



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: September 6, 2017
TIME: 6:30 pm
PLACE: Council Chamber Room
Academy Building
66 Central Square

6:30--Trinity Circle public hearing continuation Off Ashtead Road-Map 100, Lot 90
and Map 87, Lot 142 ✕

✕ Oldfield Estates Cluster special permit Modification public hearing continuation

CONT Continuation - Oldfield Estates, II -Map 66, Lot 43 and Map 52, Lots 12-17, 19-21 & 32

? *CONT* ? Continuation on proposed changes to the subdivision rules and regulations

7:00 Continuation-Imhoff Solar Project-off Auburn Street-Map 79, lots 1, 2, 4 and 18 *Cont*

Modification of the Lakeshore Center Subdivision plan. — ✕

Claremont Lakeside Bridgewater -Public hearing- special permit under 9.60 and site
plan-lot 3- Office building-Map 96, Lot 22 ✕

Board Business:

Rolling Pines, Norlen Park Extension, endorse Luongo site plan

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

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

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Delonno and Mr. Etoniru

TRINITY CIRCLE PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

The public hearing reconvened at 6:30

Correspondence received:

August 10th email from Mr. Etoniru-read into the record.

August 21 response letter from SEA

TE Comment 1: *SEA's response to my comment #9 in the July 29, 2017 email transmission asserts that: "The 3 feet per second minimum design velocity is achievable in all situations. Attached are the "Design Computations for Culverts" and supporting nomographs for the 2-year storm event." The problem with the assertion is found in the fact that flow velocity in a conduit is a function of the conduit slope, flow rate, and conduit geometry. In reviewing the May 12, 2017 subdivision plan, the June 14, 2017 subdivision plan, and the current August 1, 2017 subdivision plan, I find the geometry of the conduit from catch basin #CB2 to drain manhole # DMH 1 remains the same, the outlet invert elevation of the conduit at CB2 remains at 92.35, the conduit's downstream invert elevation at DMH 1 remains at 92.06, and the conduit length remains at 14.5 feet; yet the conduit slope changed from .020 in the June 14, 2017 stormwater report to 0.036 in the August 1, 2017, this is mathematically impossible and defies logic. The effect of the ".036" slope in the August 1, 2017 report is an exaggerated flow velocity of 3.5 fps that appears to comply with the required minimum velocity of 3.0 fps! Similar problem is found with other conduits that I previously reported as not meeting the minimum conduit velocity of 3 fps. The source of the nomograph employed in the design of the conduits should be submitted for review in order to verify the algorithm that was used for the development of the nomograph and to ascertain the limitations of the nomograph.*

SEA Response: **The methodology that was utilized to calculate velocity in the pipes is more appropriate when applied to open channel flow. Utilizing FHWA Hydraulic Design Series Number 5, the drainage pipes conveying storm water to the basin and outfall were determined to be greater than 3 feet/ sec. Velocities less than that value were limited to connector pipes from catch basins to manholes. These short runs are often less than 3 feet/ sec for a number of**

reasons, including, use of 12-inch piping (8 inch preferred), small catchment areas, and maximum spacing allowed between basins. A waiver from this requirement is not uncommon and is requested.

TE Comment 2:

Details for the oversized drain manholes that would be applicable to drain manholes DMH A and DMH 5 should be included on the detail sheet, the note on plan sheet 6 of 12 labelling them as 8' diameter manholes notwithstanding. Contractors build these structures based on details as they have to order the structures specifically from the concrete fabricators/manufacturers. My concern is that the 4 foot diameter manhole detail may be misconstrued as being applicable to all of the drainage manholes.

SEA Response:

A detail for Drain Manhole 5 has been added to the revised Sheet 9.

TE Comment 3:

the proposed drainage easement labeled "DRAIN EASEMENT 5A" on the plan for the installation of drainage pipes and manholes for rerouting the runoff from Forest Street area and the existing drain line from Ashtead Road is not advisable: it looks good on paper but it is not practical. The Town would end up with an easement that is susceptible to vegetation over growth, and a drainage line that will not be readily accessible and that is prone to tree root-induced movement and re-alignment. The culvert for the flow from Forest Street area, as well as the line from Ashtead road should be connected to the proposed subdivision road drainage system. This would make the stormwater control more manageable and reduce the threat and risk to the existing abutting landowners on Ashtead Road.

SEA Response:

The easement and drainage pipe running along the rear of lot 5 & 6 have been eliminated. The flow from Ashtead Road has been redirected into the drainage system. The 545 linear feet of pipe within the roadway have been increased to 24 inches and the outlet pipe increased to 36 inches. The elevations of the roadway have been raised one foot to ensure that cover is maintained as well as providing separation from the bottom of the drainage basin and the inlet. The drainage basin has been enlarged by shifting some property lines on Lot 6, 7, 8 and 142A.

TE Comment 4:

The proposed drainage easement labeled "DRAIN EASEMENT 3B" on the plan for the installation of a drain culvert should be changed to a drainage parcel in order to eliminate any ownership and control ambiguities in the future.

SEA Response:

The drain easement 3B has been eliminated and converted into a drain lot.

TE Comment 5:

The handicap access ramp adjacent to catch basin CB5 should be relocated further northeasterly or to the west away from the catch basin. Catch basin CB5 is at a transition point, it could cause icing problems for the access ramp.

SEA Response: The handicap ramp has been relocated further “uphill” to eliminate the possibility of icing problems.

TE Comment 6: No detail has been provided for the proposed level spreader at the drainage basin discharge culvert outfall.

SEA Response: A detail for the level spreader has been added to the revised Sheet 9.

TE Comment 7: The drainage basin is being constructed in fill. Therefore, construction specifications for the removal of any existing deleterious material from beneath the basin and replacement with pervious material should be provided.

SEA Response: A note for remove and replace of material has been added to the revised Sheet 7.

TE Comment 8: Groundwater mounding calculation for the drainage basin has not been provided, in light of the fact the separation distance between the basin bottom and seasonal high groundwater level is less than four (4) feet. However, I expect groundwater mounding at the basin location to not be as critical as the need to detain and store runoff in the basin and minimize the potential for downstream flooding.

SEA Response: The effects of groundwater mounding are minimal as infiltration is not the primary method for discharge. The water table mounding was calculated based on the Hantush method and the amount of infiltration required. The elevation rise was calculated at one foot. Still within the 2-foot separation provided.

Email received from Azu on Sept. 6th

I have completed my review of the latest plan(s) and the stormwater management report for the above subject matter. Both the plan(s) and the stormwater management report bear a latest date of August 21, 2017. The stormwater management system design has been updated to address the main concern I raised in the email below, namely: the existing conduits from Ashtead Road and the culvert underneath the driveway near proposed roadway station 1 + 50 are now routed to the drainage basin, thereby eliminating the proposed drainage easement that was labeled “DRAIN EASEMENT 5A”, and the number of outfalls has been reduced to one. Other review comments at this time include: **1**, the soil specification underneath the drainage basin “INFILTRATION BASIN DETAIL” on plan sheet 7 of 12 and the “UNDISTURBED EARTH” note underneath the “DRAINAGE BASIN WICK” detail on plan sheet 9 of 12 are incongruent with the material specification(s) note on plan sheet 7 of 12 at the easterly end of the drainage basin. The details should be revised to be consistent with the material specifications note; **2**, drainage conduits exiting catch basin #CB1, #CB2, and #CB3 do not meet the required minimum self-cleansing velocity of 3 fps; **3**, the detail for an eight (8) foot diameter drainage manhole is different from the detail for a standard four (4) foot diameter manhole. Therefore, two

separate details should be shown, one for a 4 ft. dia. manhole (already shown), and one for an 8 ft. dia. manhole. Drain manhole DMH3 should also be an 8 ft. dia. manhole in order to properly configure and fit the number of conduits entering and exiting the structure; **4**, the current configuration of the "DRAINAGE BASIN WICK" is not adequate to fully utilize the area underneath the drainage basin and optimize the design infiltration/recharge; **5**, the specification for the gravel base underneath the roadway and the sidewalk binder course should be noted on the detail shown on sheet 9 of 12. The reference to "M.D.P.W. SPECS" shown thereon for the roadway bituminous concrete should be revised to reflect the current specifications of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation, Highway Division.

A new set of revised plans submitted that address comments from 8/10/17

Rebecca commented that they have made a lot of changes from where they started to where they are now and based on Azu's five comments, she doesn't see huge things that can't be addressed with a note change. On #2, she noted that they do have a revised waiver request to address that. The locations of the catch basins are such that there is just not enough flow in the first set of catch basins that contributes to them. She said she shifted sets of catch basins and eliminated some in order to allow more flow to go to these catch basins. She said there just is no way to add enough flow using a 12" pipe to meet that 3' per second. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Etoniru to explain why that is or isn't acceptable. Mr. Etoniru stated that they could increase the slope to provide adequate energy head and push the water thru. The problem is if the Town takes over the ownership of the road all of the sands and silts that collect in there eventually will get into the pipe because there isn't enough velocity to carry that sand thru then overtime you will have build up; therefore, the available space in the pipe reduces. Mr. Driscoll questioned if it was a good engineering practice and acceptable to us. Mr. Etoniru stated that it does meet the velocity but he would rather see them increase the slope and maybe request a waiver of the cover requirements on the pipe. Rebecca said that she has adjusted the slope in the model and there is not enough flow to make it work. Even asking for the waiver on the cover, that one foot doesn't give her enough slope to provide the velocity that you are looking for. Mr. Ajemian questioned if we were at a point where things can be worked out. Mr. Etoniru said the issues are mainly drafting, in his view. He spoke about the rerouting of the drainage lines on the easement to the road system drainage, which he felt could be done. Rebecca again spoke about the site constraints and not being able to meet the requirements in this configuration and Mr. Etoniru commented that it is not the Board's responsibility to make the site work. He would not recommend waving the velocity. Mr. Driscoll suggested that she try to meet the Town Engineer's request of 3' and at the next meeting the Board will vote on the waivers. Mr. Ajemian asked Azu to be prepared to let us know which waivers we should or shouldn't accept. Mr. Driscoll questioned if the existing pipe was going to be replaced? Rebecca said if it is in good condition, it will stay; if not, they will evaluate it at that time.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to 9/20 at 6:30.

OLDFIELD ESTATES, PHASE II PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

The hearing reconvened at 7:02.

A request received from Rebecca Baptista to continue the hearing to October 18th.

On a motion by Jean Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to October 18th at 6:30 pm.

OLDFIELD MODIFICATION OF THE ORIGINAL SPECIAL PERMIT FOR A CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT

The public hearing reconvened at 7:04.

Rebecca commented that she would like the Board to make a decision on the modification this evening so she can continue on with the Phase II subdivision.

Correspondence received read:

August 16th letter from SEA addressing comments from Azu read into the record.

TE Comment 1: The application for Oldfield Estates includes an application for a special permit modification, and a definitive subdivision plan approval. I have not conducted any detailed review of the definitive subdivision plan application and the stormwater management system design report since soils testing and evaluation have not been performed at the proposed locations of drainage basins and along the center line of the roadway(s); the applicant's engineer and I are working on a schedule for the soils testing and evaluation.

SEA Response: **Test pits for the subdivision have been completed. The results will be incorporated into the revised subdivision plan. The information was also needed to assess the open space community density.**

TE Comment 2: With respect to the special permit modification application, the special permit was for a specific development pattern, with the expectation that the approved plan reflected the maximum build-out area, the availability of additional building area notwithstanding. However, the applicant has since had the wetlands resource delineation re-evaluated and identified additional upland area. The proposed special permit modification plan utilizes the area shown as Map 52, Lot 23 (Estate Lot) west of the "Brockton Edison Easement" as the basis for the yield plan (sheet 4 of 4) showing six lots in this area but then shows the additional six lots at the terminus of "XX Lane" and then maintains Map 52, Lot 23 as an "Estate Lot" (sheet 3 of 4). The applicant, using the old proverbial phrase, is trying, in my view, to "have his cake and eat it too"! The applicant can either have an "Estate Lot" or the six additional lots but not both!

SEA Response: **The revised Open Space Community Plans dated August 8th has eliminated the "Estate Lot" west of the Brockton Edison Easement.**

TE Comment 3: Also, the proposed location of the six additional lots at the terminus of "XX Lane" is inconsistent with the intent of "Open Space Community Development" in that the positioning of the six lots bifurcates the "Common Open Space" area and

reduces the viability and flow of the "Open Space". The modification plan should seek to optimize the open space area.

SEA Response:

The seven lots and "XX Lane" have been eliminated from the design. The former "Estate Lot" has been reshaped to include four open space lots. The result is a 22-acre contiguous open space to the north and a total of 72 open space lots. It is requested that the Planning Board accept the revisions and approve the modification to the 2013 Open Space Community Development plans with the following conditions (see attached).

Mr. Driscoll suggested discussing the phasing. Mr. Delonno agreed; commented that it is very pertinent to the project going forward. Mr. Etoniru stated that the original special permit was conditioned on four phases going forward in sequence; now only two phases proposed. Rebecca said that Phase three was when the connection was to be made to Erbeck Circle and suggested that the connection to Erbeck be made after 40 lots completed. Mr. Lehtola stated that the original agreement was that they would come in with 40 lots off Cherry Street and then they would connect to Erbeck Circle and that is what he will continue to do.

Mr. Driscoll said that Mr. Delonno had previously suggested that they keep the Open Space contiguous, which they have now done, and that the Jenny Leonard Park, which is on town land, be demolished. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Lehtola if he would be agreeable to that condition. Mr. Lehtola said yes; however, he would like some kind of written agreement with the Town showing that he has the right to do the work. Mr. Delonno said he would make sure there is an agreement. He suggested that it be conditioned that the take down was only for the structures, no trees. Mr. Lehtola commented that there may have to be some tree work to get the structures out of there. Mr. Delonno said actually there will have to be tree work because there are trees going thru the structures. He said Mr. Lehtola will be doing a great service to the Town for demolishing this abandoned playground. Mr. Delonno suggested having a clarification by verbiage on the 41st lot and when the actual connection to Erbeck Circle can be made. ...such as certificate of occupancy or the granting of the building permit ...he just wants an understanding of when that actually takes place. He made the suggestion of the granting of the 41st building permit. Mr. Lehtola stated that would be acceptable. He stated that the road construction would take place before that, but no building permit would be issued before that. He noted that he will also need a temporary cul-de-sac at 40 and questioned if that should be mentioned. Mr. Driscoll said it was a concern of the Erbeck Circle neighbors and trucks using their road; he suggested possibly using Jersey barriers. Mr. Delonno concurred that it was the concern of the neighbors about the construction traffic accessing thru their residential neighborhood and it will be connected sooner rather than later. If that is acceptable to Mr. Lehtola, the use of the Jersey barriers, he could start the road but not utilize it. Mr. Lehtola stated that the road would be under construction about the time the 40th house is being built. Mr. Driscoll suggested that the decision state that no connection is made to Erbeck Circle until the 41st house has a building permit. Mr. Lehtola said he didn't want to be put in a box as far as the road construction is concernedextending the water main, etc. and actually building the road. Mr. Delonno noted that is why there was the suggestion of Jersey barriers so Erbeck Circle would not be used by construction vehicles. Mr. Driscoll commented that he was fine with the construction of the road all at once; only concern was the use of Erbeck during that construction.

Mr. Driscoll suggested that the hearing be closed and asked Mr. Delonno to come up with the verbiage for the conditions for the modification, as it appears that everyone is in favor.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall, it was unanimously voted to close the public hearing.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall, it was unanimously voted to vote on this matter at the Sept. 20th meeting.

IMHOFF SOLAR FARM PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

Mr. Etoniru recused himself and left the room.

The public hearing reconvened at 7:24.

Correspondence received:

August 28th letter from DEP-Superseding Order of Conditions, Denial, Affirmation

August 31, 2017 letter from Attorney McCluskey- read-requesting a continuation to November.-
Letter read into the record.

Mr. Ajemian commented that he wanted Attorney McCluskey to know where he is coming from; if he had to vote this evening, he would vote no. He is questioning if this should be in this neighborhood; this has been before us for over a year and we have never been given revised plans based upon the comments from HLM consultant. The size was originally an issue and the numbers have gone up instead of down; no plan for screening; no plan for separating house from the solar farm

Attorney McCluskey stated that they have to go through the Conservation Commission and that could result in a change in the plan. He thought they had submitted a maintenance plan, however, that is incidental to the overall project as it doesn't have any moving parts. They will mow and grass and have a fence and will have some kind of security. He explained that they can't really submit a plan until we know where the wetlands are; that is a major hurdle, he said. They filed for an Order of Conditions, the Conservation Commission wouldn't accept their plans and they went on to file for a superseding Order of Conditions. He stated that despite the neighbor's objections, the DEP has established a wetland line.

He said he really isn't here to discuss the details of the project tonight; that is not appropriate for him to do so; he is here only to request a continuance.

Mr. Ajemian commented that he understands why new information hasn't been submitted lately, however, there is a list of things in the bylaw that had to be originally submitted that were not. He told Attorney McCluskey that he would prefer a much smaller project, wants to see screening and a separation of the house from the solar farm and poles should be underground. Mr. Driscoll stated that he had similar concerns; screening, size, and poles. He asked Attorney McCluskey to pass the Board's concerns on to the developer.

Fred Chase-60 Old Farm Road-felt that a continuance was not the appropriate way forward; have been meeting on this matter for over one year and this is the fifth meeting.

Lynette Chase-spoke about the DEP letter and things not being rectified quickly.

Dan Zani-20 Old Farm Road-questioned the fact that Mr. Etoniru was the original engineer on this project and that he serves on the Conservation Commission as their agent and was at a site visit awhile ago.

Mrs. Zani asked the Board to look at Fireworks Circle (same owner) and how the residents' concerns haven't been addressed. She expressed concern about the maintenance of this project

Mike Berolini-129 Old Farm Road-spoke about the fact that there has been no collaboration with the neighbors and no attempt to answer their questions and concerns. They have asked for plans and got none. They have asked how they plan to block our view of the solar farm and have gotten no answers. He suggested that a significant amount of money be set aside for a maintenance bond. He stated that there are many things in the bylaw that they have not addressed.

Fred Chase asked if Attorney McCluskey could have the following issues clarified by the next meeting:

1. The glare study fails to provide the manufacturer of the panels; that is important because we need to know the style of the panels and all the identifying information that will help us to learn what are the components of the panels. This was done for the BRT project (Fireworks Circle). Need to know if there are hazardous materials used.
2. The noise study identifies the manufacturer of the central inverters, but it does have a flaw; it is based upon the presence of 2 inverters, when in fact there are now 5 centrally located inverters.
3. The Town bylaws, section 22.6, sub paragraph D requires a minimum 220' setback from any Inverters to property lines in a large scale ground mounted solar array when they abut residential lots. He said at the site walk held in May, the Town Engineer indicated that wasn't applicable. He would like this issue addressed.
4. Buffering still hasn't been address with a plan.
5. Lighting for this site-The Fireworks Circle site does not have lighting of any kind- and he questioned why it is proposed in this residential area. He stated that there is no specific requirement in the bylaw for illumination being present.

On a motion by Mr. Hall, seconded to Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to November 15th at 6:30 pm.

Mr. Driscoll advised Attorney McCluskey that if there isn't substantial progress with information being forthcoming, this hearing will not be further continued again.

SUBDIVISION RULES AND REGULATIONS PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

The public hearing reconvened at 8:00 pm.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to September 20, 2017 at 7:00 pm.

MODIFICATION OF LAKESHORE SUBDIVISION

The public hearing convened at 8:02 pm.

Notice that appeared in the Enterprise on 8/23 and 8/30 read into the record. Notification green cards received.

Attorney Ed Brennan explained that the modification is a realignment of the road previously approved back in 1988. It is shifted to the east, shortened and an adjustment of the lot lines for 8 lots within the subdivision. There are a series of waivers being requested and are listed on the front of the subdivision plan prepared by Silva Engineering.

Email from Azu Etoniru dated 9/5 read: “

I’ve reviewed the proposed subdivision plan modification and the accompanying correspondence/report prepared by Silva Engineering Associates, P.C. I do not have any comments that could be deemed adverse to an approval of the proposed modification, should the Board elect to approve the modification plan.”

Attorney Brennan advised the members that the roadway will remain private and maintained by the owners within the subdivision.

Rebecca Baptista explained the changes in detail.

During the course of the public hearing, the Board made the following findings:

- the subdivision was originally approved in 1998 and was prepared by H.W. Moore Assoc., Inc. It consisted of two roadways and approximately 1,975 linear feet of pavement.
- only 450 linear feet of the previously proposed roadway was ever constructed.
- the front two lots along Pleasant Street have been developed and are occupied by a 3-story office building and a 4-story hotel along with parking and drainage areas.
- the remaining unconstructed roadway layout including drainage area and eight lots will be reconfigured
- the proposed 38 foot wide roadway at 1,700 linear feet will be shortened by approximately 1,200 from the original roadway
- the second roadway will be eliminated
- the roadway drainage will be designed to meet current stormwater regulations.
- the road will remain private
- the plan includes 6 waiver requests which are shown on the plan
- the lots on the roadway comply with zoning
- the wetlands have been approved by the Conservation Commission

- the revised plan was prepared by SEA and is dated 6/19/17

On a motion by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to approve the modification with standards conditions.

On a motion by Mr. Hall, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted to grant the six waivers requested:

IV.B.(b) ON-SITE DRAINAGE DESIGN: Waiver requested from strict compliance with the drainage basins being located on individual lots, The proposed development will be kept a private way and the drainage basins will be placed within easements.

IV.B.3,(d) DRAIN LINES: Waiver requested from strict compliance with the required 3'-6" cover over a drain line. 2¹-6" is requested with 12" of stone bedding. *(Same request made on original subdivision)*

IV.B.6 DRAINAGE BASIN WITH RECHARGE SYSTEM: Waiver requested from strict compliance with detail VII.10. Chamber and stone systems are proposed.

V.B.2 MINIMUM WIDTH REQUIREMENTS: Waiver requested from the requirement for two sidewalks. One sidewalk is requested. *(Same request made on original subdivision)*

V.B.25 MONUMENTS: Waiver requested for use of concrete bounds in lieu of granite bounds. Concrete bounds are easier to locate with metal detector.

VII.10. DETAIL - DRAINAGE BASIN WITH RECHARGE SYSTEM: Waiver requested from strict compliance with detail.

LOT 3 CLAREMONT PUBLIC HEARING-2 LAKESHORE CENTER

The public hearing convened at 8:10.

Green cards received

Correspondence received:

August 3rd letter from Water/Sewer Dept.- RE: The plan does not show the main water line being looped back to Pleasant Street; no water impact report submitted to the department for this project; the applicant has not met with the department to discuss this project. The previous agreement for sewer capacity has been met. There has been no further discussion for additional capacity; applicant needs to discuss the project with the Board of Water and Sewer Commissioners.

September 5th - Jonas Kazlauskas- there was a meeting set for August 23rd to discuss project; but cancelled due to lack of quorum. Next meeting will be held on Sept. 13th

September 5th email from Azu Etoniru - I've performed an initial review of the project plans and drainage report. Our email network was down for a few days last week but it's fully operational today.

The overall presentation of the plans and report is very good! My main issue really is the stormwater system design. I think you're using the recharge system as part of meeting the TSS removal requirement. However, since you are in a Zone II water protection area, and whereas the parking lot is a high pollutant loading source, at least 44% TSS removal is required prior to utilization of the recharge system in the stormwater quality train. The water quality treatment train calculation takes credit for in-line grit chamber/structure but there's no detail provided on plan sheet C-5 for a grit chamber/structure. I also think the recharge system under the parking should be operating upstream of the drainage basin instead of being an integral part of the drainage basin. Runoff introduction into the parking lot sub terrain recharge system via the six conduits that are tied to the manifold will not engender full utilization of the recharge system because the system as designed will rely more on energy head buildup in the basin, which would, in reality engender more discharge through the basin outlet control structure. Several of the conduits do not achieve a minimum self-cleansing velocity of 3 fps under the actual design flow conditions, albeit they will under a full-flow condition. The invert elevation of the inlet pipe labeled "a" at drain manhole DMH 111B is lower than the invert elevation of the inlet pipe labeled "b". Given the fact the inlet pipe labeled "b" is fed by roof drain down spout(s) with substantial head, it could create surcharging (partial or whole)/vortex effect on inlet pipe "a" while a certain percentage of its flow will flow downstream through the outlet pipe labeled "c"; the elevations should be revised to avoid the potential problem. The plan does not include any information on solid waste collection, storage and disposal. Also, I do not see any discussion on traffic assessment, even on a general level. The existing conditions plan, as well as the site layout sheet with lot line setback distances should also be signed and stamped by a land surveyor. I'll be in the office tomorrow morning between 9 and 10 and will give you a call during that time to discuss the foregoing items.

Mark Boudry , with Meridian Associates, introduced Pat Carney, the applicant, and Mike Brochette , the architect from PDA Associates. He gave a brief overview of the project. It will be a second office building set behind the existing one. It will have a smaller footprint than the existing building and is proposed to be 4 stories. The overall parking will be integrated with the existing building. He explained the drainage system and pattern flows. He said after speaking with the Town Engineer today, they will be making some corrections to satisfy Azu's concerns. They will be adding a forebay into the basin. Mr. Etoniru stated that he felt the modifications they propose will be satisfactory.

The architect showed renderings of the proposed brick building and explained it in detail.

No public comment.

On a motion by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mr. Ajemian it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to September 20th at 7:00 pm.

ROLLING PINES DISCUSSION

August 23rd email from the Highway Superintendent read:

The detention basin is not the issue; it is the puddling on the roadway. He met out there with Aggregate Industries and went over the issues and chatted about how they propose to repair and make water flow to basins as it should. Mr. Brown and a representative from ATL didn't make an appearance. This roadway is not town owned; it still belongs to Mr. Brown and it is not his responsibility to work with his contractors to make things right.

Mr. Brown stated that there is a \$28,000 bond; he noted that he was aware that there is a \$5,000 maintenance amount that will be retained. He has an \$8,000 engineer bill on this desk that needs to be paid and he would appreciate a release. . He suggested also retaining \$6,000 to infrared the puddles. He said he was not aware of the meeting that Mr. Ladue referred to. Mr. Delonno stated that he has been out there many times; this subdivision has had many issues and we have been able to work thru them and this falls in the same vein. He felt the release of bond funds may be premature. If Mr. Brown wants the road to be accepted by the Town, he has to address the issues and once he does, he would firmly support the release. He indicated that everything seems to be working there, with the exception of these low spots.

Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Etoniru if the wall has been certified to his satisfaction and has the basin been mowed? Mr. Etoniru said not as of the last time he had been out there. As far as the wall is concerned, he would have like to see something different, but, the problem is with the approval and the way it was worded. It allows a civil engineer to certify it, rather than a structural engineer.

Mr. Ajemian said that typically we get a written request from the developer and that is referred to the Highway Supt. Mr. Brown will hold off until the infrared is done and inspected.

NORLEN PARK EXT. DISCUSSION

Resident Chris O'Reilly appeared before the board complaining about the fact that the subdivision was never finished; it was approved in 2004. The sidewalk is overgrown; a sink hole in the sidewalk; no street lights. He referred to the subdivision rules and regulations where it states that the developer must maintain until accepted by the Town. He stated that it is obvious that AGD Development has done nothing to maintain or finish the roadway; only has a binder coat. Mr. Delonno stated that the Town doesn't really have any recourse; only to call the bond and there is not enough to do much work; only recourse would have been if the board had retained a lot. Even if we contact the developer outlining all the work that must be done, he probably would tell us to keep the bond and walk away. The one concern he does have for the Town is that retaining wall and bridge that spans that intermittent stream.

Mr. Delonno said this is between the residents who live there and the developer and their recourse is to sue the developer.

Mr. Driscoll will meet with Attorney Rawlings to see what the options are.

160 FIREWORKS CIRCLE

No action taken on the Luongo site plan-conditions of approval not noted. It will be endorsed at the next meeting.

Burrill Ave site walk at; Lisa Sullivan needs comments

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Hall, the meeting was adjourned at 9:14 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED:

 1/19/18

CORRESPONDANCE RECEIVED FOR SEPTEMBER 6, 2017 MEETING

Notices received from surrounding towns:

Town of Raynham Board of Appeals- Decision: Petition # 994- Frank Rozenas-Building commissioner's decision upheld.

Town of Raynham Board of Appeals -Decision -#947 Theodore Colocousis Petition approved
Town of Halifax Zoning Board- Petition #868 and 869-Gordon Andrews

Town of East Bridgewater Zoning Board of Appeals- Hearing on 9/6- Janelle Rotondi
East Bridgewater Planning Board- Rodman Financial Corp-Sautucket Rd. Estates- modifications denied.

Old Colony Joint Transportation committee-Agenda for 9/7 and Minutes of 8/3/17; agenda for 8/30

Public works Magazine