

**Town of Bellingham  
Conservation Commission  
Municipal Center  
Bellingham, MA 02019  
Minutes of the meeting of April 27, 2016**

**Project: 105-779 & BWP-131  
NOI**

**Project Description:**  
160 High St. – 600,000 sf. & 300,000 sf. Distribution facility,  
septic, storm water management

**Applicant:**  
Mark Pillote  
Campanelli Bell. LLC  
10 Campbell Dr.  
Braintree, MA

**Representative:**  
Brandon Li  
Kelly Engineering Group Inc.  
0 Campanelli Drive  
Braintree, MA

**Plans:**  
**Continuation time: 7:30 PM**

Cliff Matthews read the hearing notice (no PSC representative was at tonight's meeting). We decided to schedule a site walk to see the isolated wetlands and potential vernal pool in the southwest corner of the property. There should be building stakes put in place to see the outline of the structures. A May 7 site walk was scheduled for 8:30 AM.

The Conservation Commission then continued reviewing the comments letter responses from Tom Houston of PSC, dated March 10, 2016; where they left off after the meeting of April 13.

19. We're making progress on this point, but need more information. The sediment erosion plan (SEP) is too generic. David Kelly from Kelly Engineering Group: the sediment erosion plan is a "working document" with the contractor, (i.e. stockpiling). They would like to have a meeting two weeks before the start of construction (assuming the project gets permitted), to allow time by PSC to review the SEP. The applicant is requesting the commission's approval to not have to provide the sediment erosion plan until 2 to 4 weeks prior to construction. Mike O'Herron questioned what other projects in this town had asked for this method of providing the SEP (i.e. Regal Cinema Plaza project). David Kelly: silt socks will be put up all the way around the site (1/2 mile of sediment control), there will be splash pads at the entry points, materials will come on & off of Maple Street. Cliff Matthews stated that the Order will require an on-site sediment and erosion control specialist for the duration of the project. Monitoring reports will be submitted and corrective action for any failures taken immediately. Mike O'Herron asked about the plans/to deal with a major rainstorm impacts on the site when the trees and groundcover have just been cleared for any site work. He then asked that the commission consider setting up weekly monitoring reports– a more frequent communication. Cliff Matthews confirmed that the standard plan would not suffice, and that the commission will require hay bales with silt fences. A special condition likely implemented – will be a requirement that the sediment erosion control plan must be brought to the Conservation Commission (during one of their planned meetings) for review, prior to the start of any construction.

20. The larger isolated wetland will have a very substantial cut around it. The cut will extend to two feet below the pavement grade and Cliff Matthews was not comfortable with it. The proposal is to install an impervious barrier in an attempt to prevent ground water from leaching out from the beneath the isolated wetland. It appears perched soils are in place providing hydrology which the wetland needs to survive. Cliff Matthews' concern is that during construction of the impervious lining,

**Conservation Commission**

**Minutes of the meeting of April 27, 2016**  
**Page #2**

existing water pockets may be pierced ultimately causing the wetland to dry up which would be an alteration. David Kelly stated that his company has utilized this strategy in the past successfully and were maintaining the wetlands area. Mike O'Herron questioned how viable the small, isolated wetland would be when it is surrounded by fencing, foot and vehicle traffic, roads, & buildings, on all sides. The wetland exists at 236/237 elevation and is 9 feet above the planned finish grade around that area. It was determined that the commission will review this (plan sheet page 11) on our site walk. Neal Standley asked if this isolated wetlands is fed solely by rainwater. David Kelly responded surface rainfall only.

21. Regarding enclosed system velocity mitigation, David Kelly stated that the smoother the pipe the faster the flow and they have used conservative figures for rates of flow, allowing for a factor of safety. Some slopes needed to be reduced and all calculations for velocity will be provided but according to Kelly, are well within OEM specifications. Mike O'Herron questioned what level storm the testing was done on and was told that it was the 25 year level.

22. David Kelly stated during the peer review process, some inconsistencies were discovered and he appreciated Mr. Houston's findings. Cliff Matthews stated that he was still concerned with the velocity in the pipes. David Kelly said he would submit the new information to PSC and the Commission.

23. David Kelly: these types of pipes have become an industry standard over the past twenty years and have proven to be very reliable. Rates of flow were calculated in the ten feet per second range below the twelve feet per second max recommended by the manufacturers. This pipe has been in use since the 90's in Massachusetts and excavated pipes of that age (20 years) seem to still be in good condition. Mike O'Herron asked Mr. Kelly approximately how many feet of piping would be on the site.

Kelly stated that the number has not been calculated but that it is high.

24. A typo was on the plan – all set now.

25. There is a need to quantify the volumetric storm water flow post construction. The applicant will present the Commission with strategies to reduce stormwater volume and as stated at the previous hearing all avenues of reduction are to be considered.

26. David Kelly stated that in every case the attempt was being made to provide proper separation to groundwater for all basins and recharge areas including re-grading the site to elevate the bottoms of those structures. Calculations and details will be provided as part of the supplemental information package that the Commission has agreed to accept.

27. Cliff brought up the subject of street sweeping. Trucks will come in and out constantly, and debris will get into the drainage. David Kelly stated there is a 5% credit for street sweeping in the storm water management standards. Even without the 5% credit utilizing extended catch basins, water quality structures and recharge, the applicant proposes to reach the required 80% TSS removal. However, when proprietary mechanical structures are added to the treatment train, the TSS removal increase dramatically. Brian Norton asked about the building roofs and was told they will have a shallow pitch. Brian Norton asked where the piles of snow would be placed. David Kelly stated they would be on the layout plan. Mike O'Herron asked how much area is paved. David Kelly stated 15 acres of pavement area. David Kelly stated that the O & M Plan has a snow location area included.

Neal Standley moved to continue the hearing to May 11, 2016 at 8:00 PM, was seconded by Brian Norton and passed on a unanimous vote.

**Conservation Commission**  
**Minutes of the meeting of April 27, 2016**  
**Page #3**

**Project: 105- & BWP-  
NOI**

**Project Description:**  
Six Multiple Unit Dwellings, Septic & Stormwater Mgt.

**Applicant:**  
K & S Realty Trust  
Brad Wright  
Bellingham, MA

**Representative:**  
Andrews Surveying & Engineering Inc.  
J.P. Connelly  
Uxbridge, MA

**Plans: NOI &  
Hearing: 8:30 PM**

Cliff Matthews opened the hearing. Mr. Connelly stated he cannot confirm that the Abutter Notification went out in time. Cliff Matthews suggested that we take no regulatory actions tonight but open the hearing for informational purposes as it was legally advertised. The wetlands are located on the east side of their site. The proposed buildings are outside of the hundred foot buffer zone, but there will be grading between the fifty foot and the one hundred foot buffer zone. They will present that information at the hearing. Catch basins, sediment forebays and detention basins would not be within the hundred foot zone. They want to build an additional detention basin. There was some discussion about utilizing the existing detention basin. To the rear of the easterly-most buildings will be a small lawn area with grading into the buffer zone at approximately a 3:1 slope. This concluded the informational presentation. At the continuation, Mr. Connelly will present evidence of property abutter notification. Mike Roche moved to continue the hearing to May 11 at 9 PM, seconded by Shawn Wade, and passed unanimously.

---

8:50 PM – Asphalt Engineering – Farm Street – Informational –A previous site development plan which was unfiled and not approved was presented. The Commission and the prospective owner used this plan to identify all resource areas present on the site. It appears that in addition to the two hundred foot riparian zone, buffer zones to BVW, buffer zones to Isolated Wetlands; that there may be potential vernal pools. Prior to any development of the site, these resource areas must be confirmed in the field. The prospective owners stated their intention to access the rear of the site for re-ground asphalt storage and the front of the site for a 15,000 square foot building. The Commission stated that once the resource areas are identified in the field, the front of the property can be utilized provided the prospective owners stay outside buffer zones and the riparian zone. In order to access the rear of the property, an existing cart path will need to be improved. This will require a formal filing of a Notice of Intent with the Conservation Commission.

---

9:15 PM – Post Office Place – 316 Mechanic St. – Informational –The Order of Conditions states that if changes are proposed, the applicant shall appear before the Commission to determine if the changes are significant enough to require filing of a new Notice of Intent, request an Amendment, or present drawings for the Commission to approve the changes as a minor project change. Peter Lavoie stated: they want to lower the road to minimize the grade. By lowering the road they can take out the retaining wall on one side. There was a retaining wall inside the basin and now they will have a 3 to 1 slope. It doesn't affect the drainage. The planning board has already approved the field

**Conservation Commission**  
**Minutes of the meeting of April 27, 2016**  
**Page #4**

change. Our consultants from PSC looked at the drainage and calculations. They are asking for a field change, like the planning board approved. Cliff Matthews said that Mr. Lavoie must write a letter to the Conservation Commission about the changes with drawings. Neal Standley moved to grant the changes without the need to file, pending receiving the required letter detailing the changes, and a new set of plans. Shawn Wade seconded the motion and it was passed on a unanimous vote.

---

**Updates:**

**PSC comments – 160 High Street** – An account has been set up (funded by the applicant), to pay for the peer review. Only the chairman must sign for payment authorizations.

**David Brown – violation** – This violation is an un-permitted utilization of the one hundred foot buffer zone and possibly has resulted in the filling of wetlands. It abuts and may be located on Conservation Commission property. We need to determine where the town right-of-way is on Route 140 in order to find the beginning point of the easterly lot line. The orthographic photos show there has been actively going on for quite a while. Neal Standley suggested hiring someone to survey the property boundary. We have both a property boundary issue and a wetlands / buffer zone issue. Cliff Matthews has an enforcement order prepared. At Town Planner, Jim Kupfer's suggestions, the Conservation Commission or Planning Board will talk to G & H about providing us with the property line information, since they're working on the adjacent Post Office Pl. site, and already have done surveying.

**April 30 – Earth Day cleanup** – Mike Roche: 9:00 AM – 50 volunteers, SRO, two sites – Box Pond, 126 to Mill Street, other suggestions included: High Street to Route 495, and Maple Street near the Charles River bridge. The DPW is involved, to pick up the filled trash bags, and other large debris. Mike has called the CRWA for supplies. The Conservation Commission will reimburse Mr. Roche for supplies; if needed.

**Old Bridge Lane** – sediment erosion controls are in and functioning as designed.

**Varney site on Hartford Avenue** – Twelve to fourteen years ago, DEP issued a Consent Order requiring clean up and management of wastes associated with Varney's concrete operation. Arthur Allen of Eco-Tech stated that structure was installed and that the new owner, Dauphnaïs, is maintaining previously constructed structures. At Eco-Tech's request, Cliff Mathews and Jim Kupfer inspected the site. DEP never alerted the Conservation Commission to the existence of the Consent Order or the requirements therein.

**Cliff Matthews** will file an RFD, to remove two large trees from his property that abuts Box Pond.

**Silver Lake** – Lori Fafard reported an incident of vandalism on the island. The fire department came down and police were called. A fire on the island was put out, and 12 teenagers left via canoe, as rapidly as they could paddle.

Neal Standley moved to adjourn, seconded by Mike Roche and passed unanimously at 10:11PM.

Attending the meeting was: Cliff Matthews, Brian Norton, Michael Roche, Shawn Wade, Neal Standley, Lori Fafard and Michael O'Herron.