BELLINGHAM PLANNING BOARD

10 MECHANIC STREET BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019 (508) 657-2892 PlanningBoard@bellinghamma.org

Meeting Minutes Thursday, October 14, 2021 7:00 pm

Present at the Meeting:

William F. O'Connell Jr. (WFO), Chairman
Brian T. Salisbury (BTS), Vice Chairman
Dennis J. Trebino (DJT), Member
Philip M. Devine (PD), Member
Elizabeth Berthelette (EB), Member (Participated by Zoom)
Robert Lussier (RL), Associate Member

Other Officials:

James S. Kupfer was also present.

The meeting was held in person and via zoom for those who wanted to take part remotely.

Chairman O'Connell opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

Continuation Public Hearing 30 Locust Street - Bungay Brook:

The Chairman opened the continued hearing for 30 Locust Street.

Town Consultant Kupfer provided an update. The applicant is working through some of the stormwater aspects with the peer review engineer. The Board is in receipt of an updated plan set. All of the most recent information is available online.

Peer Review Consultant Frank Di Pietro communicated that he has done a preliminary review and looked at the reports and he needs additional time to review the comments from the applicant.

The applicant was present to provide what has been updated since the last meeting.

The applicant Engineer, Jim Almonte was present to provide the updates to the Board. The applicant Steve Venincasa and Michael Scott were also present. The owner of the site was also at the meeting. The Engineer provided a share screen for the members to view. The stormwater was reviewed by Michael Scott. The stormwater calculations were revised and resulted in the revisions to the grading. This was based on the Cornell method. This resulted in needing more volume on site. The result of this was expanding some of the basins. The basins were moved outside of the 50 ft. buffer which is better from the Conservation Commission standpoint. The frozen groundwater event numbers were reviewed. There was more information provided on the overflow rates, since this is Zone 2. There is pretreatment noted prior to discharge. There are the inclusion of infiltration trenches. There was an infiltration area added near the club house. The flow paths to the basins were better defined and clarified at the west side of the site. The other plan changes included the agreement with the church on the easement. The project will have sewer with a pump station. There will be laterals available for any residents who want to tie in. There will be no betterment fees charges to any residents who want to connect. The developer is paying for the line. If a resident wants to connect, it will be from the edge of their property to the line. A question was asked if the gas line will be brought in. The applicant communicated that bringing in the gas line may be difficult, since there is a push to move away from fossil fuel. There is no determination if there will be gas on sight. This is yet to be determined. The gas company is Columbia. The applicant is not sure how the gas company will cooperate with the applicant. The applicant has no issue providing gas to abutters if is allowed on his site. The applicant has not sat down with the neighbors for a formal meeting but has spoken with several of the abutters after meetings. The Chairman noted that a local meeting should be held to listen to their concerns. The Board was informed that there were two units removed from the plan to reduce the density. The Board was informed that there were changes made to the parking lot entrance since the abutter to the north brought this up at a meeting. The driveway was pulled away from the property line (35 ft). This realigned and tightened the radius. This provides room for additional landscaping and acts as a slope in this area. This was shown on the plan set. There was 30% more Evergreen added near Squier Lane for buffering and also near the sewer pumping station along with a fence. The pumping station will be underground. The Chairman would like a rendering of the pump station. The dog park was removed from the plans. There was an area north of the site which will be designated for trash and recycling. The trash areas will have enclosures. There will also be a gate on both ends of access drive. This is an emergency access to the facility for police and fire only. This is not a secondary access. The responsibility of plowing up to the gate will be the maintenance of the applicant. The necessary keys will be provided to the necessary personnel. The gate on Reservoir St. is outside the site. There was concern about bus access to site. There is an exhibit for bus turning movements. It was noted at the end of the plan set. There may need to be an internal policy for the applicant to create with parents parking in this location. The calculations for open space were shown on the exhibit plan and how the number was determined. This is greater than 80% of the site. The applicant will respond to peer review once comments are received.

There was a question asked if the applicant is able to count their stormwater structures as open space. The applicant responded that it is basically anything that is not impervious surface. The applicant will also be seeking a waiver from the roof top infiltration. The waiver list will need to be provided to the Board. The mailbox turn around is 12 ft. wide and 20 ft. long. It was suggested to put a few parking spaces in this location to avoid cars from backing up while getting their mail. The traffic engineer was present. The reduction of units helps with the traffic impact, but the data collected, and movement numbers were noted. The impact for residential versus golf course will be net neutral. The peer review can review this item. The traffic consultant noted that the peer review agreed with the provided findings that this will not generate more traffic. The original study looked at the site lines which included the removal of some of the existing vegetation to improve the site lines.

The hearing was opened to the public for comments.

Questions from the public:

- What will happen with the sewer line, and will there be betterments?
- Will the sidewalks be improved?
- How long will the construction be on road, and will there be stockpiling on site?
- Will the entire street be paved or patching?

The applicant communicated that the entire site will be paved. There will be no stockpiling since it is a small area. This work will be completed in a few weeks not months. There will not be any improvements on the sidewalk.

Consultant Kupfer noted that in terms of sidewalks, there will be no sidewalks interior to site, but the applicant can pay in lieu and contribute to sidewalks in town. This could be a condition of the decision. The applicant was provided with an estimated cost for sidewalk. The number is significantly higher than what a private developer would pay. The Consultant noted that there needs to be more than one dumpster on site, it was suggested to consider adding a larger or second dumpster.

The applicant noted there is no option for curb side pick-up. Another dumpster can be added if necessary.

The fencing around the retention basins was discussed. There is one basin over the 2.5 ft of standing water. This will be a waiver to not have fencing around basin. The Commission does not want fencing.

There was a comment to leave the basins natural but recommends in construction management plan have a 10 ft. mowed access around basin for monitoring around basin.

Consultant Di Pietro noted that a number of the comments have been addressed. There are a number of waivers which need to be reviewed. There were comments from DPW which need to be reviewed. The layout material plan shows the stored snow areas which look small for the area. This should be looked at further.

On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Phil Devine, the Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing to November 18, 2021 at 7:00 pm.

Asphalt Engineering:

The Board was reminded that at the last meeting, Consultant Kupfer was tasked with creating a favorable decision for Asphalt Engineering. All members and the applicant are in receipt of the draft decision. There have been comments back and those have been incorporated within the document. The Planning Board reviewed the document.

The Chairman wanted clarity on item #3 – make sure there is a mechanism for Asphalt LLC to the company that owns. It is the opinion that Item #5 covers the intent of the entities within the document. The document was also reviewed by the building inspector and is comfortable with the language.

On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Elizabeth Berthelette, the Board voted unanimously to sign the Development Pan Approval and Stormwater Management Permit for 190 Farm Street.

On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Elizabeth Berthelette, the Board voted unanimously to Bulk Storage Permit for 190 Farm Street.

Minutes:

September 9, 2021:

On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Elizabeth Berthelette, the Board voted to approve the minutes from September 9, 2021.

September 23, 2021:

On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Elizabeth Berthelette, the Board voted to approve the minutes from September 23, 2021.

Adjourn:

On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Dennis Trebino, the Board to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:23 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

My Sutherland

Recording Secretary