TOWN OF BRIDGEWATER

Notice of Posted Meeting to all
Town Departments, Boards and Committees and the General Public:
(as required by Chapter 39, M.G.L.)

PLANNING BOARD MEETING

DATE: 2 August 2017

TIME: 6:30 pm

PLACE: Council Chamber, Room 203
Academy Building
66 Central Square

6:30 Firefly Lane public hearing continuation
438 Summer Street-Map 49, Lot 99.

6:30-Trinity Circle-off Ashtead Road-Public hearing continuation. Map 100, Lot 90 and Map 87, Lot 142

6:30- Site plan public hearing-160 fireworks Circle
Luongo Brothers LLC Map 88, Lot 97)

Board Business:

Modification of Lakeshore Center
Right of first refusal- Jay Leach-South Street

Donald Brownell

REGULAR MEETING **BRIDGEWATER PLANNING BOARD** **AUGUST 2, 2017**

The regular meeting of the Bridgewater Planning Board convened at 6:30 pm.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Ms. Guarino, Mr. Ajemian and Mr. Hall

ALSO PRESENT; Mr. Etoniru, Town Engineer
Mr. Paul Malone, resident considering an appointment to the Board

FIREFLY LANE-438 SUMMER STREET-PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

The public hearing reconvened at 6:31 pm.
Ms. Guarino read a letter from Attorney Vieira, on behalf of Greg Maroney, the applicant. He requested that the hearing be further continued to September 6th with an extension in time for action to Sept. 31st. The Board's agenda was full on Sept. 6th, so with the approval of Mr. Maroney, and a promise to get a further extension to the Board to October 31, 2017, **a motion was made by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall to continue the hearing to September 20th at 6:30 pm.**

TRINITY CIRCLE PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

The public hearing reconvened at 6:33 pm.
Correspondence received from Mr. Etoniru read into the record:

This email transmission shall serve as a follow-up project review correspondence to the email below, and the email I transmitted on June 19, 2017 regarding the above subject matter. The current documents reviewed include: 1, the definitive subdivision plan (*composed of twelve sheets, some of which bear a latest revision date of June 14, 2017; and others bear a latest revision date of May 12, 2017*); 2, stormwater report revised June 12, 2017; and 3, a June 12, 2017 correspondence addressed to the Bridgewater Planning Board (*BPB*) by Silva Engineering Associates, P.C. (*SEA*). The following paragraph(s) enumerates my review comments on the latest documents reviewed.

1, all of the plan sheets should bear the same revision dates for proper tracking and ease of reference; 2, I very much appreciate the historical perspective provided in the aforementioned June 12, 2017 correspondence but categorically reject the assertion made therein: "It is my professional opinion that the flow along this channel is the responsibility of the Town of Bridgewater" for this simple reason: approval of projects by the BPB, including its approval of subdivisions, does not make it responsible for any deficient engineering design work or for that matter, a development project that may have been abandoned by the developer! 3, the proposed Trinity Circle subdivision site is simply fraught with technical difficulties because of the poor quality insitu soils, the presence of wetlands, and inadequate topographic relief that would have otherwise ensured continuous downstream flow of stormwater runoff away from the site's southern-southeastern fringe where runoff currently pools over a long period of time before gaining any energy head that would engender downstream flowage; 4, the locations of the

April 27, 2017 soil evaluation holes (*test pits*) excavated within the new drainage basin area are incorrectly labeled: the easterly test pit is labeled TP-West and the westerly test pit is labeled TP-East; 4a, the applicable groundwater elevation at the basin location is 82.77 not 82.50; 5, the proposed cross-country drainage pipe system within the easement located on lots 5 and 6 would involve substantial temporary work within the wetlands, as well as future maintenance work within the wetlands. This work could be avoided by connecting the existing culvert and the pipe from Ashtead Road at the manhole located at roadway station 1 + 50 into the proposed road drainage system that is routed to the drainage basin. This would also limit the number of discharge pipes to one; 6, the exfiltration rate of 2.410 in/hr. applied to the surface area of the drainage basin is inconsistent with the more restrictive insitu layer found underneath the medium sand layer. **An exfiltration rate of 1.02 in/hr. should be used**. The 1.02 in/hr. exfiltration rate, however, is a significant improvement over the 0.27 in/hr. rate that was applicable to the prior drainage basin locations; 7, the stormwater analysis assumes surface exfiltration of runoff into the soils beneath the basin. However, once significant vegetated cover is realized over the surface of the basin, runoff exfiltration will not be achieved. A method of routing or introducing runoff into the soils underneath the basin should be incorporated into the design; 8, the computed peak elevation of stormwater within the drainage basin is 86.83 during the 100 year storm event. The invert elevation of the emergency spillway is set at 87.80 on the plan. **The invert elevation of the spillway should be set at 86.83 in order to obviate any possibility of the basin's dike being undermined**; 9, several of the drainage conduits do not meet the required minimum design velocity of 3 fps under the actual flow conditions; 10, drainage manhole #DMH 5 is specified as a four (4) foot diameter manhole. This is not practical! This manhole is designed with four 15 inch conduits entering into the structure, and one 24 inch conduit exiting the structure! The four (4) foot diameter specified would simply not work. Four 15 inch pipes and one 24 inch pipe add up to seven (7) feet, so one is left wondering how a four (4) foot diameter manhole could support a seven (7) foot need, the note added on detail sheet 9 of 12 notwithstanding! Specific details for oversized manholes must be provided in order to ascertain that the structures are structurally sound; 11, while it is neither the Town Engineer's nor the Planning Board's responsibility to participate in the design of the project, a cursory evaluation of all of the elements of the site would suggest that incorporation of additional surface area into the stormwater basin would increase the available volume and reduce the pressure on trying to achieve the necessary volume by depth, especially in light of the high seasonal groundwater level at the site. This, of course, may result in the number of the lots being 7 instead of 8!

It should be noted, however, that the revised plan and the revised stormwater management report do represent a significant improvement over the prior plan and report submittals.

Mr. Silva said he had two sets of plans that shows the changes that he has made based upon Azu's comments and he reviewed each one with the Board:

TE Comment 1: All of the plan sheets should bear the same revision dates for proper tracking and ease of reference.

SEA Response: The final revised plans all have the date of August 1, 2017.

TE Comment 2: I very much appreciate the historical perspective provided in the aforementioned June 12, 2017 correspondence but categorically reject the assertion made therein: "It is my professional opinion that the flow along this channel is the responsibility of the Town of Bridgewater" for this simple reason: approval of projects by the BPB, including its approval of subdivisions, does not make it responsible for any deficient engineering design work or for that matter, a development project that may have been abandoned by the developer!

SEA Response: Agree to disagree-his assertion was that Ashtead was accepted by the Town of Bridgewater so it is a public right of way and a public drainage system. He said they are on Trinity property but the right to use them was excluded in their purchase and sale agreement with the owner and they never had any responsibility for the drainage.

TE Comment 3: The proposed Trinity Circle subdivision site is simply fraught with technical difficulties because of the poor quality insitu soils, the presence of wetlands, and inadequate topographic relief that would have otherwise ensured continuous downstream flow of stormwater runoff away from the site's southern-southeastern fringe where runoff currently pools over a long period of time before gaining any energy head that would engender downstream flowage.

SEA Response: Agree that site is relatively flat with engineering challenges.

TE Comment 4: The locations of the April 27, 2017 soil evaluation holes (test pits) excavated within the new drainage basin area are incorrectly labeled: the easterly test pit is labeled TP-West and the westerly test pit is labeled TP-East.

SEA Response: The test pit location labels have been corrected.

TE Comment 4a: The applicable groundwater elevation at the basin location is 82.77 not 82.50;

SEA Response: The applicable groundwater elevation at the basin has been adjusted to elevation 82.8. As such the basin design bottom elevation has been adjusted from elevation 85.5 to elevation 85.8.

TE Comment 5: The proposed cross-country drainage pipe system within the easement located on lots 5 and 6 would involve substantial temporary work within the wetlands, as well as future maintenance work within the wetlands. This work could be avoided by connecting the existing culvert and the pipe from Ashtead Road at the manhole located at roadway station 1 + 50 into the proposed road drainage

system that is routed to the drainage basin. This would also limit the number of discharge pipes to one.

SEA Response: **A drain manhole located at approximately 2+40 is proposed to connect the existing culvert and pipe from Ashtead Road and convey the storm water to be rear of Drainage Lot 1. This will avoid work within the wetlands.**

TE Comment 6: *The exfiltration rate of 2.410 in/hr. applied to the surface area of the drainage basin is inconsistent with the more restrictive insitu layer found underneath the medium sand layer.* ***An exfiltration rate of 1.02 in/hr. should be used****. The 1.02 in/hr. exfiltration rate, however, is a significant improvement over the 0.27 in/hr. rate that was applicable to the prior drainage basin locations;*

SEA Response: **The drainage evaluation has been revised. An exfiltration rate of 1.02 in/hr has been applied to the basin. The basin as designed , still has sufficient storage capacity with the reduced rate of infiltration.**

TE Comment7: The stormwater analysis assumes surface exfiltration of runoff into the soils beneath the basin. However, once significant vegetated cover is realized over the surface of the basin, runoff exfiltration will not be achieved. A method of routing or introducing runoff into the soils underneath the basin should be incorporated into the design.

SEA Response: **The use of a concrete galley with beehive grate has been incorporated into the revised plan set. These two basin wicks will encourage infiltration even after vegetation is established, and during the winter months.**

TE Comment 8: The computed peak elevation of stormwater within the drainage basin is 86.83 during the 100-year storm event. The invert elevation of the emergency spillway is set at 87.80 on the plan. ***The invert elevation of the spillway should be set at 86.83 in order to obviate any possibility of the basin's dike being undermined****;*

SEA Response: **The changes outlined above (the elevation of the basin bottom and the exfiltration rate) required adjustments to the outlet control structure. This included adjustments to the elevation of the v-notch and rectangular weir. These adjustments were also needed to ensure that peak rate and volume remain at 90% pre-development numbers. Due to these changes, the 100-year elevation is now estimated at 87.46. The emergency spillway elevation on the revised plan set is now at elevation 87.5**

Mr. Etoniru said that he could review these changes and comment by Friday.

On a motion by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to August 16th at 7:00.

PUBLIC HEARING-160 FIREWORKS CIRCLE-LOUNGO BROTHERS, LLC

The public hearing convened at 7:16 pm.

Ms. Guarino read the public hearing notice that appeared in the Enterprise on 7/19 and 7/26/17.

Mr. Silva submitted the notification green cards from the abutters.

Correspondence received:

Chief Levy- No questions at this time
Ron Ladue-No adverse affects
Site Narrative- elevations included-proposed to be similar to what is at #150 Fireworks Circle. Gives a project description, parking requirements, lot coverage, drainage, utilities, sketch of the building and an operation and a maintenance schedule

Azu Etoniru email of 8/2/17-

I have completed my review of the site plan for the above subject location. The documents I reviewed include: a plan titled ("Site Plan" Assessor's Map 88, Lot 97, 160 Fireworks Circle, Bridgewater, Massachusetts, July 11, 2017) by Silva Engineering Associates, P.C. (SEA), said plan is composed of three sheets; and a report titled "Drainage Evaluation, Assessor's Map 88, Lot 97, 160 Fireworks Circle, Bridgewater, Massachusetts, July 12, 2017" by SEA. The plan and the stormwater management report appear satisfactory. The proposed site plan seeks to maintain an existing shed on the lot line. While the applicant may also own the abutting land, the Board should not allow any mingling of the uses on the two lots, otherwise the lots should be combined by the applicant. No building elevation and floor plan has been provided. The site plan should include solid-waste storage and management component, as well as snow management discussion. Proposed facility lighting and signage have not been provided. Other than the items listed in the preceding paragraph, I do not have any comments that could be deemed adverse to an approval of the site plan with conditions.

Mr. Silva said he did not have a response letter tonight because he had received the email this afternoon, but he did go through the site plan to try and address the issues raised by Azu. They are proposing to move the shed to be in compliance with zoning even thought lots are in common ownership. He said he understood the point if one of the lots were sold that it could be an issue. He illustrated where the dumpster would be located (adjacent to the shed at the rear of the building). They have identified areas for snow storage (on two sides of the front and at the back side of the building). He didn't have a detail of the lighting but would be using wall packs on the building similar to the ones used at #150. He will provide the cut sheet for that. As far as the sign is concerned, it will be mounted on the building. There will be no stand alone sign. The whole area of the site is pretty much gravel except for the area of the handicap parking. Mr. Driscoll asked if there were any plantings or green space. Mr. Silva said they are in the fence business and there is a perimeter fence around the lot for their privacy; he commented that it is an Industrial subdivision and if you look around there really isn't much landscaping on the very small lots.

On a motion by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to approve the site plan with the typical conditions of approval for a site plan and subject to receiving a revised plan showing the following: shed location, snow storage areas, light locations and final review by the Town Engineer.

CLAREMONT-LAKESHORE CENTER-MODIFICATION OF SUBDIVISION PLAN

Mr. Driscoll advised Mr. Silva that this isn't a posted meeting agenda....received under board business; only discussion tonight will be to determine whether the request is a major or minor modification.

Mr. Silva said there were some waivers granted in 1988 for the original subdivision plan. He had the plan with him.

Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Silva to explain the modification in basic terms. Mr. Silva said it involves the re-routing of the roadway which results in different lot configurations. Mr. Driscoll questioned what that did to the drainage calculations? Mr. Silva said that when you look at the original drainage, some of the drainage controls are in the wetlands by today's standards. He said that the drainage for the lot that the Board has plans for

Mr. Ajemian felt this was a major modification. Mr. Etoniru commented that they are changing the location of the road and it was presented to him as just changing the pavement width; he said it should be a major modification. Mr. Driscoll commented he noticed that a new drainage report had been included with the application; that must be reviewed by Mr. Etoniru. Mr. Driscoll noted that according to the scale, the road is moving 300' to the east.

Mr. Ajemian made a motion to consider the change to the subdivision of Lakeshore Corporate Center as a major modification. It was seconded by Mr. Hall. Mr. Driscoll questioned if this would delay the application we received today for Lot 3 office building? Mr. Etoniru stated that the new office building is relative to the new road layout; the plans for that can be reviewed, he said; you can actually do them in tandem; just have to approve the change in road before approving the site plan. He questioned if this was considered a minor modification, what mechanism would we have to review that? Mr. Silva said he was not present at the discussion held with Mr. Carney and Andrew with comments brought back to the Board that it was a minor modification and that is why it was submitted that way with minor modification fees.

Vote: unanimously in favor of considering the changes to be major modifications.

Mr. Silva requested that a letter be sent to the Carneys outlining the reasons why it was determined to be a major modification.

Mr. Driscoll commented that from his perspective it is a road in a different location; a road with new drainage and needs to be reviewed.

MOTION: Mr. Ajemian

THAT: The following is a basis for the determination that it is a major modification rather than a minor modification as submitted;

1. **The road layout is in a different location than originally approved; actually moved 300'.**
2. **It requires a review of the drainage system as it is a different design.**
3. **There may be other reasons based upon the number of waivers being requested.**

Mr. Ajemian questioned whether the board can actually go forward with the office building public hearing because it is assuming that we will approve the major modification. Mr. Etoniru felt that doesn't make the assumption that you are approving it; you can look both at the same time, but you can't approve the office site plan until you actually vote on the modification.
SECONDED: Mr. Hall
VOTE; UNANIMOUS

Mr. Silva noted that when you go back to the original subdivision plan, the wetlands were in a different position so the balancing of where the lots were and what made sense for the lot is a little bit different now; so, in order to get that balance, bringing the road out made more sense. Mr. Driscoll questioned if the drainage was in the same area? Mr. Silva said it is in a similar area; not the same. It is going into the same wetland system. Mr. Ajemian suggested that the discussion be saved until the public hearing.

CHAPTER 61A- SOUTH STREET REALTY TRUST-JAY LEACH-584 SOUTH STREET

The Board received a copy of a letter from Jay Leach to Michael Dutton dated July 3rd, which he said serves as notice of the intent to transfer ownership of land by South Street Realty Trust for three residential lots on South Street. The Town of Bridgewater would have to define its intent regarding the right of First Refusal...property description Parcel ID 74-39.

The Board received an email from Michael Spagone on July 20th requesting the Board to review the letter from Mr. Leach. There was no accompanying documentation or plan. Mrs. Dorr had a copy of the Form A plan endorsed by the Board on 5/3/17 and assumed these were the lots in question.

Mr. Driscoll commented that if it was the larger piece of land, we might want to consider recommending purchase; however, these are 25,000 sq.ft lots with frontage on South Street. Mr. Etoniru that it really serves no purpose for the town to consider purchasing 3 single family lots; There is no benefit to the Town

On a motion by Mr.Hall, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, that the Board recommend to the Town Manager that we do not exercise our right of 1st refusal for these three Form A lots under Chapter 61A.

A letter dated July 21, 2017 received from Lane Planning, Inc. with reference to the Rolling Pines Drive drainage. Letter will be referred to the Town Engineer and will be put under board business at the next meeting.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall, the meeting was adjourned at 7:54 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED: _____ 1/17/18

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED FOR AUGUST 2, 2017 MEETING

OCPC Joint Transportation Committee- Agenda for 8/3/17

Town of East Bridgewater Zoning Board- decision Case No. 8-17- 335 East Street-O'Sullivan