

The regular meeting of the Bridgewater Planning Board convened at 6:32 pm virtually on zoom.

Members present- Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Ajemian, Ms. Guarino, Mr. Geller and Mr. MacDonald

Town staff participating - Ms. Burke, CED Director, Mr. Romulus, Assistant Director, Mr. Etoniru, Town Engineer and Mrs. Dorr, Office Administrator.

Mr. Driscoll 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. He advised the audience that this meeting is being recorded and will be posted within 48 hours on the Town of Bridgewater website or social web page.

FRUIT STREET PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION-CLAREMONT BRIDGEWATER, LLC

The public hearing reconvened at 6:40 pm.

Letters and emails received in the ECD Office in opposition and in favor were read into the record:

David Morgan, 243 Curve Street, Bridgewater Email dated September 2, 2020; Melissa Ramondetta, 317 Lakeside Drive, Bridgewater Letter dated September 2, 2020; Gary Abrams, 90 Goodwater Way, Bridgewater Email dated September 1, 2020; Janet Hanson, 665 Pleasant Street, Bridgewater Letter dated August 17, 2020; Jonathan & Denise Geggatt, 245 Lakeside Drive, Bridgewater Letter dated September 1, 2020; Priscilla Chapman, President, Taunton River Watershed Alliance Letter dated August 25, 2020; Nancy Abrams, 90 Goodwater Way, Bridgewater Email dated August 31, 2020; Andrea Monteith, 255 Lakeside Drive, Bridgewater Letter dated September 2, 2020; Pete Smith, 75 Greenbrier Lane, Bridgewater Letter dated August 17, 2020.

Town Engineer review email of 9/2 read into the record:

“This email transmission shall serve to formalize and memorialize my technical review findings regarding the proposed development of a 103,000 S.F. commercial/industrial use building at the above subject location. As I have previously indicated verbally, the project plan (*composed of 11 sheets*) dated June 24, 2020, and the June 24, 2020 stormwater management report prepared by Silva Engineering Associates, P.C. (SEA) are generally satisfactory, and reflect the requisite design elements necessary for a functional site development proposal. My review findings/comments/recommendations at this time include the following: **1**, the proposed water supply line(s) for the site shall not be connected to the existing/old water main on Pleasant Street that is constructed of a transite pipe material, it should be connected to a new water main. I have communicated this to the Water Superintendent who is coordinating the site’s water impact evaluation by Stantec, the Town’s Engineering Consultant for water supply. Unless a complete replacement of the existing transite pipe is contemplated, it should remain undisturbed; **2**, the elevation of the bottom of the stone clusters for stormwater infiltration in drainage basin #1 should be adjusted upward in order to provide a minimum of two feet separation between the bottom of the stone clusters and groundwater, as the stone clusters are an integral part of the basin. The bottom of the stone clusters are designed with a two foot depth beneath the basin bottom. While the southerly half of the basin appear to demonstrate

sufficient separation from groundwater based on soil evaluation pit #SE-12, the same does not hold true for the northerly half of the basin, given its proximity to soil evaluation pit #SE-11 with a groundwater elevation of 68.5±; **3**, plan sheets 2, 4 and 6 include the following match line label: "MATCH TO SEPARATE FRUIT STREET IMPROVEMENT PLAN", and the proposed grading shows that runoff from Fruit Street is being directed to the proposed site drainage system. The actual Fruit Street improvement plan should be made part of the site development plan submission in order to ascertain that only the portion of Fruit Street shown on the watershed plan (*plan sheet 11*) is contributing runoff to the proposed site drainage system; otherwise, the drainage system will need to be reevaluated. Other than the foregoing three review observations, I do not find any other design considerations that could be problematic for a favorable action by the Planning Board. I would recommend that an approval of the site plan by the Planning Board should include, among other conditions of approval, a condition requiring a certification by the design engineer that the constructed roof drainage downspouts have been connected to the site drainage system as designed and approved. I have copied the applicant's representatives in this email in order to apprise them of my review comments. Let me know if you have any questions or need additional information.'

Silva Engineering email dated 9/2/20-response to Mr. Etoniru's comments-read into the record.

Attorney Ed Brennan questioned if the board received his communication dated August 31 as he would like it part of the record? His letter was read into the record.

He said that the ACEC status has been adhered to; they worked with Natural Heritage on the turtle issue; nothing archaeological on this site. Met with Conservation last week and will have a second meeting with them next week.

Gary McNaughton- traffic consultant with McMahon and Associates explained that this type of building and uses is not a heavy traffic generator; traffic spread over different times of the day. Even though the project is slightly larger than originally proposed at 92,000 sf., the parking has decreased. Traffic to and from will be dominated from the east; all movements work well; doesn't meet criteria for any traffic signal. In process of getting final permit from Mass DOT. They will be retiming the signals at the ramps; 2017 was the last time traffic counts updated. Mass DOT would allow them to go back as far as 2014.

Mr. Ajemian asked how likely is it that the State will put a light in at Lakeside Drive? Mr. McNaughton stated that even after this project is done, 3 times more traffic coming out of there would be needed; the count now is 38 vehicle trips. Mr. Geller questioned if they would be adding any turning lanes? Mr. McNaughton said they would have to look to see if that is feasible; bike lanes may make constraints; might be enough width for some striping. Any turning lane would have to go thru Mass DOT, and they may share his concern about off ramp interaction.

Mr. Geller questioned maybe adding signage when leaving Fruit Street as a right turn only during peak hours. Mr. McNaughton said you can do that, but you have to consider where they will end up going to turn around; will be adding more left turns at Home Depot. Left hand turns are projected to be 10 at the peak hour and will not have a dramatic effect on the overall traffic flow. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Etoniru, from an engineering standpoint, if there was a striped left-hand turning lane? Mr. Etoniru said they would have to lay it out to see how many turning lanes they can achieve by striping, but it can be

done. He didn't see why it wouldn't be reasonable. Mr. McNaughton said he could pursue it, but he couldn't guarantee Mass. DOT approval of it.

Mr. Silva said an issue came up at the last meeting on the east bound traffic on Pleasant St. trying to utilize Old Pleasant St. (the commuter parking area) in order to bypass that intersection and maybe Mr. McNaughton would address the no right turn at the end of that commuter roadway. Mr. McNaughton stated that he wouldn't see any negative affect with that.

Mr. Silva indicated that the Fruit Street Improvement Plan is mainly for showing the utilities and he explained what they will be doing there. They will abandon the existing transite pipe with an 8" pipe which means they now have to connect the State facilities and will add two fire hydrants. A sewer line added which will connect to forced main done by Claremont in 2000. The gas company has brought a gas line in from Raynham and this will be the furthest brought east. Once all the utilities are brought in and connected into the site, then the street will be resurfaced the entire length from the intersection at Pleasant St. Mr. Driscoll asked if they would put in binder and topcoat down the length of Fruit Street? Mr. Silva said no, that is not in the proposal. Mr. Driscoll said he did go down there, and the road is in terrible disrepair. He expressed a problem for the town upgrading it at a later date. Mr. Silva suggested that a condition be that it be done in accordance with the Highway Department. Mr. Etoniru said it needs a full depth of reconstruction. Mr. Silva noted that it is a town accepted road and that there had to be some compromise between the applicant, the town, and the State. Mr. Etoniru agreed and said he will discuss it with the Highway Superintendent to come up with a proposal.

There was discussion about waiving sidewalk tied to the Viva project and sidewalk at Lakeshore Center. This site really doesn't want pedestrian flow; no real way to connect; considerable wetland crossings would be needed; Azu indicated the amount of pavement is limited and he is fine with it. As part of the Viva project, the sidewalk at Lakeshore Center will be extended westerly, across in front of the hotel site and office, all the way down to Axis. There will be a crosswalk in front of Lakeshore Center with an LED warning sign for pedestrians.

Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Silva to explain the drainage system which he did.

Mr. Ajemian commented that he felt most of the environmental issues could be resolved by downsizing the project in terms of runoff and parking lots, etc. and he asked if that was a consideration at all? Attorney Brennan stated that they stand by their project as presented. He felt they have addressed the environmental concerns; 13.1 acres is not being touched and will be protected by engineering. They have taken the ACEC seriously and all the engineering data is filed with Conservation because they were within that 100' buffer. It is their burden to design it to their satisfaction. He feels the project as presented is sound. He said that one observation made during the site walk is the good distance this is from Lake NIP. Mr. Ajemian asked if they would be willing to have the Taunton River shed Alliance take a look at their runoff? Attorney Brennan reminded him that the filing has been made with the Conservation Commission and that is all public information and they have full access to that data and because this is in an ACEC it has been given great scrutiny. The State came thru with recommendations that would allow this development, he said. Mr. Silva said in their letter they did ask them to look at permeable pavement which he felt was contrary to protecting the environment. He explained that if there was a spill or anything occurred, you would have more of an issue with permeable pavements than having solid pavement which can be controlled; much better chance of cleaning up and making sure that. He did not think it was a practical alternate here in the Northeast.

Mr. Ajemian questioned why they would be clear cutting the land? Mr. Silva said they need to cut what is needed to do the grading to achieve the project. They are not clearing within the 25' no touch or disturbing the wetlands. 43% of the site will be developed; the rest will be left undisturbed.

Snow storage and it's run off discussed. Mr. Geller questioned if the salts and sand from the storage of snow get into the drainage system before it goes into the wetland? Larry said it does go into the catch basin system and thru the oil/water separators and finds its way to the sediment forebay. Mr. Driscoll asked Mr. Etoniru if we usually make a condition that snow can't be dumped into the drainage basin? Mr. Etoniru said yes, that is one of the standard conditions that we have. He said that he deals with regulations all the time. They have gone thru an extensive MEPA review and they have been given a specific requirement for coverages and minimum open spaces. They are not altering wetlands; that wouldn't be allowed anyway in that ACEC. Their building is more than 50' from the wetlands and all site work is less than 25' from the wetland lines. Mr. Etoniru commented that the Conservation Commission has a regulation about salt; they have jurisdiction in the 100' buffer line and he doesn't feel that the Planning Board should spend so much time on Conservation issues; that is not within their jurisdiction.

There was a discussion on the site walk. Mr. Ajemian said it was a beautiful area and he hated to see all the trees cut down; Mr. Driscoll expressed surprise at the poor condition of Fruit Street. Attorney Brennan noted that this building will be the farthest away from Lake NIP that has been constructed to date.

The meeting was then opened to the public.

Pat Neary-225 Lakeside Drive- wondered if there were any comments received from the Town of Raynham and if they are as concerned about the aquifer as she is. She thought Mr. Ajemian had a good suggestion about reducing the size of the building. She felt there should be nothing done within that 100' setback. She commented on the size of the building expansion; has increased in size over 10,000 sq. Ft. Lighting was her concern; mentioned Dark Skies; need downlighting and secure lighting so it doesn't come off their properties. She asked that solar be encouraged and restrictions put on chemicals and fertilizer. She was in favor of replacement funding for the acres of trees that were being cleared and suggested that the replacement trees be a Northeast Native species.

Melissa Ramondetta-317 Lakeside Drive- felt an additional, updated traffic study be conducted to have a realistic picture of the traffic increase since 2017. She said there is no way with 78 houses in their neighborhood that only 38 trips per day are generated.

John Geggatt-245 Lakeside Drive-prefaced his comments by stated that he is a supporter of smart development. He expressed concern with the traffic. He doesn't think that the 2017 traffic study represents what has gone on in this area and requested that an updated traffic study be done before approval of this development. He noted that sometimes when coming out of Lakeside Drive, he must turn right, and then left into the parking area to get back to Pleasant Street to go towards town. He felt it was important for the record to note that two comments were from people out of the area. He did not think they were familiar with the conditions that have impacted their area. He would like to know who in Raynham was notified and if we had proof of their receipt of a notice.

Janet Hanson-665 Pleasant Street-expressed concern that we do not know what businesses will be coming into the building. She questioned what regulations are in place for each one? How would each

business be regulated? She suggested that a building reduction might help the encroachment issues expressed; building proposed is stretched to the limit, she said.

Carlton Hunt-80 Austin Street-expressed that he is very interested in commercial businesses coming to town. Mr. Hunt said he wanted visual representation and he suggested to Mr. Silva that he superimpose the project on a google earth map. Mr. Silva said he would do that. In his experience with this area, he did not see a traffic issue. He informed the audience that the NIP is controlled by West Bridgewater.

Mr. Silva noted that he specifically sent a package of information to the North District Office in Raynham. Ms. Neary commented in chat that it is the Central District.

Frank Sousa, 596 Main Street-suggested that they needed to investigate turning lanes.

Bernice Morrissey-150 Lakeside Drive-echoed traffic concerns and felt that drainage was critical.

Ms. Neary requested that Azu review the Fruit Street Improvement plan.

Someone asked about time for action. Ms. Burke said that we are still in a State of Emergency and there is no time limit.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Ms. Guarino, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to continue this hearing to October 7th at 6:30 pm.

Minutes of 8/19/20 were on the agenda, however, the members did not have a chance to review them. Put on the next meeting's agenda.

There were no Board or Committee reports.

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to adjourn the meeting at 9:02 pm

MINUTES APPROVED: