



January 24, 2011

Mr. Adam Bossi, Administrator
Wetland Committee/NRC
525 Washington Street
Wellesley, MA 02482

Subject: Wellesley Country Club (WCC) Proposed Maintenance Facility Location

Dear Adam:

As the Wetland Committee requested at its last WCC hearing, the Friends of Brookside offer the following sites as preferred and alternate locations for the proposed maintenance facility. Please note that 24"x36" mapping (entitled Sheet 1 and 2) is attached that shows eight sites that, based on our analysis, are feasible. All eight are outside of utility easements. All are outside of, or barely intruding into, 100-foot buffer zones to BVW or streams. All are entirely outside of any Riverfront zones. Topography is not an impediment for any of these sites.

In addition, we have used an 80x240-foot footprint for the proposed facility, a highly conservative assumption as WCC is current operating out of an area that is, for all purposes, less than half that size. We have also been careful to site the proposed facility in areas that are accessible and do not intrude into the fairways or rough.

I note for the record that the mapping submitted to us and to Beals & Thomas is old and does not show existing conditions. For instance, the former clubhouse that was razed is shown on the Conoco maps as an existing facility. A practice putting green that now exists behind the current maintenance facility is not shown. A large portion of fairways between Brookside and Forest Streets are crosshatched on the Conoco plans and identified as, "Renovated Golf Holes." We have to presume that this indicates that the fairways have been reconfigured or otherwise altered. Consequently, we are unable to accurately assess whether there are feasible alternate maintenance facility locations in this vicinity. Parking in the vicinity of the new clubhouse is not shown accurately. Given that WCC has denied me access to the site, I am unable to "ground truth" selected areas, an additional and inexplicable impediment to any transparent and constructive process.

Working from outdated mapping furnished by the proponent is clearly counterproductive, and our frustration is acerbated by our discovery that more accurate aerial maps are available on the Internet. **The use by the designer of outdated mapping raises many issues, not the least being whether Conoco's analysis to date is reliable, particularly as it appears to be based on the same older material that was sent to us.**

Regardless, after crosschecking our proposals against accurate aerial mapping, we believe these alternate locations are feasible. Most important, all are far less environmentally damaging than the proposed Brookside Road location.

As noted, all alternate locations shown on our mapping use the WCC 80x240-foot footprint. This footprint creates a building that is close to one-half acre in size without counting the second floor area. Such an area is unusually large for an 18-hole golf course maintenance facility. I note this because if the building size were even slightly smaller, other areas we do not show on these plans become available. Working closely with an architectural firm might allow WCC to be more creative in its siting analysis. As it is, the required footprint becomes a blunt instrument that is far less than sensitive to the physical constraints on the course.

Locations are numbered on the maps, and a brief narrative description of each location follows:

Location Comments

- 1 Located between fairways in a largely wooded area north of the aqueduct and east of the existing maintenance facility. An existing WCC utility roadway would have to be rerouted, which is feasible and inexpensive. The proposed use is outside of all buffer zones.
- 2 Located directly east of and beside the existing maintenance facility on Wellesley Ave. Outside of fairways and outside of buffer zones. Excellent vehicular access.
- 3 Located at the existing Tennis Facility. There is sufficient area and vehicular access is excellent. Site 3 would displace an existing facility.
- 4 Located in the driving range directly west of the outside tennis courts. Access is excellent and the proposed use is away from buffer zones.
- 5 Located in the vicinity of the old clubhouse and directly west of the existing pool facility. A maintenance facility in this location would have to be sensitively designed to avoid actual and visual impacts to the historic remains directly south of this location. Despite these constraints there appears to be ample room to site a facility. Existing sewer lines might have to be relocated; vehicular access could be entirely from within the WCC property. Our schematic shows a building just touching the 100-buffer line, but a facility could easily be designed so that it was entirely outside that buffer and is sensitive to historic concerns.
- 6 Located in a triangular area between Wellesley Ave. and Forest Street, Site 6 would displace the existing paddle courts, which could be relocated. Paddle court construction is inexpensive, and relocation closer to the clubhouse is logical. In addition, this location is largely hidden from public view. As with all of our proposed sites, access is excellent and the location is outside of buffer zones.
- 7 Beside Forest Street, Site 7 lies outside of the fairways and rough. Parking and vehicular access could be from the sides of the facility. The location is outside of buffer zones and utility easements.
- 8 Site 8, the last of our alternatives, is also the most logical--and least expensive. Use of this location would allow WCC to either expand the existing maintenance facility, or to raze it and build an entirely new one.

There are no environmental constraints, no zoning impediments and no utility easement issues.

Finally, I suggest to the Committee that they consider hosting a daytime technical meeting between the experts for all interested parties. To be productive this meeting should occur before the next public hearing. Such a meeting might have one or two of the Committee members and representatives from Beals & Thomas, Conoco and my firm. The purpose of the meeting would be to work through remaining issues such as zoning, costs, and environmental and historic constraints--all issues that might impede facility siting.

Working technical meetings that result in an understanding about outstanding issues are frequently far more effective than conducting the same analysis in an evening meeting. This is particularly the case when, as with this application, some of the interested parties only have partial information on which to form opinions.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick Garner". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized font.

Patrick Garner
PLS, Wetland Scientist, Hydrologist

Attachments: 2 Sets of Conoco Sheets 1 & 2