

The regular meeting of the Planning Board convened at 6:30 pm via Zoom

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Ajemian, Ms. Guarino, Mr. MacDonald

STAFF PRESENT: Mr. Romulus, Assistant Director; Leslie Dorr, Office Administrator

Mr. Driscoll, Chairman, read from prepared text on Governor Bakers order of 3/12/2020 and how the meeting will be conducted and how to be able to speak at the meeting. All votes will be by roll call.

### **CLAREMONT LLC-SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL PERMIT-FRUIT STREET PUBLIC HEAIRNG**

The public hearing convened at 6:34 pm.

Notification of certified letters to abutters sent to Elijah.

Elijah read the public hearing ad that appeared in the Enterprise on 8/5 and 8/12:

The Bridgewater Planning Board will be conducting a public hearing on August 19, 2020 at 6:30 pm on application by Claremont Bridgewater, LLC for a special permit under Section 9.6 and site plan approval under section 9., to be located off Fruit Street extension, Assessor's Map 83, Lot 84. The proposal is for an office/warehouse building for distribution with parking lot and associated parking

Copies of plans may be requested by emailing [CED@bridgewaterma.org](mailto:CED@bridgewaterma.org).

The public hearing will be held as a virtual meeting over zoom. A link and instructions to participate in the meeting will be posted to the calendar on the Town's website at [www.bridgewaterma.org](http://www.bridgewaterma.org). A recording of the meeting will also be posted to the Town's webpage within 48 hours after the meeting ends.

All interested persons are encouraged to attend.

Only comments received were narratives from Mr. Romulus and Mr. Silva from SEA.

Attorney Ed Brennan, representing the applicant explained the proposal. It is a 103,000 sq. ft building to be used as flex space; can be divided up into different entities; walls can be moved and partitioned to give area needed for particular tenants. It is a spec building. They have geared the design towards the uses that are allowed in our zoning by law and in the PDD. Uses could vary from medical devices, distribution, to light manufacturing etc. It has been designed with generic parking areas for any proposed uses. Access to this lot is by way of Old Pleasant Street at Fruit Street via right of way that was taken by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. They have the right to use the roadway. The frontage is on Pleasant Street. He suggested to look at sheet 4 of the plans prepared by Silva Engineering. It shows the footprint of the building, the parking areas, and one of the two drainage basins...the one on the west side.

Mr. Ajemian asked if the entrance is off the end of Fruit Street? He was told yes. He asked how "treed" is the site? Mr. Silva said it was a fairly wooded lot which will be cleared up to the 25' no touch area. Mr. Ajemian spoke about a project that means clearing the whole lot and the applicant intends to gift the Town a cash amount so the town can use that money specifically for planting trees elsewhere in town. He asked if this applicant would be open to that? He said there was a formula done for the

amount. Attorney Brennan asked if he could disclose the figures on that project? Mr. Romulus noted that he would send a copy of that case to Attorney Brennan. Attorney Brennan asked if they value the lumber as a marketing commodity and what it would be worth at a sawmill? He said he would be happy to look at it and sit down with the owner. Mr. Ajemian asked him to please consider it.

Mr. Silva made his presentation. The access is parallel to Route 24 which is now called Fruit Street which was originally Pleasant St. When Rt, 24 came in the late 50's, the State cut off the access to this land and provided this 50' accessway adjacent to the layout. It is a 24' wide road which will feed and allow to circulate within the site itself; it also will be where utilities will be extended. They will be reaching back as far as Pleasant St. and coming all the way down Fruit street with a new water line, a sewer line, and extending gas into the site. Once the trenching is done and utilities in, they will repave the entire section. He spoke about getting comments back from the Water Department about a looping improvement. The site drains from Route 24 in south westerly direction; they are not changing the natural grade of the site itself. They are capturing the water and cleaning it first with oil grit separators and sediment forebays before they route them into the detention basins, which they ultimately will discharge into the adjacent extensive wetlands system. There is no other direct connection over to the other section of the PDD; this site is all self-sustaining in terms of being developed on site. They will be going by two state facilities that are along Fruit Street. They have been using Fruit street like a private driveway up until now; at the end of Fruit St. they have been stockpiling material over the past 40 years. That material must be taken out of there in order to get to the access point, which the state deeded to this property. That work will be done as part of this project.

There are 197 parking spaces to service the office component of this project; there is a loading dock to the rear of the building. Mr. Driscoll noted that the building is only 37.12 feet from the lot line. Mr. Silva said they treated that as a side lot line; the front is down towards the commuter parking area of the lot. Attorney Brennan stated that there has been a lot of confusion about Old Pleasant street in that area and Mr. Silva explained the history. (the section that connects from Fruit St. over to Pleasant St. and along it is where the commuter parking is located) It is a public way.

§9.655 requires that the pedestrian circulation system includes pathways providing direct routes between major buildings, parking areas and roads and that a secondary walking system allows movement to and through open space areas. Mr. Romulus was supportive of the waiver of this Section due to type of use and the project abuts a wetland that cannot be crossed and is more of an industrial use compared to the rest of the projects connected to the proposal.

Ms. Guarino stated that something she read today, indicated that the anticipated traffic would be 328 vehicles and she questioned if any signal lights were proposed at the end of Fruit Street? Mr. Silva said nothing triggers it; no requirement for any signalization there.

Mr. Ajemian questioned if the commuter parking area would become an access into Fruit Street? Mr. Silva said no. Mr. Ajemian questioned how would they be stopped? Mr. Silva said there is nothing to stop them, but it would not be practical. Mr. Ajemian felt it could become a cut thru. Mr. Silva said what they could do, at that end of Old Pleasant, they could put a no right turn and then they would not be able to come into the site.

Janet Hanson questioned what was the Board waiving? Mr. Romulus explained.

Carlton Hunt-asked about the map? Mr. Romulus put up another page of the plan that defines Old Pleasant Street and Fruit Street more clearly. Mr. Silva pointed out all the State buildings.

Janet Hanson-665 Pleasant Street- questioned what they are looking for in the special permit? How close will they be to the other lots? How much are they going to protect the wetlands? Are they going to abide by the 100' buffer? She said she would want to protect what is there. Mr. Silva commented that there is a special permit requirement as part of the PDD in order to build on any site within the district itself; They are getting to the 25' no touch area on the site which is what was agreed upon for the turtle habitat issue. He doesn't know of any site abiding by 100' which represents the threshold for which you file with Conservation for approval of a project and within that, when you trigger that, you then show what activity you are going to have within that 100' and in all cases, they have maintained that they do nothing within the first 25 feet from the wetlands. There is activity, mostly grading and drainage, that are outside of the 25', up to the 100' buffer and that is pretty much what you are seeing here. When the project is done, it will be pretty much a grassed area that will be in that 100' buffer zone. He said there is a potential to have a building within 50' of a wetland, but they are considerably farther away than that for the closest point to the building.

Mr. Driscoll advised Mrs. Hanson that her August 20<sup>th</sup> email with attachment letter dated August 17<sup>th</sup> was received. Mr. Silva indicated that he did not receive her letter. In reviewing the record, an email had been forwarded to Mr. Silva on Aug. 17<sup>th</sup> at 8:04 am.

Attorney Brennan answered her question about how far away this project from the rest of Claremont properties. It is 1200-1300 feet away from the roadway going into the rest of their development.

Carlton Hunt-complemented the applicant for coming in off Fruit Street; he spoke about the tree removal program he found and sent to the Planning Board that was used on another project; It basically calculated the value of trees for the amount of carbon they remove annually. It does not look at the value of the lumber; it looks at the value of trees against climate change alterations.

James Walsh-60 Crescent Street-spoke about the archaeological sites and the fact that they are burial grounds asked what has been done to protect them. Mr. Silva said that those sites (lots 6 and 7) are nowhere near this project and nothing is proposed at this time. Mr. Walsh asked what is in place if something is discovered on this site? Attorney Brennan explained that there is mandatory reporting that must be done if anything is discovered; there is nothing customary for this site. The rules and regulations are all in place and applicable to all construction sites.

Mr. Romulus provided an email for residents to send in further comments and questions.

[CED@bridgewaterma.org](mailto:CED@bridgewaterma.org)

Pat Neary asked if the Town of Raynham has been notified of this project? Mr. Silva stated that he couldn't say, notices were submitted to Elijah, but they should be there. Ms. Neary felt as this project is in their zone II aquifer, she felt they should be part of the discussion. Mr. Silva stated that they have always weighed in and have been part of discussion. She commented that there is a tremendous amount of impervious area on this lot, including the roof line and the pavement and she would hope that someone was checking to see if the percentages are adequate and comply to the town's zoning regulations. She spoke the archaeological sites; she was reading past paper work and there was a request by the Mass Historical Commission for data recovery to mitigate adverse impacts to the total

land site and she wanted to know if that had been done. Mr. Silva said he couldn't speak on the status of that. He explained where the tomb site was; it is not anywhere near here and not connected in anyway. Ms. Neary stated that there was also a memorandum of agreement with the Mass Historical Commission when surrounding lots around lots 6 and 7 were developed; she wondered if that has been done. Mr. Silva stated that the lots surrounding 6 and 7 are held up until that condition is met. He advised her that Lot 8 in the last project change was cleared to go forward. Ms. Neary said she would like to see that paperwork. Mr. Silva said that the MEPA filing was online, but, if she would like a copy of it, he will make a copy for her. He asked her to contact Ashley in his office. Mr. Carney stated that out of 170 acres of Claremont owned land, 85 acres will remain forever as open space which is very heavily wooded. He spoke about listening to the Town who wanted commercial development, providing huge taxes and over 400 jobs.

Melissa Ramondetta-317 Lakeside Drive- spoke about some of the same issues as far as sensitive wetland areas, will site directly across from the NIP, zone li aquifer protection district, additional traffic. She said she would like to know how this building will benefit the town. She questioned if a warehouse was allowed in the PDD. Mr. Silva explained that this building will never be seen unless you go down to the end of fruit street; there is a significant wetland area between this site and the lake and is not remotely across from the NIP; designed to meet higher threshold because of sensitive area that it is in; pre-treatment of oil/grease separators, and forebays have to meet criteria due to sensitive area that it is in. The project has taken into consideration the environment, he said. Less than 50% of the uplands are being developed. This has been done in a well thought way over the years, he said. Mr. Carney noted that this isn't the first review of this site; the MEPA review was extensive. They have also filed with the Conservation Commission. This is not going to be a truck terminal; can be many things....well landscaped. The environment has been taken into consideration to the greatest extent.

John Gaggatt-245 Lakeside Dr-will submit his comments and concerns in writing. Mr. Driscoll advised him that this hearing will probably be continued to Sept. 2<sup>nd</sup>, so please get his comments in as soon as possible.

Bernice Morrissey-150 Lakeside Drive-felt the residents will hear the noise from the project, even though it cannot be seen. She said we are connected hydrologically and there is a culvert that is to the right of the site just before the park and ride and sometimes it is very active. Her concern is that she heard grass was involved in some of the landscaping which means fertilizer and nutrients. Another concern is the traffic from people leaving the site at 5:00 along with the park and ride; and people trying to get out of Lakeside Drive; it will be a nightmare, she said with people turning left out of that site. As far as trees, it would be wonderful to put native trees along 104 because of all the development and trees taken down, they are hearing noises from places they never did before. She said the blighting has gotten out of control. Lighting is important to consider, she said. Need a plan for snow removal. She hoped they could improve the area in a sensitive way. Mr. Silva said he would have someone from McMahon Associates at the next hearing to address her traffic concerns. He addressed her concerns on the culverts. He said he did extensive test pits out there with the Town Engineer and they know exactly where groundwater is; they have designed their system higher as to not be close to the groundwater.

Mrs. Morrissey mentioned grants available thru the Dept. of Water Shed; she is looking into it. Mr. Silva explained that the Canoe Club regulates the level of the Nip...Chris Iannitelli, Dept. of Public Works, West Bridgewater, if he put in boards, the level of the Nip will go up.

Mr. Silva said they have filed with Conservation and the first hearing is next week.

Mr. Ajemian asked if there will be retail in there? Attorney Brennan said that retail was allowed, however, this building is not geared towards retail clientele.

**On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to conduct a site walk on Wednesday, August 26<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 pm.** They will meet at the end of the pavement on Fruit Street.

Ms. Guarino questioned how the snow will be handled? There will be snow storage on site with the option to take off site if it cannot be handled.

Carlton Hunt

**On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to September 2<sup>nd</sup> at 6:30.**

Melissa Ramondetta asked if the public could attend the site walk? Mr. Romulus will get back to her.

#### **MINUTES**

**On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded Mr. MacDonald, it was unanimously voted to approve the minutes of 7/15/20 and 8/5/20 with some minor corrections suggested by Ms. Guarino**

Mr. Romulus advised the Board that Ms. Burke and Mr. Dutton will be working with the applicant for Broad Street to get needed information in by August 26<sup>th</sup> for advertising.

Ms. Guarino informed the Board that the CPC has approved money for the Congo Church steeple work.

**On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 pm.**

**MINUTES APPROVED: 9/16/2020**