



## BELLINGHAM PLANNING BOARD

---

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

### **Meeting Minutes** **Thursday, November 18, 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  
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 applicant has made progress. The stormwater updates have been provided with responses to peer review. The sewer was confirmed and no onsite. There will also be curb to curb repaving of the road. There was a meeting with the DPW about the sewer. The applicant is prepared to speak on the sidewalks.

The applicant Engineer, Jim Almonte was present to provide the updates to the Board. The applicant Steve Venincasa and Michael Scott were also present. There was a comment letter received from Peer Review on October 24, 2021. The applicant has prepared a response letter. The Board was informed that there was a productive meeting with the Conservation Commission last week. The applicant has also provided a waiver letter. The applicant is working to revise the

site plans to reflect comments from peer review letter. The Commission meeting was a working session to discuss comments from peer review. The hearing was continued to December 8, 2021 and will provide them revised plans. The applicant discussed sidewalks at a meeting and the applicant will fund construction sidewalks in other locations in town. The DPW prepared a cost estimate. The applicant has agreed to provide that number and will provide funds once the developer closes on one unit and will provide a portion of funds until the project is fully funded. The project is anticipated to be completed in three years. The number was designed based on linear feet within the site. The amount is for \$147,000. The location of the sidewalk is up for discussion and suggestions. A question was asked if there is a need for a performance bond. There could be language about if infrastructure is not complete a performance bond could be put in place. The applicant does not plan on phasing the infrastructure and will be completed in one phase. There will be no phasing of the roadway. Reservoir Street will be completed with the sewer. The road will be patched and paved the following year but will look for direction from the DPW. The Chairman did ask if the applicant meet with the residents in the area. The town would like the applicant to set up this meeting prior to the next meeting.

Resident Shawn Wade is concerned about the sidewalk in the Reservoir Area. The residents on the street would like to be contacted.

Resident Brian Rhodes – abutter to north – wanted to meet with the applicant and be invited to any meeting.

The Chairman asked if Mr. Wade could reach out to the residents and have a meeting at Bungay Brook to hold the meeting with the applicant.

It was recommended that the DPW outline what will happen regarding sewer.

A meeting will be coordinated with the applicant and the neighbors. The Town Planner will facilitate the scheduling of the meeting.

**On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Phil Devine, the Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing to January 13, 2022 at 7:00 pm.**

**Continued Public Hearing 152 Depot Street:**

The Chairman opened the meeting for 152 Depot Street.

The Town Planner provided an update. The purpose of the meeting was to focus on traffic. The applicant has made progress. The previous study included 148 and 152 Depot Street and this has since been amended to reflect 152 Depot only. The town has secured a consultant to review the traffic study and impacts it may cause in surrounding areas. The project is expected to generate

380 vehicle trips on average weekday including a total of 254 passenger car trips and 126 truck trips. During the morning weekday peak hours, the project is expected to generate 51 vehicle trips. The majority of the movements at the study area intersection are expected to operate at the level-of-service D or better with the addition of the project related traffic which acknowledges that specific movements at the Hartford Avenue with Depot Road and Grove Street intersection are currently operating at an F independent of the project. All of the movements at the proposed site driveway intersections with Depot Street were shown to operate at (LOS) B or better during the peak hours. The lines of sight to and from the project site driveway intersection with Depot Street exceed the recommended minimum distances for the intersections to function in a safe and efficient manner based on the measures speed of traffic along the corridor. There is no proposing of widening of Depot Street. The applicant should show templates for trucks entering and exiting the site. The applicant communicated that there is adequate driveway separation for the vehicles with Best Buy. There are some delays when turning left heading to Hartford Avenue. The applicant received the peer review report today and will review and report back to the Board. A question was asked about how the permitting will work for the traffic signal. This is not a DOT intersection so they would have no involvement. The DPW may get involved and would ask the Board to have a secondary review. The Board wanted further clarity on the light with the estimated cost being \$175,000- \$200,000.00 which does not include construction or permitting. This is simply the fiscal cost. It is recommended that a more detailed estimate be provided. The applicant communicated that they have committed up to \$250,000.00. The permitting time frame from design to build would be estimated at one year from design to construction. There was another question about getting more information about the estimates used, was it a national estimate, or are there any regional variations like density which should be taken into account. The applicant responded that the national standard was used and based on square footage. This is based on information which must be used for MA DOT. The applicant did communicate that there are more warehouse uses that generate more traffic. There was a sensitive analysis done to look at the project assuming it was an amazon type facility and with this additional traffic there would still be the capacity to accommodate that level of traffic. The expectation is this will be a typical warehouse which generates what is seen as the Dunkin Donuts next door. A question was further asked, what would a high facility demand facility generate for traffic. The applicant responded that the morning would be about another 130 trips, then in the evening would be an additional 200 trips. The last time the ITE estimates were updated was based on the 10<sup>th</sup> edition since the 11<sup>th</sup> edition was just provided two weeks ago. The editions are updated every 3-5 years. A comment was made that a lot has changed in this area in five years. There was a concern about this being a 24-hour operation and how the numbers will be change due to this factor. The applicant noted that the numbers would really not change and can provide this in a letter. There was a request to look at the impact from Best Buy. The applicant is able to provide this information. The applicant did communicate that all their vehicles will be on site and there will be no cueing of trucks and traffic. The Board noted there were videos showing the Best Buy tractor trailers cueing issue. It was requested that the

numbers be updated based on the new edition. The numbers presented are conservative for a typical warehouse.

The Town Consultant Dan Mills from MDM Transportation provided an overview of the review. The report provided from the applicant has been prepared in general conformance with the industry standards and show the conditions for locations along Depot Street. The report also includes the operations at the site driveway and identities mitigative actions aimed at improving safety. Consultant noted that the raw traffic count data was not adjusted downward to provide a conservative analysis condition. There were no covid-19 pandemic adjustment factors reviewed. The travel speeds provide an appropriate basis for setting the traffic signal warrant criteria as outlined in the MUTCD. There was also noted that the crash rate at the North Main Street intersection is nearly twice the district 3 crash rate. The applicant should prepare a collision diagram for the intersection to determine if safety improvements can be made to enhance safety at the intersection.

The Consultant recommended the following:

- Provide sight line calculations sheets for the record
- Sight line triangles should be shown for the site driveway on the Site Layout Plan to confirm the minimum sight light criteria are met.
- Provide calculations for the background projects growth rate and site-specific tracing for the background projects through the study area for review.
- There should be provided trip distribution calculations for review.
- The applicant should review mitigation alternatives at the North Main Street at Depot Street intersection.

**General Public:**

Attorney Wozniak noted that the report was done during the pandemic. The applicant should include the highest use of numbers. With a traffic light there, the traffic will be pushed back to the Mobile station. It is his opinion the study needs to be redone. The police department should provide input on this.

The Chairman communicated that the safety officer be invited to the next meeting.

The Town Planner noted that there should be a look at the pre-pandemic. The applicant responded that they could look at the historic data. It was done in July which the world was coming out of the pandemic.

**Resident, Stephen Goyette, 58 Box Pond Road:**

Mr. Goyette is concerned about home values going down due to this warehouse. The Town of Bellingham is in the bottom five of the State for warehouses. This does not contribute to the

value of homes. This project does not make sense. He has a petition with over 250 signatures opposing this proposal.

**Resident, Eric Vanderwal- 60 Fox Pond Road:**

Mr. Vanderwal expressed that he has owned a business in Bellingham for almost 50 years. He wanted to know if the applicant will pay to repave Depot Street with all the traffic which will be in this road.

**Resident Casey Petipas-Haggerty, 226 Depot Street:**

Ms. Haggerty wanted clarity on how the applicant came up with the traffic numbers. The applicant will reach out to Ms. Petipas-Haggerty.

**Continuation:**

**On a motion made by Phil Devine, seconded by Brian Salisbury, the Board voted unanimously to continue the hearing to January 13, 2021 at 7:00 pm.**

**Bellingham Shores – Phasing Plan Modification:**

The Board was informed that Fargon, LLC purchased the “Bellingham Shores” Definitive Subdivision form Bellingham Residential #2 Realty LLC. The applicant formally submitted a letter asking for a modification to the approved phasing of the project.

The Engineer Stephen O’Connell was present representing Fargon, LLC. It was explained that the South Main Street has the best accessibility, has the least amount of abutters and the entrance is already disturbed. The utility and roadway would commence at the start of Road A which was noted on the plan. This work will continue to Road B to a set of catch basins. The Board would like the applicant to notify the abutters within 100 ft. of the project about the change to the proposed phasing.

**On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Dennis Trebino, the Board voted unanimously to approve the minor modification for Bellingham Shores regarding the phasing plan.**

**Minutes:**

**October 28, 2021:**

**On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Elizabeth Berthelette, the Board voted unanimously to approve the minutes from with revisions.**

**Calendar 2022:**

The Board is in receipt of the 2022 Calendar.

**Adjourn:**

**On a motion made by Brian Salisbury, seconded by Dennis Trebino, the Board voted to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 pm.**

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Amy Sutherland", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Amy Sutherland

Recording Secretary