

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

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Driscoll, Chairman; Mr. Ajemian, Ms. Guarino, Mr. Geller and Mr. MacDonald

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Romulus, Assistant Director; Ms. Dorr, Office Administrator and Associate Member, Astrid Rojas. Mr. Etoniru arrived later in the meeting.

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. All votes will be by roll call.

### **MINUTES APPROVED**

Ms. Guarino said she had read the minutes and there were only a couple of scribes errors which she had emailed to Mrs. Dorr.

**On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Geller, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote, to approve the corrected minutes of 1/6/21 and 1/20/21.**

### **14 SUMMER STREET PUBLIC HEARING**

The hearing convened at 6:33 on application by DA BAR, LLC for site plan approval under Sec. 9.80 for renovations of a mixed-use building located at 14 Summer Street. There will be a restaurant on the first floor and 5 apartments above.

Correspondence received:

Building Inspector-He is all set with the site plan. The only issue he sees right now is the fire escape. The set of stairs on the right side of building leads up to a window; a door is required by code.

Azu Etoniru- He has completed his review of the site plan for the above subject location prepared by Silva Engineering Associates, PC (SEA). His review was focused primarily on the engineering design aspects. He assumed that the CED will review the site plan for compliance with zoning, therefore, his review has not embraced zoning compliance evaluation. The proposed site work involves the redevelopment of a previously developed site, including conversion of a mix of existing gravel and sparse vegetation surface to a bituminous concrete surface. Hisy review comments include the following: **1**, the proposed stormwater recharge system is not furnished with an emergency overflow provision; **2**, the proposed stormwater recharge system is located within insitu soil horizon that is not conducive for stormwater recharge. A specification for the removal of unsuitable material within the recharge area from elevation 90.5 down to elevation 86.2 and replacement with clean pervious soils, free of contaminants and other deleterious material should be added on the construction details sheet; **3**, the volumes of runoff for all storm events under the post development conditions are slightly higher than the corresponding volumes of runoff under the existing conditions at the 90 percent level; **4**, the bottom of the stormwater recharge system is only two feet above the seasonal high groundwater level. The applicant needs to provide a groundwater mounding calculation to demonstrate that the recharge

system would not be surcharged; and 5, information should be provided to verify that the proposed lighting will not cast glare onto the abutting land(s).

Mr. Silva made the presentation. He said that the Assessor's have the property at 1800 sf., but their survey has it coming in a little bit shy of that. The building sits to the right side of the property; there is parking in front, to the left and to the rear. He said the property was provided with Town Water and an on-site septic system. He said there was a new sewer line provided to take it off the septic system and the water line was upgraded for fire prevention. The area of the old septic systems will be an area for some upgrades that they are proposing. The original set up in the building was 2 apartments with a 200-seat capacity restaurant. They are proposing 5 apartments and a 100-seat capacity restaurant. There is a proposed bump out at the rear for a proposed stairway that meets codes, a proposed patio out front, but other than that, the footprint is the same. They put in a wall, with a permit from the building dept., on the right side and to the rear abutting Latham Terrace which will allow for leveling out of the surface elevation in the back and it will serve to separate the commercial use in this building with the residential use on Latham Terrace. He said the previous number of parking spaces that were required to support the former restaurant was 52; there are 22 proposed spaces on site and 10 spaces that will be absorbed in the CBD.

Response letter from SEA received this afternoon dated 2-3-21 which addresses Azu's concerns about the stormwater system that is in the back to handle roof recharge; they will add a detail that shows that there is an overflow from the roof drains in the event that the roof chambers cannot the flow that will discharge to ground level in those situations. There was a question about the soils supporting the recharge system and Mr. Silva said they will be adding a note to the plan that would specify the requirements that were outlined by Azu. The third question had to do with the volume of run-off for all storm events is slightly higher than that for the current conditions; they can't meet the 90% reduction, he said. He said this is a redevelopment of a property, so they are trying to do everything to the extent possible. He felt it was a minimal difference from the standards for new sites that are from the ground up. The next question was about groundwater mounding and whether the positioning of the chambers would not fall into a situation where there would be a mounding of the available volume; they have shown that there is a 2-foot separation at the bottom of the chambers. He will provide ground water mounding calculations to show that there is not an impact or if need be, they will adjust the elevations of the chambers. Next question was about lighting and whether it would cast a glare on other properties. There is a note on the plan which is holding to the standard that it must be equipped with a prismatic lens to reduce glare to maximum cut off 70 degrees vertical.

SEA also received questions from Elijah. One question was on the building height. SEA consulted with the architect and the new roof height is 6" higher than the highest roof that is remaining at the front portion of the building. The architect will provide documentation that the height does not exceed the 45' limit; they are not even close to that, he said. Mr. Driscoll clarified that this is not a special permit application, only a site plan. He said that in the CBD, without a special permit, the height is only allowed at 40'. Rebecca from SEA said the height is closer to 36'. Mr. Driscoll noted that with the restaurant capacity being cut it half, the project is less non-conforming than before.

Ms. Guarino questioned the fact that snow storage is shown on 6 parking spaces at the rear. Mr. Silva said during a snowstorm, you may have less capacity at that point; they will have to either take snow off

site, or realize they have less capacity in the parking lot. He noted that there are businesses nearby that don't provide any parking.

Mr. Ajemian said he would like to see what the building is going to look like, especially in terms of color. Vinyl siding versus Hardy plank discussed. Cynthia Danksewicz, 121 Greenbrier Lane, the applicant, said she would do what the Board wanted; however, she would rather do an upgraded vinyl. She did some research, and this location is outside the Historic District. Cynthia said she is open to what is suitable in the area; she would do whatever the town would like as far as the color schematics.

Mr. Silva's response letter of 2-3-21 was put up on the screen and discussed again as Mr. Etoniru had arrived at the meeting. Mr. Etoniru said that if they can provide a detail on that recharge system on how that works, that would be satisfactory. Ms. Danksewicz questioned why all this work had to be done; the building has been there for years with no complaints. Mr. Etoniru explained that the redevelopment involves adding more pavement which means less impervious areas. She asked if she could use the parking areas as is, with no pavement? Mr. Etoniru noted that we are not here to design the project; we review an application that was submitted and make comments. Ms. Danksewicz understood why these things needed to be done if area paved, but again questioned leaving it the way it is. Mr. Etoniru commented that it is a conversation she should have with her engineer.

Mr. Etoniru said that he had noted that there is a deficiency in the post development runoff, but he also made a point to bring it to the Board's attention that he believes that what Mr. Silva said because the redevelopment and increase is de minimis, but he has no problem with it.

Lighting discussed. Mr. Driscoll commented that in mixed use, we try to have 15' poles. Again, this is not a special permit, he said. Mr. Silva said he had no problem with that. Mr. Driscoll questioned if there was a difference in using 15' poles rather than 20'. Ms. Danksewicz suggested it was the quality of the 20' pole and they are sturdier.

Comments from the Assistant Town Planner reviewed.

There are two areas at the rear showing some landscaping; not specific. Mr. Driscoll questioned if there would be much glare on the house adjacent to Latham Terrace? Ms. Danksewicz said they have already discussed this with the property owners who have been very accommodating. If headlights are an issue, going into the second floor, they would put up a fence. Due to the height of the wall, lights will not be an issue for the first floor. Ms. Danksewicz stated that they had discussed putting a fence around the whole property anyway. Mr. Geller mentioned a fence around the dumpster.

Mr. Driscoll questioned if there was calculation of lot coverage pre and post? Mr. Silva said they are at 90 now and will be 90 when developed. Mr. Romulus said if it does not increase the lot coverage, then it is fine.

No public comment in chat or hands raised.

Mr. Etoniru stated that the groundwater mounding needs to be resolved prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Silva said he would update the plans to show that currently that the current conditions are 90% coverage and not exceeding it; will add the section of fencing; the roof drain detail; any adjustment to the roof drain recharge; groundwater mounding...basically all the comments that were verbalized.

Unsure if they will show 15' or 20' poles. She will have the electrical supply house give her the specifics on a 15' and 20' and decide which would be the best.

Ms. Guarino questioned the Building Dept. comment about the fire escape going to a window. Ms. Danksewicz felt they were grandfathered, however, if the Building Inspector wants a door rather than a window, they will put it in.

Ms. Rojas asked where the properties were that they had previously rehabbed? 484/486 Main St. and 487 Main Street.

**On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, it was unanimously voted to continue the hearing to 2/17 at 6:30 pm.**

**On a motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Ms. Guarino, the meeting was adjourned at 7:51.**

**MINUTES APPROVED:**