

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Ajemian, Tom Hall and Jean Guarino

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Delonno and Mr. Etoniru

CLAREMONT PARKING LOT-PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

The public hearing reconvened at 6:31pm

Steve Carvalho, engineer from Farland Corp., submitted revised plans dated November 21, 2016. He said he had supplied a copy to Azu this morning along with a signed, dated copy of the drainage report.

He also submitted a copy of the 81X plan that was recorded in the Registry of Deeds.

Email from Azu Etoniru, Town Engineer, read into the record:

He had the opportunity to review the revised site plan bearing a latest date of November 8, 2016, along with an undated and unsigned/unstamped stormwater management report prepared by Farland Corp. It's my understanding the applicant has recorded an 81X plan combining all of the lands into a single parcel instead of filing an ANR (Form A) plan for combining the lands. However, since the applicant owns all of the adjoining parcels, I suppose an 81X plan would be appropriate because the surveyor's certification is to affirm that no new lines of division of existing ownerships or for new ways are being shown on the plan. However, a copy of the recorded 81X plan was not included in the revised plan set. With the 81X plan, the special permit application can now be amended to reflect a special permit modification in order to cure/remove the zoning use cloud over the original application for a stand-alone parking plan. The revised stormwater management report should be signed, stamped and dated by the licensed civil engineer responsible for it! The drainage plan includes the disconnection of the existing stormwater conduit that conveys runoff from the northeasterly end of the land at 2018 Pleasant Street to the existing catch basin that is tributary to the outfall discharging to the lake. The Board should include a condition of approval that mandates the actual disconnection of the existing conduit from the catch basin in question; and prohibit any discharge of the site's stormwater runoff into the Pleasant Street drainage system by overland flow or by subsurface connection. The Board should require a certification statement prepared by a licensed civil engineer which shall verify for the Board compliance with the prohibition condition upon completion of the parking lot construction. Specifications relative to size and weight of the stones to be used in constructing the drainage aprons/pad and spillways should be included on the plan. Specifications for the drainage basin outlet control structure shown on plan sheet 7 of 7, including concrete strength, reinforcing rods, dimensions of the structure, etc. should be included on the plan. The electric line labeled ETC on the plan calls for the removal and disposal of the line. What is proposed as the source of power for the light poles in the parking lot? The

cutting and capping of the respective water service lines to the dwellings at 2018 and 2020 should be inspected by the Water Dept. prior to placement of any backfill material!

Mr. Carvalho explained the changes made to the plan based upon Azu's comments/recommendations. He said he had no disagreement with any of the comments and he feels that he has satisfied all of his concerns. Azu stated that he is satisfied with the responses to his comments.

Mr. Driscoll spoke about the landscaping and asked why the landscaping shown on the plan wasn't continued to the left to provide additional screening. Mr. Carvahlo said they have a level area near the detention basin; it is a 3-1 slope in that area; he said it was possible; however, they had concern about mulch washing down into the bottom of the depressed area. They focused on the area closest to the abutter. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Etoniru if he was pretty sure that the lights won't shine into the residential homes across the street; Mr. Etoniru said yes due to the type of lighting they specify. Mr. Driscoll asked about the car head lights shining while going into the parking spots. Mr. Etoniru stated that buffering was always a preferred option and any additional vegetation would be advisable. Mr. Driscoll said he mentioned at the last meeting that they consider a more residential looking light rather than a commercial light and asked if that is something they will be considering? Mr. Carvahlo said they would prefer not to mix the lights; the lights at the Claremont office building and hotel are the same ones being used. Mr. Driscoll mentioned the lights at the funeral home parking lot being one of a lantern type than a street light. Mr. Carvahlo stated that he felt it would look funny mixing them, but he would be happy to look at it. Mr. Etoniru said he didn't do a comparison of lights; however, the specifications for the ones they are using will not shed light beyond their boundaries due to the LED lighting they have. Mr. Driscoll commented that if Azu felt it was ok, that is fine; he is just trying to minimize any impacts for the houses on the lake. He asked again if the buffering could continue over to the left. Mr. Carvahlo commented that shouldn't be an issue. Mr. Driscoll asked if any of the plantings shown had some height to them to block the lights from cars. Mr. Carvahlo spoke about not using hedges due to the fact that it would create a hidden and secluded spot and for security reasons they would rather not. There was one tall tree shown. Mr. Ajemian agreed with Mr. Driscoll that the vegetation should be all the way across. He also stated that he felt the lights should stay the same as long as there is no increase in lighting.

Mr. Sullivan questioned the fact that the special permit that was issued for the hotel was specific to lots; these two lots were not originally included. Mr. Delonno explained that is why they are also before the board tonight for a minor modification to the site plan and why the 81X plan was prepared to combine the two house lots with the hotel. There was a question raised if these houses were included in the overlay district. Mr. Delonno said yes.

Pat Neary, Lakeside Drive, commented that she is pleased to see that the two houses will become a parking lot; however, she is concerned about the lighting. She said she lives a good distance down Lakeside Drive, but in talking with her neighbors the existing lights affect the neighborhood...more lights, if the same, really is not acceptable, she said, if it is the same style. She commented that down lights would be acceptable to her; if the existing ones are down lights, they are not the proper kind. The DOT facility and the hotel are really impacting the neighborhood she said, and she wished they would take that into consideration.

Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Etoniru if he felt there was too much lighting on the site? Mr. Etoniru said it must be a balance between public safety and the neighborhood and the buffering that you are asking for; the lighting shouldn't cast glare; you don't want to get to a point that you can't see what is in there, he said. Mr. Driscoll noted that there are only 6 lights proposed. Pat Neary expressed concern that trees take a long time to grow so the planting of trees will not help them now. Mr. Etoniru stated that the Board can require a minimum height in their conditions of approval.

Bernice Morrissey-Lakeside Drive-stated that this area of the Hockomock Swamp, where it abuts 10 communities, is known for its night sky so she echo's Pat's concerns about the lights. She expressed concerns about drainage; she felt the Town should take some responsibility for those drainage sites that exist in numerous locations off the Claremont site that go up as far as Rozenas that are not functioning. She spoke about extreme flooding occurring behind one of those houses and should be considered in the drainage. She complimented Claremont for doing some upland vegetation and getting rid of some very invasive species on the other side of the road from the site we are talking about. Mr. Driscoll noted that some of the recommendations suggested by Mr. Etoniru should help the overall quality of the drainage and flooding issues.

Modification request discussed. The application states that the original permit was dated 4/16/99 and the nature of the modification is to allow the construction of a 60 space parking lot and associated grading and drainage. Mr. Driscoll questioned if this is really the modification or is it to combine the two houses with the hotel? Mr. Delonno said he wasn't sure about the original special permit was crafted, but the permission was for this to be used in combination with the hotel property so this is not considered a standalone use. The special permit is for the use. The 81X plan that was submitted combines the two house lots into the hotel lot.

On a motion by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Hall, it was unanimously voted to accept and approve the modification.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted to close the public hearing on the Special Permit application.

Mr. Driscoll suggested having Mr. Etoniru draft conditions and the Board vote at the December 5th meeting.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall, it was unanimously voted to vote on the application on December 5th at 6:45 pm.

FIREFLY LANE PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

The public hearing reconvened at 7:08 pm.

Letter read dated 11/21 from Daniel Vieira, representing the Applicant, Maroney Building & contracting, Inc. He requested a continuance of the public hearing to the second meeting of December. As a secondary matter, his client requests that the Planning Board engage the services on a peer review basis, at the applicant's expense, of Peter Fletcher for soil evaluations and Nicholas Lanney from HML Associates for Drainage design review.

A letter dated 11/21/16 from Gregory Maroney read: requested a continuance and the hiring of 2 outside consultants.

Mr. Delonno explained that there was been a difference in opinion between the Town Engineer and the applicant's representative's as to what the existing conditions are on the site and that has bearing on the suitability for development.

Mr. Etoniru said his obligation is to the Town of Bridgewater to evaluate applications before the board. The reviews and comments that he has made on the drainage are indisputable; the calculations were not done properly; the sizing of the pipes, for example...on plan calls for a pipe is 18", calculations reflect a 15" pipe. Then he recommended that test pits be done at the location of the proposed drainage basins they have shown on the plan, test pits at the location of the basin, but no test pit data was reported. The closest test pit they have for the basin was actually 50' from the basin. Their finding established the mottles features that represent periods of wetness. He had recommended that specific test pits be done at the basin location and witnessed; they did not contact the Board's office for that. They found in those test pits soil classifications that were at variant with what they found 50' away. At which point he said while it might be possible that you will get that amount of change, it might be suspect if it has that dramatic difference. So they scheduled another test pit. Mr. Etoniru said he went out on 11/14 and dug three test pits and he found redoximorphic features at one pit at 60" and in another at 67" and another at 56" which when converted to elevations, would not yield the proper separation from the basin to the maximum groundwater. So, two things are in question: permeability of the soil...the material they are classifying as predominately sand would not and does not exhibit characteristic of sand. This material was very silty, he said.

Mr. Ajemian said he was totally against having someone else coming in. We have a Town Engineer that we should listen to his opinion. There is nothing from Mr. Miller, their engineer, indicating that he disagrees with Azu's assessment and why.

Mr. Maroney was present. He stated that the reason he wanted to get another opinion is because they had Eric Badger from the Board of Health out there and he did about 30 test pits for septic systems and he was in agreement with Jim Miller and another soil evaluator; they are all calling mottling at the same spot. Azu came up with a mottling at 2' higher in the area of the detention basin. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Maroney if he was on-site when the tests were done. Mr. Maroney said no. Mr. Etoniru noted that Mr. Badger is not witness the test pits taken at the detention basin. The one that he did witness which was the basis of the original comment was one reported at 50". He stated that Mr. Miller, as of this date, has not submitted his documentation or characterization of those three test pits. What is on the plans is what they recorded on their own; not what was witnessed. If you use the number that they produced, at 50' away, that new system will be in groundwater.

The Board unanimously agreed that they will not send the plans to another consultant; not going to set a precedence of sending out to another consultant if applicant doesn't like comments/recommendations.

Mr. Maroney granted an extension in time for board action to January 31, 2017.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to Jan 4th at 6:30 pm. The abutters were advised that meeting nights will be changed to Wednesday nights.

MILL STREET/PLYMOUTH STREET SPECIAL PERMIT PUBLIC HEARING-DYER

The public hearing convened at 7:42 pm.

Ad that appeared in the Enterprise on 11/7 and 11/14 read into the record. Green cards received. No abutters present.

Correspondence received read into the record:

1. Highway Supt-

- The Easterly side of Mill St has a continuous swale along the street side to the brook. This is an area that has 2 driveway openings and a proposed sidewalk. A plan of how surface water runoff in this area will continue to the brook should be presented.
- The lot encroaches on an Edison easement:
 - Infiltration system overflow drains onto the easement
 - Employee lot is on the easement
- Utility company vehicle access has been removed from the plan (Plymouth St entrance)
- HP ramps must comply with latest ADA specifications
- Town will not assume any responsibility for snow removal on sidewalks or parking lots
- Six inch granite curb on radii transitioning to Cape Cod berm is preferred at driveway openings
- Mill St was paved in Summer of 2016 – there is a 5 year moratorium preventing road cuts for utilities
- Refer to revisions set forth by National Grid, paragraph 3 (letter from Mike Koska, dated 10/6/16, Site Plan Modification)

2. Fire Chief-He has no problem with the change.

3. Azu Etoniru-

*He completed his review of the application for a site plan modification filed by Michael J Koska and Associates (MJKA) on behalf of Dyer Construction for the above subject location. The documents he reviewed include: **1**, an October 6, 2016 correspondence from MJKA addressed to the Board; **2**, a report titled: "Site Narrative (Lot 1, a portion of) Map 24, Lot 23 Mill Street Bridgewater, Mass." dated November 18, 2014, revised January 2015 and October 2016 by MJKA; **3**, a site plan (titled: "site plan modification Lot - 1 (A portion of Map 24 Lot 23) Plymouth and Mill Streets Bridgewater, Mass") dated October 5, 2016 by MJKA. Said site plan is composed of six sheets. The original site plan for the subject site was approved by the Board in 2015. The instant application for a site plan modification is engendered by a proposed use change from office only to office and restaurant use. The plan has been modified to reflect the required parking spaces and update of the stormwater management system. Town water and town sewer are available to the site. Based on my review of the aforementioned documents, it is my opinion that, the proposed modification is in harmony with the site plan requirements of the zoning bylaw, and it is consistent with the plan previously approved by the Board. However, a grease trap should be provided on-line for the restaurant kitchen prior to the E-1 sewer pump. Also, the required stormwater treatment volume within the grit chamber shall be provided within the first*

compartment of the chamber and the second compartment only needs to contain sufficient transient volume for the clarified effluent from the first compartment prior to discharge; so the second compartment can be only a 1,000 gallon compartment or even less. I would recommend approval of the site plan modification with a proviso that all other comments raised by the Board or other town departments would have been satisfactorily addressed, along with the foregoing comments regarding grease trap for the restaurant kitchen and the stormwater quality treatment volume composition within the grit chamber.

- 4. National Grid- Lori Loughlin-National Grid's transmission Line Engineering department has not had adequate time to review and comment on these modifications. She asked that the board please refrain from a final decision on the matter at this time it is imperative that National Grid limits uses within its rights of way for public safety, reliability and integrity of its facilities.**

Mr. Michael Koska presented the plan. He explained that their application is for a special permit under section 6.3.E.2 for a change in use from a warehouse to a restaurant and office space. The original site plan was signed 4/6/15 and other than the changes noted, the plan remains the same. The wetlands line that was done by Dr. Hewittson is current. The second sheet shows 7 parking spaces added toward the SW corner of the property. Parking requirements now call for 1 space for every 4 seats. (80 seats proposed, so 20 spaces for the restaurant and 25 for the office) Drainage design stays the same as it was because it was over designed to begin with. They have relocated the dumpster as previously requested by National Grid and got the snow storage of the National Grid easement. There is a proposed sidewalk that would go down to the 8 parking spaces. The 90X40 building remains the same The grit chamber in the area of the 8 parking spaces needs to be revised based upon a letter from Mr. Etoniru. The emergency overflow area is located just outside the 25' no touch buffer zone. He said he understands that he has to go back before conservation. There is an access road for the utility company to get down to their poles.

Mr. Koska said he was not aware of Mr. Ladue's letter, so he hasn't had a change to incorporate any comments or answer any of his questions. He said they have been in contact with National Grid; they are not impeding their access, he said.

Mr. Driscoll questioned if there are really those amounts of infiltrators in the small parking lot? Mr. Koska said yes; the soils in there are very difficult as they are taking in virgin property. Mr. Driscoll asked if the rendering of the building is the same. . There will be more glass in front along with brick on the bottom. Mr. Sullivan requested a schematic of the building.

On a motion by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to Dec. 5th at 7:00.

On a motion by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to adopt the 2017 schedule; includes changing meeting date to Wednesday nights.

It was decided to have Christmas dinner on Dec. 7th at 4:30 at the Fireside.

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Hall, the meeting was adjourned at 8:14.

MINUTES APPROVED:_____

