

P.O. BOX 43
BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

EDWARD T. MOORE, CHAIRMAN GLENN E. GERRIOR, VICE CHAIRMAN EMILE W. NIEDZWIADEK ANNE M. MORSE JOHN P. MURRAY

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

March 23, 1989

Meeting was called to order at 8:00 p.m. All members except GG were present. Board's consultant, Philip B. Herr was also present.

Submissions:

Dana Standley for Jim Troupes, land surveyor, submits a 81-P for Maple Street. Applicant is John L. Marshall.

EM questions if it is near the property which Marshall owns.

D. Standley indicates it is Jack Marshall's land.

EM questions where the house is in relation to the lot.

D. Stanley points it out on the plan.

EM questions if they are just defining lot lines.

- D. Standley indicates that is correct.
- P. Herr states he is confused by the property lines.
- D. Standley explains they had a problem showing the property line and the line. It does not show the wall too well. It is really a monument.

EM states it was endorsed earlier by the Planning Board the way it is shown on the plan. The Planning Board needs 2 copies of the plan and Form A. He should forward one to the Town Clerk.

AM makes a motion to approve. EN seconds. Vote of 3.

LAKEVIEW ESTATES
CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 2

March 23, 1989

EM explains that the continued public hearing was scheduled for 8:30 tonight. He questions if anyone is here from Attorney Roberti's office. He reopens the public hearing for Lakeview Estates, continued from February 23, 1989 and continues the hearing to later at 10:00 p.m.

AM makes a motion to continue. EN seconds. Vote of 3.

P. Herr suggests the Planning Board go over the articles for the Town Meeting. He put together the hearing notices which summarizes the articles. He brought copies of the articles.

EM gave a set to the Board of Selectmen.

P. Herr indicates that there were changes.

EM will give the Board of Selectmen the changes.

P. Herr prepared the public hearing notices.

EM states that is what will appear in the newspapers instead of the whole text.

P. Herr indicates that is correct. At the bottom of the notices it says that the entire text is available at the Town clerk's office. The board really needs to make sure that the text is at the Town Clerk's office. The entire text must be posted.

EM reads letter from the Board of Selectmen, dated March 22, 1989, regarding a policy to resolve problems. The letter requests the Chairman of the Planning Board attend a meeting on April 19, 1989 at 7:30 p.m. to discuss fiscal problems. It is an open meeting which all members are invited to attend. Future meetings will be held quarterly. EM indicates he will be unable to attend since he will be away from April 19 to April 23, 1989.

RIVERVIEW PARK - PHASE 6 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

EM reopens hearing.

B. Lord, representing the applicant. They went through everything at the last meeting. The Board wanted P. Herr's input. They put the entrance to Stony Ridge Village on the plan to see if it could line up. They checked the plan with the Town Clerk and the Town Engineer.

Em states that Stony Ridge had revised plans.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 3

March 23, 1989

JM questions what is happening with the road.

B. Lord explains that the Fafard Companies and other projects, through the Town Administrator, hired Bruce Campbell & Associates to do a traffic work up. Maple Street is in the process. It is an extensive traffic survey.

EM states that Phase 6 is next to the Old Colony Gas Station.

EN states that only one has access.

P. Herr states that changes have been made. The applicant sent a print with the marked changes. Responsive issues raised includes if the Board will waive the requirement since only a lane can be a dead-end street and the proposal for traffic for a non-residential subdivision onto the road is a great concern. He will sign off on it after he knows what is proposed. There is a spirit of cooperation now. It is problematic since the location for traffic is a major concern.

? states the traffic study will be taken in parts. Access to Phase 6 is basically fixed. They cannot go further west from 495. There is no other point to access to the property. The purpose of the traffic study is to determine improvements to Route 126 to handle the proposed developments for Fafard and Stallbrook Center. They have to come up with improved schedules and equations for who will pay for what.

- P. Herr states the traffic study will calculate and figure out who is responsible for what.
- ? indicates they sent the plans to heta. Campbell & Associates.
- P. Herr states that it does not make sense to have the road end where it does. He does not know where it goes. It would be peculiar to approve the plan without knowing where it goes.

EM points out that none of the rest of the plan will change.

B. Lord states it will stop further back because it will not cross the wet areas. The study will decide where $t\sigma$ put the placement of the road. Putting it further back allows for movement.

EN states it depends on who acquires the land.

B. Lord states it is not a question as to who acquires the land.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 4

March 23, 1989

EM questions if it is a collector street.

- B. Lord indicates that is correct.
- P. Herr points out they could say it is land locked.

EM questions if they are land locked here.

P. Herr states they fail to ensure reasonable access.

EM states they could make the road go all the way through.

P. Herr explains it does not make sense to spend time and money engineering this alignment when it will go out there.

EM questions how people will get to the property without the road, the way it exist today. Will they have a right of way or an easement?

- B. Lord explains they have frontage on N. Main Street.
- P. Herr indicates if the Board signs off on the plan, they will not have assurances that people can come out that way.

EM states the Board does not want to put them in a position to force them to use the frontage on N. Main Street. He suggest they get an easement.

- M. Megalli states it is a dilemma.
- B. Lord suggest they leave the road back. They can get in there.

EN states the main problem is the wetlands. It is the Army Core of Engineers land. The applicant does not own the land.

B. Lord states it is not a question of buying the land. People want to develop the land.

EN states it might be land locked by the time they finish it.

- ? showed the master plan to the town... There are wetlands and the Army Core of Engineers parcel. It leaves a narrow future road.
- P. Herr questions what condition they have prior to construction. Do they have a provision for connection to the property to the east or south. It would become part of the record of the plan.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 5

March 23, 1989

EM states the Board could act on the plan with a condition that that provision be on the plan prior to the 20 day appeal period.

P. Herr indicates that is correct.

EM asks for questions from the audience.

B. Lord indicates there will be no development until they have provisions for the easement.

EN makes a motion to close the hearing for Phase 6. JM seconds the motion. Vote of 3.

EM questions if there is a motion for approval or disapproval.

EN makes a motion for approval subject to an easement granted to landowner.

- P. Herr states it is not an easement. They must provide access.
- B. Lord states the wording of the provision will be made for access.

EN makes a motion for approval subject to the provisions as stated. JM seconds the motion. Vote of 3.

EM states the Board has made a motion to approve provided the access is provided to the property owner when the plan is brought in. The approval must be typed up and brought to the Town Clerk. There is a 20 day appeal period.

P. Herr questions who will do the decision for approval.

EM is more comfortable with P. Herr preparing it. P. Herr might want to dictate it to the Board's clerk over the phone.

P. Herr does not want to do it at all. He will discuss it with the Board later.

NEW ENGLAND COUNTRY CLUB CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

AM returns to the hearing.

G. Martinelli, counsel for Forge Development will discuss the proposed subdivision for New England Country Club. They have 231 building lots with an 18 hole championship golf course. The hearing began 1 1/2



P.O. BOX 43
BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 6

March 23, 1989

The major issue concerns the second means of egress. the last meeting they agreed to the conditions proposed by the other At the last meeting, they agreed to abandon going out Bound Road to Woonsocket if the Planning Board agrees to egress going out Board Road to Wrentham Road in Bellingham and Woonsocket agrees to connect the New England Country Club sewer to the Woonsocket sewer. They also made arrangements for title with Mr. and Mrs. Philips, the owners of the parcel between New England Country Club land along Bound Road and Wrentham Road. They made arrangements with the Philips' for a They have recorded and paid for a 60' right deed conveying the land. of way connecting New England Country Club with Wrentham Road. land conveyed by the Philips' to New England Country Club will serve as a detention basin for storm water. The detention basin exceeds the requirements of the town. It will have 3' of water with the 100 year Storm drains in the street will be funneled into the basins. They submitted the proposed egress to the other town agencies. have letters of approval from the safety officer who reviewed the site distance. It meets the town's standards. The Town Engineer and Highway Dept. approved the roadway and intersection. The Water/Sewer Dept. and Fire Chief also approved the plan.

EM has letters from the Town Engineer and Highway Dept. He does not have a letter from the Safety Officer. He did not get to pick up the mail.

G. Martinelli states that he has extra copies of the Safety Officer's letter.

EM reads letter dated March 22. 1989 from the Safety Officer, James Haughey, which indicates the feasibility of exiting Bound Road to Wrentham Road. It was reviewed with the Town Engineer. He indicates there are 475 feet site distance west on Wrentham Road and 660 feet site distance east on Wrentham Road. He suggest the stone wall on Wrentham Road be removed 30' and the land on the west side be graded down. The exit is feasible with changes.

EM reads letter from the Fire Chief, dated March 23, 1989 relative to fire protection. He indicates adequate fire flows to elevation 310, emergency access road widened to 15' and repaved, breakaway barriers, street names are acceptable, water/line hydrants be installed before construction, and a hard surface roadway be installed.

EM reads letter from the Highway Dept., dated March 22, 1989 relative to the Bound Road egress which was reviewed with the Town Engineer. The letter indicates that the corner of Bound Road and Wrentham Road be regraded and the detention basin be moved to allow for a line of site:



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 7

March 23, 1989

the outfall drainage under Bound Road be redirected; engineer show profile of Wrentham Road 100' each site of the intersection with Bound Road; and the town provide an easement at the detention basin along with adequate access, protected by a chainlink fence. The Safety Officer request a fence which can be seen through.

 ${\sf G.}$ Martinelli indicates they will work with the town and ${\sf Mr.}$ Philips, the owner of the land, to assure that everyone is satisfied.

EM reads letter from the Town Engineer, dated March 22, 1989 which indicates the 12" water main on Bound Road will connect with an 8" on Wrentham Road. The Water/Sewer Superintendent conveys his approval notwithstanding provided the steps issued in a earlier letter from the Water/Sewer Commission are complied with. EM received a phone call from cliff Matthews, Conservation Commission, who could not attend the meeting. He will follow up with a letter. He questions if Mr. Sousa met with him recently.

J. Sousa indicates that is correct.

EM states the Conservation Commission was concerned about the detention basin running into Wrentham. He did not like the idea. The solution is it will run under Wrentham Road back into Bellingham. That is workable. There is no problem with that. Mr. Matthews will send a letter stating that.

EM is concerned about the height of the inlet and outlet. They are looking over it with the Town Engineer. The outlet is overflow. It would not run out until the detention pond was full. It would be adequate that way. He questions if there are any other changes.

- G. Martinelli indicates those are the changes with respect to Bound Road. They have one other change with the knuckle in the road. They combined two lots into one lot. The intersection at the radius satisfies the requirements. They have not executed the sewer agreement with the Mayor of Woonsocket yet. They are affirming they will go out Bound Road to Wrentham Road instead of to Woonsocket provided that the Board approves going out that way.
- J. Sousa indicates they still have adequate width and the same frontage.
- P. Herr refers to the drawing relative to the knuckle. It requires a further adjustment of the property line. It is a curb, not a corner. It does not meet the requirements for a stop sign. They might want the property line to form a right angle.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 8

March 23, 1989

EM questions the need for a stop sign there.

- P. Herr explains they do not want people going around it like a curb.
- ? states there is a question relative to the grade. That is one reason to go with a curb.
- P. Herr questions if any land in Bellingham east of Bound Road is in the right of way.
- 6. Martinelli explains that Bound Road is a dedicated right of way. It runs along the Wrentham town line. The actual site of the old road ambered away from that. The way it is layed out is the actual way it was layed out in 1770 along the town line.
- P. Herr questions if Country Club Drive will be gated.
- G. Martinelli explains they will have a card access gate.
- P. Herr questions if there is anything which will preclude the owner of the land in Wrentham from preventing the subdivision from using Bound Road as frontage.
- G. Martinelli states that the Philips' could subdivide.
- P. Herr indicates there would be around a dozen lots if that happened.
- $6.\$ Martinelli states that Mr. Philips expressed the view that he likes everything the way it is.
- P. Herr is concerned because the road would actually be a dead-end road for anyone who does not have a card. He is concerned with the possibility that there may be a dozen house lots with no secondary way to turn around. He is concerned about service to those dwellings. More house lots would create difficult circumstances. People going in to service those house lots would end up on a road without a turnaround. It functions like a hammerhead.
- G. Martinelli states there is room to turn and go back out.

EM questions who will maintain Bound Road.

- G. Martinelli states New England Country Club will maintain it.
- P. Herr indicates it will be maintained with a dozen other people, some



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 9

March 23, 1989

who pay taxes in Wrentham and Bellingham.

6. Martinelli believes they will be glad to be relieved of the responsibility. They took that on at the beginning.

EM indicates that if that was his field and someone put in a new road, he would put in his road and as many house lots as could be done. It is a possibility.

P. Herr states that would be a reasonable circumstance if the road was put in. He is concerned if they do not put the roads in but develop four main lots off the frontage.

EM states they could also access Wrentham Road.

P. Herr indicates that the corner does not. He questions how many feet from Bound Road to Jenks Road, more than 200'?

EM indicates that is correct.

- P. Herr explains that the people who have frontage along bound Road do not have Jenks Road as an alternative. The sliver of land is a deterant.
- R. Picard questions if Bellingham is interested in abandoning Bound Road and opening it up to a private way.

EM explains that would have to be done through a Town Meeting. He questions if the field in Wrentham was subdivided, would they be able to show access?

P. Herr indicates they would. It is a fairly steep piece of land with a 10% grade.

JM questions how many feet it is from Wrentham Road.

P. Herr responds that it is about 15'.

EM states the field has roads on three sides, Jenks Road, Wrentham Road and Bound Road. He questions if a development in Wrentham would want to come out with this grade. Jenks Road is just as steep.

- P. Herr indicates that this is not a no traffic situation.
- M. Megalli states that it is subject to a cul-de-sac at the end.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 10

March 23, 1989

- 6. Martinelli states that it might require sacrificing an area of land the loss of a lot.
- M. Megalli states that a temporary cul-de-sac would not take a temporary easement.
- P. Herr indicates that temporary does not get deducted from the lot area.

AM questions if there is a legal way around it without moving it.

- P. Herr indicates it is not very obscure.
- G. Martinelli indicates that New England Country Club is prepared to consent for abandonment by the town to go out Bound Road.
- P. Herr explains this is a legitimate real concern. The cost of construction is not the real concern. It is not a traffic concern until the lots are developed along the road. The easement is there for a turnaround if the road does not go through, there is the possibility that somebody will put in frontage development.
- G. Martinelli states they are prepared to agree to a temporary easement for a turnaround at that point. They have no intention, implication or suggestion to build a road to connect with Woonsocket. There are a lot of people here tonight who are relying on us not doing it.
- M. Megalli states they are trying to solve the problem for the future.

EM requests questions from the audience.

Leo Dalpe, 230 Wrentham Road, states the problem of the headlights shining at his home has not been resolved.

EM states that was discussed at an earlier meeting which Mr. Dalpe may not have attended. They can go over it again.

G. Martinelli states they submitted a study to the Board and Mr. Dalpe Which had been undertaken by the engineers demonstrating a path that the lights would take and suggested they should not be a source of concern to the Dalpe family. They also offered two meetings ago to install shrubery of Mr. Dalpe's choice to block any rays which might be reflected that way. He believes that has been declined by Mr. Dalpe. They already raised the bridge and changed the elevations of the road. They feel they have done everything they can to resolve this problem.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 11

March 23, 1989

EM questions if they have the chart which shows the lighting.

G. Martinelli submits a copy of a letter dated March 6 to Mr. Dalpe indicating the things they have done. He reads letter from Mr. Sousa to Mr. Dalpe which discusses a meeting between Joe Kostik, Mr. Sousa and Mr. Dalpe on February 28, 1989. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss further concerns which Mr. Dalpe had relative to the headlights. They also met with him on two occasions prior to this meeting. They have raised the bridge elevation to lower the projection from vehicle headlights, the tennis courts were moved to the interior of the project to eliminate any neighborhood concerns for noise and lights, they have also provided a copy of all design drawings of the entrance road and bridge and our engineers headlight study which Mr. Dalpe requested. They also propose to supply plant screening at New England Country Club's expense as stated at the Planning Board meeting at February 23, 1989 to eliminate any concerns which Mr. Dalpe may have with headlight interference to his property.

 ${\sf EM}$ states their road and entrance is not directly across from the house. Only cars making a right turn.

J. Sousa indicates that is correct.

EM states that cars coming down the road or cars making a left turn should not hit the house, but cars making a right turn could. Do you agree with that Mr. Dalpe?

L. Dalpe does not agree. That is not where the problem is going to come. The problem is when you come off the bridge and approach Wrentham Road, the lighting is going to hit the house.

AM states it looks like the house is way over.

L. Dalpe states the problem is as soon as they come off the bridge, to make the climb because it is 8 degrees, according to the plan. It is going to come right over the house.

EM questions if screening and trees along the road would prevent that.

- L. Dalpe does not feel that the diagram is correct.
- G. Martinelli states that is an engineering drawing.
- L. Dalpe states the drawing does not go back to where it comes down to the bridge. Where the road is i $\,$ ine, but that road going down to the bridge is 12' off the main road.



P.O. BOX 43

BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 12

March 23, 1989

AM questions if it will shine from that far back.

J. Sousa states it would not be that great. As it approaches and gets closer, it will be away from the house.

EN questions the number of feet from Wrentham Road.

J. Sousa states it is about 160'. There is no doubt you can see the headlights from his house when a car is turning right but there would be no propensity on the house at that distance.

EM questions if they are saying that Mr. Dalpe will see the lights from inside the house, but the lights should not be that bright on the house.

EN states it would bother people inside the house.

AM states it seems like the distance is too far away.

J. Sousa states that is exactly where they propose the road. It has been surveyed and engineered.

AM questions where the concern is.

L. Dalpe states the concern is where they come off the bridge, way back as they climb.

JM questions if the houses are still there or if they are gone.

- L. Dalpe states they are gone.
- 6. Martinelli states they are prepared to do what is reasonable in terms of screening the area to protect Mr. Dalpe's privacy.

AM asks Mr. Dalpe if he thinks screening will help.

- L. Dalpe does not think that screening will help.
- G. Martinelli feels there is very little they can do to satisfy Mr. Dalpe except for moving the road or raising the bridge which has already been engineered and cleared through the Conservation Commission.
- L. Dalpe feels they should raise the bridge. He believes it would be better for conservation since they would be out of the swamp



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 13

March 23, 1989

completely.

EM questions what was offered.

- L. Dalpe states they offered to plant a bunch of stuff in front of his window. He would not be able to see the road.
- 6. Martinelli states they offered to do it if he would like it.
- L. Dalpe does not want to be put in a jail.

EN can understand why Mr. Dalpe does not want trees in front of his house. He has a nice lawn now. He questions if there is any way they could put bushes on their side.

- G. Martinelli states they offered to do that.
- L. Dalpe wants them to guarantee him that he will not get any lights but they will not do it.
- G. Martinelli can not guarantee that. The plan meets subdivision approval. They are trying to accommodate Mr. Dalpe.
- B. Lord, representing L. Dalpe, states that he realizes it would be very expensive for them to raise the bridge and extending it out, but they are the ones who are impacting on Mr. Dalpe. Mr. Dalpe wants guarantees that this development will not cause problems for him. He questions the necessity for the 8% grade when they are keeping it at 5% or below on the other side at their own club house. The bylaw states 6%. They will raise the bridge on the side of their development, but they are not willing to change the slope on the other side. This is a development that Mr. Dalpe supports overall. He has supported the development in the past. However, it should not impact somebody who has been there for quite a while. He is asking for a guarantee.

EM questions who would judge the guarantee.

JM requests they pull out the profile.

- 6. Martinelli states they can not guarantee anything.
- J. Sousa states the grade is 150 feet away from the intersection. 250 feet from the bridge to the road and 160 feet to his house.
- L. Dalpe states he could see lights at 600 700 feet.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 14

March 23, 1989

B. Lord indicates it is because of the type of intersection that it is.

EN questions if the problem is because Mr. Dalpe's house is directly opposite the road.

L. Dalpe states his bedroom is.

JM would like to have a field trip to simulate the situation.

AM points out that it is not possible because there is no grade now.

- G. Martinelli suggest the inconvenience to Mr. Dalpe is one of the consequences which happens to evolve when you have development in a town. Some people are bothered by excess traffic. Mr. Dalpe is bothered by the fact that there might be a little more light resulting from traffic in this neighborhood. They have a legitimate subdivision. They are prepared to do whatever is reasonable for screening. He does not feel they should be asked to do anything else.
- L. Dalpe feels the applicant had time to raise the bridge.
- G. Martinelli points out that they did raise the bridge.
- L. Dalpe states he is not coming in at the last meeting to tell them about the lights. He told them from the beginning.
- ? questions if they can change the angle of the road somewhat so they lights will not shine.

EM states they can not change the angle of the bridge.

B. Lord states that Mr. Dalpe is asking for a guarantee. They say it will not impact. He is asking them to guarantee that.

AM questions what he is asking them to guarantee - that he will not see lights or that he will not see bright lights.

B. Lord explains that Mr. Dalpe wants them to guarantee what their engineers say.

AM states that the wording is technical. Do they mean massive bright lights.

B. Lord states that Mr. Dalpe wants a guarantee that the lights will



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 15

March 23, 1989

not affect his house.

EM questions if they are talking about lights just in the windows or lights below the windows.

L. Dalpe is talking about lights in the windows.

EM noticed that Cliff Matthews for the Conservation Commission is out in the hall. He calls him into the meeting and explains the suggestion of raising the bridge which would make the bridge longer. The Board is wondering what the impact would be on the wetlands that the bridge is going over.

C. Matthews states there are limits on the bridge.

EM states it is not a simple matter to just raise the bridge.

C. Matthews states that is an engineering question.

EM questions if it would require more filling from a conservation point of view or loss of wetlands.

- C. Matthews is not sure.
- M. DiFrancesco, Ronald Ash & Associates, can address that. Right now the bridge was cited to minimize the wetland impact. The filling involved would be in abundance. If the bridge is raised any more they would need more filling. It would be out of compliance with the order of conditions for the subdivision.
- L. Dalpe states that raising the bridge would bring the abuttment further upland.
- J. Sousa indicates they would have to build higher and they have a minimum slope.
- L. Dalpe states they should put more fill in and carry the abuttment up ahead.
- P. Herr explains that Mr. Dalpe is saying they would have a longer stance between abuttments.
- L. Dalpe states they could put in more piers.
- G. Martinelli points out that more piers would involve less wetlands.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 16

March 23, 1989

- J. Sousa states there is one pier at the center of the bridge. They are already at the maximum for filling. They are trying to minimize the wetland impact.
- $\boldsymbol{6}.$ Martinelli states they are right at the limit with respect to wetland impacts.
- B. Lord points out that if the bridge was raised, it would be ending in an area which is actually outside of the wetlands. The amount of filling would actually be reduced.

EM explains that if the bridge is made longer, they should have less filling and less impact on the wetlands because they are bridging more Of it, raising up the grade, so they should be getting further away from the wetlands.

M. DiFrancesco states the idea was to have the concrete blocks trucked in. They are at an 80' length now. They can not get any bigger than that on the roads.

EM questions the difference in grades which Mr. Lord mentioned. He questions why they will have less of a grade on the country club end.

M. DiFrancesco explains that there is a transition from Wrentham Road. There is a 2% grade which goes down to 8% coming down to the bridge. That is the difference in the grade. That meets the subdivision regulations.

JM questions if they could twist the road the other way where the bridge is.

- P. Herr explains that this was done to minimize the wetlands.
- J. Sousa states that it was very carefully located.
- ? states there will be lots on either side of the intersection. There are going to be lights from cars. He can not see how this would be any different from any subdivision planned from herein.

EM questions if there is going to be a house on the lots.

J. Sousa indicates that is correct.

EM states the difference is the grade from the bridge and the volume.

B. Lord explains that the people who are buying a lot at those



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 17

March 23, 1989

intersections are buying knowing that those intersections are there. Mr. Dalpe clearly did not. The rules and regulations do state that the subdivision will be the least impacting as possible. That is in the state and town regulations. He understands there is a logistic problem, but his proposal would be less impacting on conservation.

- M. Megalli states there will be lights at the intersection no matter what is done. The shades are down at night.
- L. Dalpe will not have his shades down in the summer time.
- G. Martinelli states there are a couple of street lights in front of the house now.

EN points out that they are stationary. You can shade them. It is a matter of degree.

- L. Dalpe feels the only reason why they will not raise the bridge is the cost. He questions if that is true.
- G. Martinelli states the cost would be tremendous.
- L. Dalpe states they had plenty of time to rearrange the bridge.
- G. Martinelli points out that it was rearranged.

AM questions how intense the lights will be.

J. Sousa states the headlight studies and location of the road was done by an engineer.

AM can not see how it would be that much of a problem, especially with the angle of the house.

JM would like to simulate it to see if the lights are bright.

- J. Sousa states it would be impossible to simulate.
- L. Dalpe explains that his neighbor across the street did some fence work after they took the houses out. Mr. Dalpe realized the lights would shine on his house after this neighbor was in back of his house with his truck at night.

AM questions if that was 450 feet away.

L. Dalpe states he was approximately 300 feet, close to the river. He



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 18

March 23, 1989

feels he is going to get the lights 100%.

- J. Sousa does not feel that is a good evaluation. Their bridge is approximately 10 12 feet above the riverbank.
- B. Lord states that changing the heights increases the weaving of the lights which increases the nuisance factor of it. There are many tests they can do to evaluate the problem. The fact that it will take time and money is immaterial. They have had notice of Mr. Dalpe's concern right along.

AM does not know that these tests can be done in that location prior to construction.

G. Martinelli suggest the yassume that the lights will shine on Mr. Dalpe's house. The fact is that it will impact wetlands and cause further delay for the project at great expense. They are prepared to screen and do whatever they can within reason to try to alleviate the problem. Re-engineering the bridge is not a reasonable solution.

JM states the Planning Board does not get involved with the expense. Mr. Dalpe's concern is not financial - it is his piece of mind.

 ${\sf AM}$ questions if Mr. Dalpe's feels the hedging which they are offering will help the situation.

- L. Dalpe does not want them in front of his home.
- 6. Martinelli states they would put the hedges on their property.
- P. Herr states that Mr. Dalpe's house is considerably to the east. He requests that someone point out the location at which the lights will shine on Mr. Dalpe's house.
- M. DiFrancesco points it out.
- P. Herr states it is just after the bridge. Screening placed to the right and along side of the road will help.
- B. Lord states the curve is not shown the same way on the plan which they are referring to.
- P. Herr suggest they look at the subdivision plan to see the curve. It looks as if screening on their property will solve the problem. The only thing the drawing lacks is the location of the house. But the engineers have certified that this is an accurate location of where Mr.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 19

March 23, 1989

Dalpe's house is. He feels that they could accomplish this with screening on their property.

- G. Martinelli states they are willing to do that.
- L. Dalpe still wants a guarantee.
- B. Lord feels the guarantee could be worded to state that the applicant is willing to put up whatever is necessary to protect Mr. Dalpe's property. Mr. Dalpe does not want them to put in a skimpy planting which will not work and then state that they tried.

AM feels they could specifically state what they plan to do.

- 6. Martinelli will identify how many trees, types of trees, how tall they should be.
- P. Herr indicates that could be part of the conditions for the plan approval.
- 6. Martinelli states they are prepared to do that.

EN states they should make those conditions part of the covenant.

Mrs. McGilvray questions if the lighting is the only concern which Mr. Dalpe has. She questions if the Board owes Mr. Dalpe a duty because he is a long time resident.

L. Dalpe states he wants them to quarantee nó lights.

EM states that even a new resident has the same rights. The Board is here for anyone.

John Vanno, questions at what point the applicant will do blasting. He is concerned it will affect his water well.

AM suggest the applicant might be willing to have the blasting company go out and take pictures and do a pre-inventory prior to blasting.

6. Martinelli states that is part of the blasting company's job.

AM explains the applicant is contracting the blasting company, so they are liable. The blasting company is accustomed to do this pre-blasting service.

6. Martinelli states they are contracting the blasting company. They



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 20

March 23, 1989

will go out and do the pre-blasting survey. They will carry the insurance. It is part of their responsibility.

- J. Vanno just wants assurance that it will not fall in his well because he will not have any water.
- J. Sousa explains that they require the blasting company to show them a certificate of insurance.

EM questions if they would be willing to put in another guarantee or another covenant stating that if the blasting did affect Mr. Vanno's well or heating system through the development, they would bear the burden of it.

G. Martinelli does not feel it is appropriate for the Board to ask them to do that. He is not offering to do that. Anyone who has problems as a result of blasting will have recourse against the contractors who are doing that. They can assure the Board that they will require the contractor to have insurance.

Jean Godotte, 399 Maple Street, states that she received a letter after blasting had been done for Sommerville Lumber. The company did come in and take pictures prior to blasting. But she was not notified of the blasting until after the fact. She now has cracks but does not know if the blasting caused them. That is why she feels a guarantee from the developer is important.

EM explains that the Board does not have the power to make anyone give a guarantee.

Robert Bradley, 16 Peaceable St., Boston, is curious about Bound Road to Woonsocket.

EM talked to Mr. Cibley, Chairman of the Board of Selectmen. He has not been given any official petition relative to Bound Road. If it is presented to the Board of Selectmen, they will have to put it on a town meeting warrant and the town meeting will vote on that. The country club reaffirmed that they have no intention of doing that. It would not be fair to hold them up because of a rumor that the road might go through.

Paul Votta, attorney for Richard Picard, questions the temporary turnaround until Bound Road goes through.

P. Herr explains the reason for the temporary turnaround is for future construction in the area.



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 21

March 23, 1989

EM explains that the Board is not saying that it will go through, but it could at some time.

Paul Votta states he would hate to have them put the road through after they get the sewer hook up from Woonsocket.

EM reiterates that the applicant already said they will not do that. There is no indication from the town of Bellingham or the Planning Board that they will put a road through.

EM states the petitioners have the idea that it would be a good idea to get the road approved and have New England Country Club pay for it. That is not likely.

JM makes a motion to close the hearing.

- B. Lord is concerned that Mr. Dalpe will not be protected if the Board closes the hearing prior to seeing something in writing.
- G. Martinelli states they made the representation to plant the trees to screen the property. They are prepared to negotiate the wording of that with B. Lord.

EM states that it should read "whatever it takes" to screen Mr. Dalpe's property.

B. Lord does not feel that saying suitable screening will take care of it.

EM states that Mr. Dalpe asked for a guarantee and the Planning Board got the applicant to agree to a guarantee. The Town Engineer and Board's consultant agree that screening will take care of the problem.

- B. Lord would like to know the wording of what they are proposing for screening.
- P. Herr states the wording is not going to be done tonight. B. Lord is saying that Mr. Dalpe should have the opportunity to refute what is proposed. That is not consistent with closing the hearing. The function of closing the hearing is keeping the project moving.

JM makes a motion to close the public hearing. AM seconds the motion. Vote of 4.

EM explains that the lighting issue will be covered and it will have



P.O. BOX 43 BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

page 22

March 23, 1989

more than just the wording "suitable screening". When it is drafted, the Board will give Mr. Dalpe a copy to review prior to signing it.

JM questions the extention date.

G. Martinelli states the Board has until August 31, 1989.

JM moves that the decision be taken under advisement.

- G. Martinelli suggests they submit draft covenants to the Planning Board, P. Herr, Town Counsel.
- F. Herr identifies the fact that approval will have a lot of conditions. One of the conditions will be that suitable security has to be provided.
- G. Martinelli questions what he means by security.
- P. Herr explains it is performance security, a bond. In addition, there will be another set of covenants. In a usual subdivision there is only one. The statement of approval will be delicate in its wording. He feels the Board should ask P. Herr, the applicant or L. Ambler to put together a decision.

EM states it would be a vote a confidence.

G. Martinelli states they submitted a draft of proposed undertakings which addressed the various conditions and concerns of the various town agencies and the other items which the Board was concerned about that time. It did not address screening for Mr. Dalpe. He offers to sit down with Mr. Ambler or P. Herr to finalize it. He suggest they will be able to come back in one month with these items worked out.

EM explains that the hearing for New England Country Club is closed but the Board is scheduling them to return on April 27, 1989 at 9:00 p.m. to come in with all the conditions which have been set forth. It will be a public meeting. They will come in to see if the conditions have been worked out to the satisfaction of the Planning Board, P. Herr and Town Counsel.

- P. Herr states there have been a number of marginal changes to the plans such as the temporary turnaround and the corner. It is now appropriate to produce a set of plans which the Board will accept.
- G. Martinelli will get a final plan to M. Megalli.



P.O. BOX 43
BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019

MINUTES OF REGULA	AR 1	MEET	TNG
-------------------	------	------	-----

page 24

March 23, 1989

	,	Trust Cart Sairting St. 7 Car
	Hom	1. E Sterning
Edward T. Moore, Chairman	Blenn E.	Gerrior, Vice-Chairman
\$		
	9	
Emile W. medzwardek	Ane	In morse
Emile W. Niedzwiadek	Anne M. M	
John P. Murray	ios time dada e j. j. j. d.	