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

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Mr. Driscoll, Mr. Ajemian, Ms. Guarino, Mr. Geller, Mr. MacDonald (arrived at 6:46)

STAFF PRESENT:  Jennifer Burke; Assistant Director, Elijah Romulus and Office Administrator, Leslie Dorr.

Mr. Driscoll, Chairman, 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.

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUATION ON ORDINANCE D-FY20-007

On 6/24/20 the Board received notification from the Council Secretary that at their meeting held 6/23/20, the Town Council unanimously voted to withdraw Ordinance D-FY20-007: The recodification of Zoning Ordinance.

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

Due to the probability of a long public hearing on the school, the members decided to take the next two items out of order.

FIREFLY LANE-REQUEST TO RELEASE LOT 1 FOR MODEL HOME

In a letter dated June 11, 220, Mr. Greg Maroney requested the release of Lot 1 for the purpose of building the model home. He noted in request that this had been done for Oldfield Estates and Crimson Estates.

The CED found no problem with the request but suggested that no occupancy permit be issued until the road bond was received.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. Geller, it was unanimously voted by members present, by roll call vote, to execute the covenant release for Lot 1 for the purpose of a model home, however, no occupancy permit to be issued until the road bond is received.

ANR WALNUT STREET

The plan was prepared by Michael J. Koska & Associates. The applicant nor the engineer were present. The two lots are adjacent to Winterberry Lane. #370 Walnut Street is Lot 2 and #352 Walnut Street is Lot 1. The plan is reconfiguring the lots to keep the shed on Lot 1. Both have adequate frontage on Walnut Street.

Mr. Romulus was ok with the plan; there are no issues with the plan as proposed.

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Geller, it was unanimously voted by members present, by roll call vote, to endorse the Form A.
Mr. Driscoll disclosed that he sits on the school building committee and asked if there was any objection to him sitting on the hearing? There was no objection.

The public hearing convened at approximately 6:42 p.m.

The public hearing ad that appeared in the Enterprise on June 17th and June 24th was read into the record:

“On Wednesday, July 1, 2020, at 6:30 pm, the Bridgewater Planning Board will be conducting a public hearing on application by Derek Swenson for site plan approval for the construction of the new George H. Mitchell elementary school to be located at 500 South Street.

The public hearing will be held as a virtual meeting over zoom. A link and instructions to participate in the meeting will be posted to the calendar on the Town’s website at www.bridgewaterma.org.

Copies of plans may be requested by emailing CED@bridgewaterma.org.

A recording of the meeting will also be posted to the Town’s webpage within 48 hours after the meeting ends. All interested persons are encouraged to attend.”

Abutters notices of certification received.

Mr. MacDonald entered the room at 6:44.

The meeting was then turned over to the project teams for their presentation.

Gene Raymond from Raymond Designs, Dustin Powell and Jeff Pilat from Samiotes were the presenters.

Lengthy presentation given, with a pause between sections for questions.

Project overview was given by Gene Raymond- Raymond Designs- Traffic and site circulation- It is located on the same site as the existing school. They are keeping the entrance off South Street. They are proposing two vehicle ways out of the site to make site circulation better. Slide showed overlay of new building over the existing. The new school with be 2-stories but a smaller footprint. It slopes from South Street to Bedford St. Height of building is 32’ along South Street, which is under the Zoning bylaw (35 feet is allowed) and on the backside, it is 46’. They received a variance from the ZBA last week for the increased height. Conceptual site plan shown- for orientation purposes only. They tried to separate the parent drop off and pick up with getting the Q off of South St. Buses will come in a separate entrance off but traverse the site to the left. There will be a new two-way exist, one way only, for the buses to Bedford Street with a right turn only. A rendering of the school was shown. Two wings with a two-story glass entry. Wing on left is facing towards South Street. The main office is part of that wing.

Mr. Ajemian questioned what grades will be in the school? Mr. Raymond said PreK thru 2nd grade. The previous school was PreK to grade 3. Mr. Ajemian questioned what the two playing fields were for? Mr. Raymond said mainly for recess and physical education in the spring and fall. There will be play materials, swing sets and things like that. Mr. Ajemian commented that he thought with the buses turning right only, would be a lengthy way to get back around to the school. Mr. Raymond said they had a traffic study done and in consultation with everyone involved including public safety people and school people felt this seemed to be the best way to separate the cars and buses and not having a lot of back
up on South Street.

Gene Raymond—slide of traffic study. Showed locus of the study. Next side showed the conclusions:

1. The levels of service at surrounding intersections will virtually remain the same.
2. At pm school—The westbound approach at South/Winter will rise from Los E to Los F-Monitor, but no traffic signal is warranted.
3. Adequate safe stopping distance exists for traffic using or passing the site.
4. Site distance to north of South Street driveway could be improved by trimming or removing trees.
5. No roadway modification required at Rt. 18 and Wally Krueger with right turn only/exist only bus circulation.
6. No reduction in safety on the surrounding roadways and intersections will occur due to the proposed development.

Mr. Raymond then explained the on-site circulation. Special Ed vans will have a separate drop off and pick up location. Vans come at a different time between 8:10-8:30 and the buses come about 15 minutes later. He explained the entryway improvements. It will be widened. Next slide was the afternoon late day pick up. PK vans showing up at 2:30; the buses and parents at 3:10. Between 3:30-6:00 there is an afternoon program.

Questions—Mr. Geller asked if they planned on doing anything at RT.18? Mr. Raymond said no; he assumes that there is an existing stop sign there. They will be resurfacing but will not go to the state highway. Mr. Geller questioned who was going to police that the buses will be taking a right hand turn only? Mr. Raymond said they are counting on the school department taking control of the bus drivers because they are contracted with the school dept. He felt it would be a major issue for the bus company the first time a bus driver turned left! He said there will be a gate at the far side of the senior center which will be remotely operated by the school to ensure that there will be no cut thru traffic. Mr. Ajemian asked if they were repaving the entrance to the senior center? Mr. Raymond said they are not repaving on the senior site, but they are swinging the Wally Krueger Way around the senior center and putting in some curbing so there will be a more formalized way into the parking lot and a more formalized exit; it will be just resurfaced, not widened. Mr. Geller questioned the number of students in the facility? Mr. Raymond said it is 740 K-2 and PreK may vary, but could be up to 240 kids, but it would be split between a morning and afternoon session.

The program was turned over to Dustin Powell-Traverse—Site Design and Landscape Design.

1. Site is designed to provide safe circulation for pedestrians and vehicles throughout.
2. Play areas are positioned close to the building and are protected by fences and plant screenings.
3. The site takes advantage of the existing slope as much as possible working with the grade changes across the site.
4. Parking is disbursed to avoid massive parking areas. Internal islands and plantings are provided to the greatest extent possible while accommodating snow removal.
5. Materials are chosen to fit within the context of Bridgewater playing off wetlands and streams present on the site and the fields and meadows elsewhere in town.
6. Plantings comprised of a mix of trees, shrubs and grasses.
7. Plant pallet is comprised of deciduous shade trees, evergreens, ornaments, flowering trees and native species.
8. Plantings are positioned to soften the scale of parking lots as well as the building.
9. All trees are to be installed at a minimum of 2½ “caliper.

Questions: Carlton Hunt asked have tree selections been optimized for carbon c...inaudible. Dustin stated that she honestly didn’t know that term. Mr. Raymond asked if they were using all native plans; Dustin said yes, as many as possible; Mr. Raymond felt the thought was that the trees suck up and deposit carbon into the ground thru their root system. He commented to Dustin that he did not think they were asked to do that; he didn’t know the answer to the question either. Mr. Ajemian questioned if they had considered deer resistant plants? Yes, they were told that there is a deer population on site, so to the extent possible, they will be doing that. Mr. Geller commented that he assumed that there will be no poisonous plants or plants that will have seed or pods that children could choke on? In that area, it will be mostly shade trees planted for relief from the sun. He asked if there was going to be a blow up of the playground presented tonight. Dustin said no. Kris from Traverse stated that once the native species grow and reach canopy height, they will contribute to the carbon storage, for sure. They have not done an estimated count on that yet. Mr. Geller asked if there will be irrigation put in to keep all these plants alive? It will be as drought resident as possible. There will be no mowing of the slopes. To meet the Leeds credits, they will not be putting in irrigation. The contractor will be responsible to make sure it is watered and maintained until final acceptance which is typically a year after planting. After that, the Town will be responsible for maintaining. Ms. Burke clarified by saying it would not be the Town’s responsibility, but the District’s responsibility. Kris said she would provide a maintenance manual. Mr. Geller asked if there is some reason, we a building this Leed? Mr. Powell explained that the MSBA funding, which is a State agency, and funding part of this project, requires that the project meet green design standards; one being Leed and one being high collaborative for high performing schools. Mr. Geller questioned if they were going any higher than Leeds certified? Mr. Raymond said that the District was able to secure an extra 2% of reimbursement on the project from the State and in order to do that, you have to do two things: Be at least Leeds certified and you also have to beat the Leeds standard for energy use by 16% minimum and he believes that by 28 or 29%. Carol Lefeber asked what is happening to the intermittent stream? It will remain. She stated that Wally Krueger is a fairy narrow way for two-way traffic and asked if it would be wise to expand the with of it, especially for snow removal in the winter. Mr. Powell said it is 20-24 feet and that is sufficient for two buses or a car and a bus. The main entrance will be in the same place but will be widened within the property lines. Carlton Hunt commented, expanding on his comment about the trees, that there are ways to calculated optimal co2 removal; please do consider trees used as it is important from an environmental standpoint; Large trees may affect solar panel installation in the future. Please evaluate long term effect of plant vegetations. Kris said she would take it back to the town for long term planning for solar panels on the school site. Mr. Powell noted that the roof area and mechanics are designed for future solar panels. The roof structure is built accordingly and will support those structures. Mr. Ajemian asked, “that is the reason for not putting in solar now?” Mr. Raymond said it was a budget reason; no funding set aside for it. Mr. Ajemian commented that there are firms that will install to get the electricity. Mr. Powell thought that would be a school department or Town initiative to solicit those types of groups. Carlton Hunt chatted that he was chairman of the energy committee and would be happy to discuss these things. Carol Lefeber expressed concern for seniors navigating up the bus exit from Bedford St. Mr. Powell said they met out at the site multiple times with the senior center; he reminded the audience that it is only 15-20 minutes in the morning when the senior center is closed and the same in
the afternoon. The did what they could to slow down the buses with a curve in the road, signage and traffic tables.

Jeff Pilat -Samiotes Consultants then presented-Civil and site preparation plan; civil and vehicular Hardscape and signage plan; civil and Stormwater Management and utilities Stormwater plans. He started off with the soil erosion and sediment control plan which they put together to protect the resource areas, the ditch and wetlands.

Next slide-Civil and site preparation plan-only resurfacing Wally Krueger Way up to the senior center; shows erosion control for that work as well.

Next side- Civil and circulation hardscape and signage plan. There is an existing bituminous walkway by the intermittent stream to the east of the school that will be widened to allow vehicular access. Will be putting in a new 3-sided culvert below that. There are three proposed parking areas to the north, south and west of the building. They will be putting in signs and pavement markings to show directional flow of traffic. He spoke about the automatic gate that will prevent cut-thus. Speed tables shown on plan which will help with traffic calming and allow the senior citizen to exit safely. The width of that drive is approaching 29'; a typical drive land is about 12’, so they have plenty of room as they get out to Bedford Street.

Next slide- Civil and Stormwater management and utilities plan Majority of utilities will be coming from South Street- He explained the Stormwater management system. They have met with the Conservation Commission and hope to close at the next meeting. He then explained the grading plan. Retaining walls around the playground areas.

Mr. Driscoll questioned what are they doing for curbing throughout the site? It is vertical granite. The Building Committee is going to entertain some alternates as part of the bidding package. If some things come in high, they have some wiggle room to be able to award the project to still maintain the schedule. They might propose to limit the vertical and use some cape cod berm somewhere. Right now they are on budget for the vertical curbing; this will be a safety valve.

Azu’s comments received in email July 1, 2020 read into the record.

“I have completed my initial review of the site plan application for the above subject location. The documents I reviewed include the following: a report titled “George H. Mitchell Elementary School – Traffic Impact Analysis” by Bryant Associates, dated February 2019; a report titled “The New George H. Mitchell Elementary School 500 South Street Bridgewater, MA 02324 Stormwater Report” by Samiotes Consultants, Inc; and the plan sheets by various team consultants. My review comments at this time are as follows: 1, in general, the plans and reports are satisfactorily presented; 2, a plan index sheet should be provided, enumerating all of the sheets and sheet content caption to facilitate review and tracking of the plans; 3, at some point, full size sets of the plan sheets (24” by 36” sheet size) should be provided as the small size sheets are not very legible; 4, the stormwater report and the plans do not include existing conditions watershed plan and the post development conditions watershed plan and their respective sub catchment areas, therefore, the input data for each sub catchment could not be verified/evaluated; 5, the flow paths and the types of flow assumed in developing the times of concentration should be shown and annotated on the watershed plans; 6, the methodology
employed in the stormwater modelling does not account for stormwater flows through the drainage structures (catch basins and manholes), therefore, the effects of potential backwater or surcharging within the structures have not been characterized or identified. The structures should be analyzed/modelled as detention basins/ponds with insignificant storage in the stormwater analysis scheme; 7, the soil evaluation profiles/data documented at the site should be added on the plan with applicable groundwater elevation indicated for each proposed recharge system, along with the 2 year, 10 year, and 100 year peak elevations and the respective system bottom elevations indicated on the recharge system details; 8, a comparison table which summarizes the results of the existing conditions and post development conditions respective peak rates of runoff and volumes of runoff should be provided; 9, concrete strength and dimensional details (including wall thickness) for the catch basin and the water quality structure shown on sheet C-6-2 should be indicated on the plan; 10, the percentage of voids used in the stormwater analysis for the infiltration system(s) should be 40, not 30; 11, the traffic circulation and parking plan appears adequate. However, school bus route within the school site is not clearly defined on the site plan. The turning radius at the southeasterly intersection for a school bus exiting the school site and traveling easterly towards Bedford Street through the senior center site needs to be evaluated, it does not appear to be adequate; it should be sized to allow for an emergency fire apparatus with ladder to safely negotiate the turn. If you have any questions or need further information, please call or send email."

Mr. Pilot provided answers to Azu’s comments and said in some way, they will take care of all his comments.

Mr. Raymond explained the exterior lighting-Mr. Carlton Hunt questioned why they did not incorporate LED lights with battery storage? Mr. Raymond said that was brough up with the District and there were many maintenance issues with them; they are very finnicky and take up a lot of a maintenance budget.

Mr. Hunt questioned what is being used for paving? He was told standard bituminous asphalt.

Next slide- Gene Raymond- site lighting, Building Massing and Materials Mainly brick with painted panel

Mr. Geller asked if there was a dumpster on site? Mr. Raymond said it will be at the back on the north side of the school at the lowest level on a pad along with a pad for the transformer. He was not quite sure if it would be fenced. Mr. Geller asked about fencing around the playground? They were talking about an ornamental picket. The drive around the school runs parallel to all three sides of the playground. Mr. Geller asked if there had been any discussion about a freak accident with a rogue car going into the playground? He said he was looking for precautionary stuff to make it safe, perhaps bollards or a fence that can stop autos. Mr. Raymond said no. You would need a ton of bollards and that would be extremely costly. Mr. Geller felt a precautionary measure should be taken to keep the children safe. Mr. Raymond said he was sure Dustin’s group could do some research on that and provide some options with associated costs, to the school committee. Mr. Driscoll said that was a good thought and something the school building committee could discuss.

Mr. Ajemian asked them to explain the rationale for not enter and existing on to South Street- Mainly due to conflict points on the site and off the site and that is why they wanted to create two separate routes.
Carol LeFeber questioned where will the children be accessing the playgrounds from? The have placed the playgrounds right next to the building and will come from the inside thru the cafeteria and then go over to the right to enter thru another door.

Mr. MacDonald questioned whether they have taken precautions to avoid any mold like the previous school problem due to the wetness of the area? Mr. Raymond stated that was a major issue for the Town probably since when that school opened. There was a forensic study done with what happened with the old building and it really had nothing to do with ground water or the wetlands near the building. It was all about the building trapping moisture inside it because there were some construction issues with exterior walls and moisture that came in, could not get back out. There is no evidence of groundwater near the floor slates of the building. The soils are great.....lots of gravel. They can very confidently say that there will be no mold or moisture issues inside this building.

The Board wanted to keep the hearing open until Azu’s comments were responded to in writing. Mr. Raymond indicated that the continuation would not impact them.

Mr. Hunt and Mr. Ajemian wanted to make sure they were considering the tree types that were deer resistant. Mr. Raymond asked that an email be sent to clarify exactly what they are looking for so they would be able to address it. Mr. Romulus said he would do that.

Ms. Burke suggested that if a board member had a question, to email Elijah so he could forward to consultants so they would be prepared to address at the next meeting.

On a motion by Mr. Ajemian, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, it was unanimously voted by roll call vote to continue the hearing to July 15th at 6:30 pm.

-----

Minutes of 6/17/20 were on the agenda for approval. No one had the opportunity to review at this time. Minutes will be put on the next agenda.

There was no director s report.

Ms. Guarino said the CPC was reviewing an application by the Congregational Church.

On a motion by Ms. Guarino, seconded by Mr. Ajemian, the meeting was adjourned at 8:28 pm.

MINUTES APPROVED: 7/15/2020