conditions					
Total site acreage	8			Superseding Order of Conditions					
New acres of land altered		2.3		Chapter 91 License					
Acres of impervious area	0	1.3	1.3	401 Water Quality Certification					
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		3158		 Certification MHD or MDC Access Permit Water Management Act Permit New Source Approval DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit 					
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		0							
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0							
STRU	JCTURES			Other Permits					
Gross square footage				(including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:					
Number of housing units	0	40	40	40B Permit					
Maximum height (in feet)	0								
TRANS	PORTATION								
Vehicle trips per day	0	391	391						
Parking spaces	0	94	94						
WATER/W	VASTEWAT	ER							
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	0	6820	6820						
GPD water withdrawal	0	0	0						
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	0	6820	6820						
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	W:0, S:0	W:0.20 S:0	W:0.20 S:0						

<u>CONSERVATION LAND</u>: Will the project involve the conversion of public parkland or other Article 97 public natural resources to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97?

)

_)

Yes (Specify

r

⊠No

Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, preservation restriction, agricultural preservation restriction, or watershed preservation restriction?

Yes (Specify

⊠No

RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habitat of Rare Species, Vernal Pools, Priority Sites of Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?

HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does the project site include any structure, site or district listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth? ☐Yes (Specify_____) ⊠No If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of any listed or inventoried historic or archaeological resources? ☐Yes (Specify_____) ⊠No

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is the project in or adjacent to an Area of Critical Environmental Concern?

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should include (a) a description of the project site, (b) a description of both on-site and off-site alternatives and the impacts associated with each alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off-site mitigation measures for each alternative (*You may attach one additional page, if necessary.*)

(a) Woodland Meadows LLC is proposing to construct a 40-unit apartment building, on an eight acre parcel, on the east side of Woodland Road just south of Turnpike Road (Route 9). The northern portion of the site is in the Business Village Zone and the Southern portion is in the Residence A zone..

Currently most of the site is open field, brush and new growth woodlands. The site is sloped moderately steeply from the abutting properties to the east down to the wetlands along the western edge of the site. A small stream channel flows through the site, entering the site from the abutting property to the south and exiting the site through a culvert under Woodland Road on the west side of the site.

The USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) has mapped the soils on site as Merrimac, Paxton, Woodbridge and Swansea Muck, which are hydrologic soil groups A, C, C and D, respectively. A wetland complex transects the site along the west side, bordering a small stream. There are no areas on site designated by the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Atlas as critical or habitat for rare or endangered species.

(b) The Proponent has examined other uses for the property including a miniature golf course, self-storage facility, and a Dairy Queen (or similar restaurant), however zoning issues, wetlands issues and market forces have conspired to make an affordable housing project the most attractive alternative. The environmental impacts from each of the options are similar, with minor differences, such as the following:

1. The self-storage facility and the Mini-golf are not allowed uses under the zoning by-law and therefore required a special permit. Substantial public opposition to those proposals made them undesirable to pursue with approval being unlikely.

2. The traffic impacts of the Self-storage are substantially less than any other options however the mini-golf and Dairy Queen had the possibility of Substantially more traffic.

3. The mini-golf proposal may have necessitated additional wetlands impacts.

4. Each of the rejected proposals had lower water use and smaller septic system requirements.

Off-site alternatives are severely limited by the fact that the proponent does not own other similar properties in this area.

(c) The mitigation contemplated with the proposal is the dedication of open space.