REGULAR MEETING BRIDGEWATER PLANNING BOARD DECEMBER 4, 2019

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Ajemian, Ms. Guarino and Mr. Geller. (Mr. Geller recently appointed as a member by the Town Manager upon the resignation of Ms. Sullivan. He was sworn in today)

ALSO PRESENT: Bill Akins, Associate Member, Elijah Romulus, Assistant Director

Mr. Driscoll explained the rules and procedures for public hearings and informed the audience that the meeting was audio and video recorded.

PUBLIC HEARING 152 ELM STREET-MACKENZIE REALTY TRUST

The public hearing convened at 6:31 pm.

Bill Akins, associate, was sitting in on this hearing.

The public hearing ad that appeared om the Enterprise on 11/20 and 11/27 was read into the record. The green cards-notification to abutters-were submitted.

Correspondence read into the record:

- Jennifer Burke and Elijah-Nov. 28th-The applicant is seeking Site Plan approval to construct a 14,128-sf warehouse building (Assessors'Map71, Lot35) The locus is situated in the Elm Street Industrial District (Industrial E) zoning district with frontage on Elm Street. The property is close to the West Bridgewater town line. Elm street intersects with Pleasant Street (Route 104 west). Many neighborhood uses are commercial in nature, there are also some residential uses.
- The Department finds that the site meets all zoning requirements. The project has been reviewed by HML Associates. There report as well as the Applicant's response is enclosed. HML has not had an opportunity to review the response and updated plans as they were received on Wednesday. The Department would encourage the Applicant to use solar energy on the building. The plan shows that there are three spaces in addition to the 15 that are required per the bylaw. In an effort to reduce excess impervious surface, the Department recommends keeping spaces 1, 8 & 9 as grassed provided that the proposed use does not warrant the additional spaces. If the Board is so inclined ,the Department recommends approving with standard conditions including the following: Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit the applicant must submit an updated site plan for review and approval of the Community & Economic Development Department & Town Engineer depicting parking spaces 1, 8 & 9 as grassed.
- Dec. 4th email from Highway Supt.-hold off on curbing until Elm Street reconstruction is complete.
- HML report received and response letter from Frank Gallagher. Not read into the record, however, Mr. Gallagher went over the letter and his responses in his presentation.
- HML notification today that he had only one issue remaining-if a loading space is required?

The site is north of where First street comes into Elm, on the west side of Elm; there is currently a residential home on the site. There are wetlands that run along the northern and southern boundary lines which have already been submitted thru an ANRAD process and have been approved; going back to Conservation on December 28th for a Notice of Intent.

It is a proposed warehouse building which is permitted in this zone; they have sewer and water that would service the site. 14 parking spaces are required, and they have 17 spaces shown on this revised plan with two handicap spaces. It will be one-way traffic; lighting is primarily on the building, with one existing light post opposite parking space 4. A dumpster is added to the revised plan. There is a drainage divide that runs through the middle of the site; half drains to the north and half drains to the south to the wetland. They have not changed that pattern. They have added three drainage swales that serve as infiltration basins which control the stormwater run off and the infiltration requirements that they had thru the Mass. Storm water regulations. There is a recharge field at the front which will capture the lawn area. That has been reviewed by HML and approved. The building is a metal build9ing with entrances across the front with 7 bays at the rear; each has a garage door and a single-entry door. Mr. Gallagher commented that the only issue remaining has to do with the loading requirement. The owner has told him that and loading or unloading of goods and materials would take place within each bay. Approximately half of the building will be occupied by the applicant and half will be leased out to contractors-plumbers, electricians, etc. Based upon that, they feel there is no need for a separate loading area.

Mr. Ajemian expressed concern about 16' being tight for tractor trailer trucks turning the corners of the driveway. Mr. Gallagher said there will be no 18 wheelers, only pick up and utility trucks. He commented that 16' was enough room for two vehicles to pass; agreed it might be tight. There was also discussion on whether vehicles would have room to pass each other if one was parked. Mr. Gallagher was asked if he could make the driveway wider? Mr. Gallagher said he could possibly make it 2' wider if the board wanted. There was discussion on whether one dumpster was adequate for 5 businesses. Also discussed was the fact that a trash truck might have trouble navigating the site.

Mr. Driscoll questioned whether there was enough parking and if one spot for a dumpster was enough for 5-7 businesses. He suggested that some of the parking spaces that were eliminate be dedicated for possible dumpster spaces. He questioned access to the dumpster if someone was parked near there. Mr. Gallagher said that space must be vacant for the dumpster to be emptied. Changing the location was discussed. Mr. Driscoll questioned the sign? Mr. Gallagher said they left that open ended but wouldn't exceed what the requirements are.

Mr. Romulus felt the hearing should be continued to discuss loading concerns and the possibility of the footprint of the building being changed to accommodate the traffic flow.

A light pole was questioned that was shown on the plan in the recharge area and Mr. Gallagher said it was an oversite on his part; will be no pole in that area. Mr. Gallagher was asked if there will be enough lighting in the handicap areas? Mr. Gallagher said there should be with two wall packs at the rear and one at the front.

Laura Carlson, who lives across the street, said she is all for business, but expressed concern that this property has not been taken care of and asked if there is anything this Board can do to have it cleaned up? Hasn't been mowed, windows are broken out; not normal maintenance being done. Mr. Romulus said there really isn't anything this board can do now; under site plan approval there could be a condition that they must maintain the landscaping. Mr. Gallagher said he will speak with the proponent about her concerns. Mr. Romulus told Mrs. Carlson that any code to require maintenance of property should be addressed with the Town Manager.

Mr. Ajemian wanted to see data that trucks will be able to get around the building. Mr. Driscoll said he would like to see adequate dumpster area or no parking in that area. Mr. Akins questioned whether a fire truck could navigate the corners?

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

PUBLIC HEARING ON SPECIAL PERMIT /SITE PLAN CONTINUATION ON 1420 HIGH STREET

The public hearing reconvened at 7:12 pm.

Mr. Driscoll read into the record the notification that appeared in the Enterprise on 10/2 and 10/9.

> On Wednesday, October 16, 2019, at 6:30 pm., in the Chamber Room of the Academy Building, the Bridgewater Planning Board will be conducting a public hearing on application by the Town of Bridgewater Water Dept. for a Special permit/site plan approval under Section 6.30.B.5 to allow a public utility in Zoning District Residential A/B. The proposal is to construct a new water treatment building. The plans were prepared by Stantec and are on file in the office of Town Clerk and CED office.

The hearing was opened on that date, but since the abutters were not notified the hearing was continued to this evening without any testimony. The green notification cards were received.

A summary of the project from the CED read into the record:

> Town of Bridgewater Water Department–1420 High Street The applicant is seeking a Special Permit [Section 6.30 (B)(5)] & Site Plan (Section 9.8) approval. The Applicant proposes to construct a new water treatment building. The locus, shown on Assessor's Map 14, Lot 12 and known as 1420 High Street consists of a 7.1-acre parcel. High Street crosses over the Matfield River with the site proposed on the east side of the River. The locus is situated in the Residential A/B zoning district with frontage on High Street. The majority of neighborhood uses are residential in nature.
>
> Department finds that the site meets all zoning requirements. The applicant has updated plans meet the necessary parking spaces and address the concerns raised by our engineering consultant. There are three items which the Applicant is requesting a waiver of the Board's Rules and Regulations. All related to drainage items. They are items 2,3 and 4 in the engineering letter. The Town Engineer has also reviewed these items and is comfortable with the Board's ability to waive them. The Department recommends approving the Special Permit and Site Plan with the standard conditions of approval.

Mr. Etoniru arrived at 7:14 pm.

Justin Motta, design engineer, from Stantec explained the proposal which includes the construction of a new water treatment plant and upgrading the existing infrastructure and existing maintenance garage at 1400 High Street. This is to deal with the existing iron and magnesium in the water supply. He explained that the existing water supply comes from four (4) wells. Two were constructed in the 1960's and they pump water to the existing treatment plant which is at the nitrate building located at 1400 High Street. In the 1990's two new wells were constructed #8 and #9 and they receive disinfection and PH

Control within well pump station #8. The upgrades will include upgrades to the existing well field wells as well as a building and all four wells will be treated at 1420 High Street. He said one of the challenges of the project was how to deal with the back-wash waste from the infiltration. An evaluation was done whether an on-site or off-site disposal into the sewer system was best. It was decided that on-site disposal was best due to the sewer system being a distance away and would come at a high cost.to connect. He explained the process. Mr. Driscoll questioned if it had an odor and he was told no; it is not like sewerage. Mr. Driscoll questioned how many gallons per day would it be? Mr. Motta said 15,000 gallons per cycle.

There is a 24' wide driveway to the entrance off High Street. There are six parking spaces in front of the building and two spaces in front of the lagoons. The building will include chemical deliveries and it was decided during discussions with the Town that there is enough space for those deliveries as the deliveries are infrequent and the plant staff could make accommodations for those deliveries. There is a 6' barbed wire fence that goes around the entire facility. Mr. Driscoll questioned whether there will be any screening proposed along High Street? He asked if there would be any plantings proposed along the wall that abuts the neighbor? Mr. Motta said no. No landscaped plan had been provided. Mr. Motta said no landscaping has been proposed. Mr. Driscoll expressed concern about a 6' barbed wire fence in a residential neighborhood that is not properly screened or planted. He commented that it should blend with the neighborhood as best possible.

There is a 12' access driveway that goes to the back side of the building between the building and retaining wall. They have their septic tank and septic leaching field back there and a pumping station for the septic system to pump up to the leeching field. Another challenging aspect of the site is the zone 1 radius protection area which he explained.

Mr. Driscoll questioned how far off High Street is the building? He was told 100' and the land in front is wooded and will remain that way. There will be a camera on the building for security. Mr. Ajemian commented that he would like more screening towards the residential house nearby. Mr. Driscoll commented that there should be a landscape plan submitted showing what will be done near the house to the right and facing High Street. He felt it should blend as much as possible in a residential zone. Katie from Stantac explained where the trees will remain and where they must go due to the retaining wall. She said they left as much as they could untouched.

Pat Brennan from Amory Engineers stated that the plans have been revised to meet his comments.

Katie Connery from Stantac explained why the specific waivers were requested.

Mr. Romulus recommended approving the waiver requests and add a condition that a landscaping plan be submitted prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit. The plan must be stamped by a registered landscape Architect and must include additional screening along the eastern property line and the frontage on High Street

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted to close the public hearing at 7:32 pm.

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to grant the waivers of the Bridgewater Subdivision Rules and Regulations concerning Storm Water under Sections 4.B.1, 4.B.4 and 4.B8. (See Stantec letter dated 11/19/19 for explanations)

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Geller, it was unanimously voted to approve the Special Permit allowing this public utility in Zoning District Residential A/B and approve the site plan with the standard conditions and that a landscape plan, stamped by a Registered Landscape Architect be submitted prior to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit. The plan shall demonstrate the correct recharge needed to comply with the MAPED Stormwater Management Standards. The plan shall also include additional screening on the eastern property line and plantings to encourage regrowth along High Street.

0 SPRING STREET SPECIAL PERMIT/SITE PLAN PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION

The public hearing reconvened at 8:03 pm.

Sitting on this hearing: Mr. Driscoll, Ms. Guarino, Mr. Ajemian and associate member Mr. Akins.

(Mr. Geller had missed the last hearing on this matter)

Water Department sent an email that they have no issues with the project.

Email from Mr. Morris to Elijah dated 12/4/19 was reference, not read.

A revised plan dated 11/15/19 was submitted showing the landscape architect stamp. The chain link fence will remain for a separation from the Polish Club to address their concerns and the water/sewer connections will go into Spring Street, not Spring Vale Terrace because neighbors had concerns about them tying into their system. Drawings were submitted showing the elevations of the building and floor plans of the first and second floor. Mr. Driscoll questioned if there were plans submitted for the third floor. Mr. Morris said no but there will be no more than 2 bedrooms in each unit. They will be using hardiplank rather than clapboards that were previously mentioned.

Mr. Driscoll noted that there still no handicap space shown. Mr. Morris noted that they can widen one of the spots to make it handicapped. Mr. Driscoll felt the dumpster was not accessible and Mr. Morris said he could turn it around. Mr. Driscoll commented that he thinks and building itself if beautiful and thinks will be a great addition to the neighborhood. He said that the intent of the bylaw is to promote as much commercial as possible downtown and have the residential as accessory; he said it seems like he is doing as little office space as he can asked why there are only three parking spaces and suggested that they be shortened and the staircases be tightened up to make a smaller utility space. Mr. Morris explained that they have no basement and they need a place to put all the heating systems, sprinkler system, etc. Mr. Driscoll felt that the 500 sf. of utility space could be condensed into the stairwell area making more commercial space. . He said that because this is a special permit, the Board has the ability to reduce the parking requirements by 25%. Mr. Morris noted that three parking spaces are required for the commercial and three for the residential; they have provided 4. He said that they only have 11,000 sq. Ft of land area and they are trying to limit the use that they have on the land. Under the bylaw, they could have 4 apartments, he said. They also have a relatively high-water table and they didn't want to jack it up into the air, hence no basement. Mr. Morris noted that they have a tenant and he likes the design. Mr. Etoniru commented that the Board shouldn't get involved with the interior design. Mr. Driscoll commented that we are just trying to encourage businesses and 900 sq. ft. is not a large space; he would like to maximize the commercial space. Mr. Morris said he would be willing to reduce the size of the utility room by ½ and incorporate it into the commercial space if that was a condition of approval. Mr. Geller said he doesn't think the main electric and sprinkler could be mixed together by code. . Mr. Romulus said he didn't have an issue with the utility room as proposed. Mr. Morris. Morris said the building is being constructed with engineered beams and the first-floor walls can be moved around. Mr. Driscoll questioned Mr. Etoniru if there would be an issue of adding another parking space due to the increase? Mr. Etoniru said they have to consider that they are adding impervious area; Mr. Driscoll questioned if it was a pervious area, like with pavers would that be ok? if you are exercising your authority under the special permit, yes, you can do that. He did suggest that the Board has to keep in mind that the Board already established the one in the back didn't meet the drainage requirements, that is why they didn't go forward so when you are considering lee wage, you have to keep that in mind too. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Romulus what the parking requirements would be if addition space was added to the commercial? Mr. Romulus said there are 6 that would be required if 300 was added. He said they could add the 300' and still have enough parking. Mr. Driscoll questioned how would the handicap parking space be handled? Would it change the drainage, he asked Azu? He said any new pavement would constitute impervious area. Mr. Driscoll asked if they can satisfy two spots and a handicap with the pavement they have there? Azu said he would say so. Mr. Driscoll commented, so, if they added the 300 sq. Ft from the utility room, the plan would be ok except for showing the handicap space. Mr. Etoniru said correct!

Mr. Morris again commented that if you want him to commit to 1200 square feet of residential and add one more parking space, he thinks they have the space to accommodate that right now.

Mr. Driscoll explained to Mr. Morris that Mr. Geller could not sit on this hearing, so Mr. Akins is a voting member; 4 votes must be unanimous to move forward with a vote. He asked Mr. Morris if he wanted to go forward, or hold off to the next meeting? Mr. Morris said he would like the board to vote tonight. He will be more than happy to work with any conditions that the Board may impose.

Mr. Driscoll reviewed some conditions of approval:

- Azu had a drainage condition- must provide information on the limits of removal and replacement of unacceptable material around the recharge system.
- Handicap space must be provided
- The building will be built in accordance with the design and materials shown
- The utility room will be reduced by 50% and to become part of the commercial space
- Make sure only two bedrooms in each residential unit
- Tandem parking is for residential and will be identified with markings
- Architectural floor plans submitted for the 3rd floor submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit.

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

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Akins, it was unanimously voted to approve the site plan and Special Permit for 0 spring street with the conditions just discussed and the standard conditions of approval.

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION-SOUTH FARM ESTATES

The public hearing reconvened at 8:45pm.

The Board was expecting a revised plan showing the location of the fire hydrant and comments from the Water/sewer Dept. and Mr. Etoniru.

Water Dept- Regarding South Farm Estates, the addition of a fire hydrant approximately 500 'from South St up South farm Drive is acceptable.

Highway Supt- Kind of busy with snow events and getting plow drivers hired, I did look at plan briefly and at this time I do not see anything questionable…I see it will remain private with an association to maintain street.

Mr. Etoniru said they have introduced the water line for fire suppression, and they don't need to loop it because it is not providing domestic water for consumption. However, you must verify that they are installed. He suggested that a condition be that the wells must be installed and connected to the houses prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit by the Building Dept. He stated that he was happy with the location of the Fire Hydrant; it is within 500' of the first dwelling. Mr. Romulus was satisfied with the landscape plan and tree selection.

Mr. Driscoll commented that just like we have done in the past with 4-lot subdivisions, there should be a Homeowners Association established which should be recorded with each deed prior to lot release. Mr. Etoniru noted that there is a standard template for that. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Morris if Parcels C of (13 acres) and A are the conservation parcels that will have the conservation restriction? Mr. Morris said yes. He said that they talked about possibly the Town wanting those in which case they would have to maintain the drainage easement so they can run the drainage along the side. Mr. Driscoll noted that if the town doesn't want it, it should be tied to the Homeowners Association and deeds, with restrictions of passive recreation. He suggested putting that as a condition of approval and then if the Town takes it, it can be eliminated. Mr. Morris said he would like to give the Town the opportunity of taking it because it does abut 20 acres of Town owned property. He said it must be settled what it is going to be before the first house is sold because we can't go back and change it. Mr. Morris suggested tying it to the Homeowners Association, but, put in there if the Town wants it, it will be transferred over. Mr. Romulus read a possible conservation restriction. Mr. Romulus suggested a condition that lots created by the subdivision approval shall not be further subdivided.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted to close the public hearing at approximately 8:55 pm.

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted to approve the subdivision known as South Farm Estates with the standard conditions with the addition of several site specific additions: The drainage easement in Lot 3 shall remain as conservation land either in a conservation restriction with a Homeowner's Association or deed to a non-profit agency dedicated to preservation of open space. Proof of restriction shall be provided to the Community and Economic Development Office prior to the first certificate of occupancy. Lots created by this subdivision approval shall not be further subdivided. A Homeowners Association will be established for the maintenance of the roadway, as it will remain private and it will be recorded with the deeds for the lots. The wells for the homes will be installed prior to an Occupancy being issued by the Building Dept. The location of the fire hydrant will be shown in the plan submitted for signature.

BOARD BUSINESS

Firefly Lane- Road bond calculation was calculated by the Highway Supt. In the amount of

$64, 738.38. The developer is looking for lot release. Ms. Dorr noted that she had typed up the form E covenant release, however, she has not been advised by Mr. Maroni which lot is to be held. Ms. Burke said the board could sign the covenant release, to be held until information is received, as well as the bond. Email received from Mr. Etoniru indicating that he has reviewed the firefly Lane preliminary street as built and find no issues with it. He noted that the plan was prepared prior to the installation of the sidewalk binder course. The as built should be updated to reflect the sidewalk. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Etoniru if he had a chance to review the road bond calculations? Mr. Etoniru said he was not copied on that. Mr. Driscoll questioned the figure calculated for the topcoat of $6480 and said his driveway was $7500, so how can you pave a street for that figure? Mr. Etoniru said he will have to check with Ron to make sure this calculation is for Firefly Lane; he suggested that perhaps he might have mixed up with the sidewalk. The Board held off on the request.

Trinity Circle- Bond release requested in the amount of $14,550. 00 Mr. Romulus recommended that it be released. There was a question with the preliminary as-built plan dated November 12, 2019 having conflicting elevation datum references and asked that the plan be corrected and resubmitted. A revised plan dated 12/3/19 was received. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Etoniru if he had inspected the work? Mr. Etoniru indicated that the work was fine. He stated that he hadn't looked at the handicap ramp. He suggested that the Board hold off on the request until the next meeting

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted to approve the minutes of 11/6 and 11/20.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Geller, it was unanimously voted to approve the 2020 meeting schedule.

No board or committee reports.

Mr. Romulus presented a Tree Maintenance and best practices program he prepared. He explained to the Board that it really isn't under this Board's purview, but under the jurisdiction of the Town Manager. The Town code outlines shade trees and the tree warden's regulations and responsibilities. He would have to be approached to make any changes. Some of the best practices he looked at came from the Town of Wellesley, the City of Summerville, the Arbor Day Foundation, State of North Carolina, Cape Cod Commission and some materials sent by Les, Ray and Mr. Akins. Mr. Ajemian suggested that a tree Board and a tree bank be established. Mr. Romulus noted that is under the authority of the Town Manager. He advised the board that they can send a letter to the Town Manager making suggestions.

Mr. Ajemian made a motion to send a delegate to see the Town Manager to discuss the possibility of setting up a tree board for the purpose of controlling trees that are planted and taken down. It was seconded by Mr. Geller and unanimously voted.

Mr. Ajemian made a motion to put this discussion on the agenda for Jan 15th, 2020.

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED: ____