

**BELLINGHAM PLANNING BOARD**

**P.O. BOX 43**

**BELLINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS 02019**

**RICHARD V. DILL, CHAIRMAN  
VALERIE J. DeANGELIS  
WILLIAM M. WOZNIAK  
STEVEN CHOINIERE  
EDWARD GUZOWSKI**

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING**

**May 11, 2000**

Meeting commenced at 7:00 pm. All members were present. Minutes recorded by Planning Coordinator Jill Karakeian.

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

The Board reorganizes.

RD turned the meeting over to the clerk JK. JK called for nominations for Chairman. VD nominates RD for Chairman. SC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC & EG).

RD nominates VD for Vice Chairman. WW seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC & EG).

SC nominates EG for Secretary. WW seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

The Board signs letters to the Norfolk Registry of Deeds to record SC and EG signatures.

The Board also signs clerk's payroll and miscellaneous invoices.

VD mentions to the Board that JK is four meetings behind in minute not including tonight's meeting. She is only supposed to work 19 hours a week. Because our meetings have been so lengthy and working the two days a week at Town Hall and getting a lot of visitors. She doesn't have time to use that time to complete the minutes. I discussed with Denis Fraine whether we could get some more funding for her to get caught up on the minutes and he said that would be okay for her to work a few more number of hours to get caught up. As long as it is not a permanent basis and we could transfer some money into the budget to do that. JK did an estimate on how many hours she thought it would take her to complete. She came up with an estimate not including tonight's meeting of 33 ½ hours x \$11.00/hr. = \$368.50. If everyone is in agreement

with this, I will discuss this further with Denis to get the funding so JK can put in the additional hours to get the work done.

WW asked what happens if this goes into more hours?

VD says that the next thing she spoke to Denis about was the need for a Town Planner. He is going to move ahead in the fall. He has been discussing the Blackstone for us to share a Planner who has a great deal of experience. Rather than us getting a Planner with less experience. This will take care of the problem JK is having now. She is actually acting as a quasi Planner because she has discussions with Lawyers, Engineers, Developers and all the other people. That would alleviate the problem.

RD says that has to get moving now so we can get it on the warrant for the October Town Meeting. Because, we want to have the funding to hopefully get someone for the beginning of 2001. Talking with Phil today, the Blackstone Planning Board is not aware of any Town Planner in Blackstone.

#### **MAPLEBROOK COMMONS – ENDORSEMENT OF SPECIAL PERMIT**

JK informed the Board that Lee Ambler reviewed the Special Permit Decision and he changed one word on Page 3, Paragraph 5 it said “majority of owners of those units” and Lee wanted it to say “percentage of owners of those units”.

WW motions to sign the Special Permit Decision of Maplebrook Commons. SC seconds. Vote of 3 (RD, WW and SC). VD and EG abstains.

#### **BEECHWOOD ESTATES – MODIFICATION TO A SUBDIVISION – PUBLIC HEARING – continued**

E.K. Kahlsa of LandPlanning and represents Richard Martinelli is before the Board to bring them up to date on the proposal for the Modification of the Beechwood Estates Subdivision. We received correspondence from Don DiMartino and Lee Ambler. Don expressed his recommendations to contact Atty. Ambler. Paragraph #4 in Don's letter reads: it is becoming obvious that this street will probably never be completed in full accordance with the approved plans. The proposed construction would be acceptable to provide maintainable access under our bylaw and will eliminate a section of road that is now gravel and very difficult to maintain. The technical concerns I have are as follows: the roadway construction should be at grade that is as close to the grades proposed in the approved subdivision plan to ensure proper cover over underground water and pipes. Mr. Martinellis has agreed to conform with that request. He suggested that if other buildable lots remain on this street, when they are to be built, we should get more work done towards completion. The proposed cross section eliminated the roadway crown and therefore makes future construction utilize the existing drainage system significantly more difficult. He asked that a plan be submitted of the area to be improved and the edges of the existing pavement. We have prepared a plan showing proposed and existing pavement.

SC asked the width of the are to be paved?

E.K. believes it was 16' of pavement, loam and seed to complete a 40' right of way. It seems that we will be able to conform to Don's request. We would be happy to accept the Board's release of these lots from the covenant subject to our ability to post a bond of sufficient size to satisfy Don's requirements.

VD is very concerned that this is going to set precedence in this Town. I don't see how the Board can approve this in light of the fact that this will set a precedence and that this road could be requested at Town Meeting to become a Town accepted road and how can we justify it. It is not a hardship. When you purchased the land, you knew that it couldn't be built on at that time. I make a motion to deny the Beechwood Estates Modifications to Definitive Subdivision. WW second. Vote of 3 (RD, VD and WW). SC and EG abstains.

### **81-P SUBMISSION – SUSAN LANE**

Bruce Wilson of Wilson & Associates, representing Lorusso Construction presents to the Board an 81-P plan on Susan Lane. We are proposing to take a portion out of the two lots and we are also moving the driveway a little to allow the guy in Lot 1 to landscape and put plantings in. The piece that is taking out in the rear of the parcel we would like to put it with the Bellingham Plaza site and have a little alternative area to put drainage should we need it.

Jerry Lorusso explains that the drainage idea is in the future. The main thing is that I want to be the abutter to the property.

VD asked how many dwelling units?

B. Wilson says that the two houses will stay and there will be no additional.

VD mentions Phil talks about Section 232D of Subdivision Regulations: require that the owners of the land be shown along that of abutters.

B. Wilson changed that for him. There was a little confusion on the plans originally, but I revised the drawings and took care of all the questions Phil had.

VD asked if they were going to do anything in that area?

J. Lorusso agreed to put stipulations on that 70 buffer that we can't touch any trees or remove any ground cover.

SC motions to sign the 81-P for Lorusso Construction on Susan Lane with noted conditions of the 70' buffer zone and conditions to remain (no tree or ground cover removed). VD seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

### **MILFORD/BELLINGHAM TECHNOLOGY PARK – PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION**

Kathy Noonan of Vanasse Hangen and Brustlin, Bruce Gorrell, Trustee of 495 Associates is before the Board to discuss the Preliminary Plan for Milford/Bellingham Technology Park. This is approximately 147 acre parcel and is currently undeveloped. The majority of the parcel is zoned

industrial. There is a 400' strip zoned residential along Farm Street. The same time we submitted this preliminary plan to Bellingham we submitted a similar plan to the Town of Milford and in its existing state there are two lots. The easterly lot is currently developed with three buildings and parking lot. The westerly lot is undeveloped, except for an access drive.

RD asked who was occupying the existing buildings?

C. Noonan said that it is EMC. The proposed subdivision has three lots in Bellingham and three lots in Milford and a proposed subdivision road that will service access to all the lots. The first of our issues tonight is access to the site. Because of the residential zone along Farm Street we thought it would be more appropriate to access the proposed lots in the industrial area. Therefore, we are proposing the existing access drive be made a subdivision road and start at Maple Street in Milford and continue along the existing access drive and extending into Bellingham. The road will be built as a subdivision road both to the standards of the Town of Milford and the Town of Bellingham. We also recognize that emergency access from Bellingham is desirable in this case because it is such a way around. We are proposing an emergency access road coming off of Farm Street. The second major area we wanted to discuss tonight was water supply. The existing lot occupied by EMC is serviced from the Milford Water Co. There is a 12" main in the access drive and we propose that 12" continue into Bellingham and service those lots. I met with the Town of Milford Water Department and they said they would certainly supply Bellingham with the water and they would be happy to do that. Regarding sewer for this lot there exists a valid sewer permit with the DEP that was issued to 495 Assoc. in December of 1990. That has been approved and endorsed by the Town of Milford.

B. Gorrell explains they have been involved in this project since December 1979 and one of the commitments we made was to attempt to do as much development as we could in Milford in the beginning of the project.

VD questioned the road being private and not added to the Town of Bellingham. Is that your intent?

C. Noonon says yes, it will always be private.

VD suggests continuing this in light of the fact that our consultant recommends that no action be taken tonight until he has had enough time to review this submittal. I would also like to see what the Town of Milford has to say after their meeting.

VD motions to continue the Preliminary Subdivision plan for Milford/Bellingham Technology Park to June 8, 2000 @ 7:30 pm. WW seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

#### **HIGHRIDGE ESTATES – SPECIAL PERMIT & PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION – PUBLIC HEARING**

RD abstains and leaves the meeting.

VD discloses that Mr. Jones did build my house 2 ½ years ago and I have an ongoing drainage problem that he has corrected and he is going to re-landscape my yard all of which is covered

under warrantee and in no way has any impact on this development and I have disclosure with the Town Clerk and part of the public record. Also like to point out that this is a Special Permit and requires four out of five members to vote and we do not have an alternate at this time. It is up to the applicant if he wishes to proceed with four members.

Tim Jones agrees to go forward with four members.

WW motions to waive the reading of the public ad for the Highridge Estates Special Permit & Preliminary Subdivision. SC seconds. Vote of 4 (VD, WW, SC and EG). RD abstains.

Mike Carter, project engineer from GCG Associates representing Tim Jones the applicant. The parcel of land is located off of Lake Street. The land is easterly off Lake Street and includes about 215 acres +/- . The topography of the land, the high point is the westerly side of the site. On the site, there is approximately 28 acres of wetlands. We are proposing to do a cluster subdivision which consists of 95 lots, about 25,000 sf per lot. It would consist of two access points off of Lake Street. There will be two A/R cluster lots which are fronted on Lake Street. There will be one 2-family A/R lot. That will give you a total of 98 lots in the subdivision. There will be approximately 140 acres of open space which 28 acres of that open space is wetlands. We are proposing municipal utilities, water & sewer. The offsite improvements that are required to get the water and sewer to the site, we will be required to extend the water line down Railroad Street to Park Street to Center Street where there is an existing 12" water main we can tie in to. The sewer, we would run a gravity sewer from the site, towards Peter's River on Railroad Ave. to a sewer pump station that would be constructed and then it would be pumped through a forced main up to Center Street. There is approximately 7,516 feet of roadway in the cluster subdivision. There are two ways to come up with the cluster. One way is the formula, which gives us 98 lots and the other way is to do a Conventional Subdivision and we prepared a plan that showed that. Under the Conventional we showed 95 lots. 93 Conventional and 2 A/R lots. If you would look at the lot sizes, they range from 80,666 sf to 240,000 sf. There are some lots that don't meet the 90% rule. We haven't really looked at it close enough and moved lots around.

Eric Anderberg, Atty. (representing Tim Jones) explains that there is an alternative under the bylaw. The formula has been properly figured and does work. Our choice is to use the formula and it works.

VD asked the width of the street that is proposed?

M. Carter says it is a 60' right of way.

VD mentions that the Board has a number of comments regarding this project. Specifically from Don DiMartino. He talks about the issue of the sewer and the fact that the State no longer wants to see town sewer connections, they want to see recharge.

M. Carter says that he met with Mr. DiMartino regarding his letter and one of the things we discussed, as we propose it, we would like to bring sewer down Railroad Ave. He indicated that we might not be able to get a sewer extension permit. If we find that we cannot go down that

road, than an alternative would be individual septic systems, based on soils. The soils vary in the area. Another alternative would be an onsite sewer treatment plant.

VD asked the high elevation concern with some of the house lots and water pressure.

M. Carter explains that the lots further back into the site towards the Franklin Town line fall above the normal operating pressure for a residential home. We may have to isolate the area on a high pressure zone. It means you would put a water main in and then put in a fire pump and a regular conventional jockey pump to increase the pressure. The water main would be looped through the site from one entrance to the other entrance.

SC asked about the boy-scout land and now that all of the open space is going to be turned over the Conservation, will that boy-scout land not be land locked right now?

T. Jones explains that now open's up the boy-scout land and there will be a 15' right of way for the Town to access that land without having to go through anyone else's land.

WW mentions that all of these plans should note the owner of record.

M. Carter says that he will make sure the owner of record is on the plans for the next meeting.

SC questions Phil's comments on the straightness of the road.

M. Carter will be curving the road a bit.

EG asked if they do run sewer from Center to the site through Railroad Street and Park Street, would those residents have the option to hook up to sewer?

M. Carter explains that they will put the line into the road and stubs at the right of way for each home, then it is up to the Town and in homeowners to actually find capacity and hook up

EG questioned the traffic impact on Lake Street and whether or not sidewalks would be considered? There is already complaints about the traffic on Lake Street, maybe a sidewalk would help the situation.

M. Carter says that they will look into that.

Wendy Householder (Gemmer Lane) asked about the water loop and what affect will that have on Gemmer Lane?

M. Carter says that if we are able to secure an easement through a water loop through Gemmer Lane that would be a positive effect on Gemmer Lane.

Mike Nowfrey, Atty. representing the Burr Family and we are just asking to be notified of progress of this project and their main concern at this point is the drainage.

Mike Burr (Lake Street) questioned the meeting with Conservation and why the abutters weren't notified? I wanted to walk that to see what was being talked about. I have walked that land many times and it is wet, especially this time of year. I really feel these lots should be bigger and fewer. All the open space is going to be left for who? Later on down the road it will be built on.

T. Jones explains that once it is deeded over to the Conservation it can't be built on. I understand, that Cliff had asked me personally, because the Boy-Scouts of American was a land locked piece of land, he has indicated to me that he wants to do an actual Conservation area. A place large enough for hiking trails. He wanted Ernie Taft to be involved in this as well.

Residents of Lake Street very concerned about the traffic and the people that use Lake Street to cut over to Prospect Street to get to King Street in Franklin.

VD says these are very serious concerns and I think that is something that the Developer has to address. A traffic study would need to be done considering the traffic impact as well as the school impact.

Direct abutters on Lake Street voices concerns about the drainage and the impact that their property are going to take once they start developing that land.

M. Carter explains that this is a preliminary stage and we are going to go through a whole drainage design. It will require that no increase of volume, no increase in rate will leave the site from any particular rain event up to a 100 year storm event. When this is done, you will see detention basins, maybe recharge basins all that will protect the surrounding properties.

Debbie Burr (Lake Street) questioned the hill on Lake Street right near her home and asked if the entrance into the site that is directly across from her be moved to make the sight distance a little better?

M. Carter explains that will be looked at, at the Definitive stage and the sight distance will be checked.

VD suggests that the Board send a letter to the Safety Officer and ask him to review the site distance at both the entrance locations to the site.

WW asked that we get his input on the two straight away roads through the site. They are proposed to be 30' collector street, 1500' long.

VD asked why the roadway is proposed to have 30' of pavement?

M. Carter says that is a regulation.

VD says that can be waived.

M. Burr questioned the lots on Lake Street and the fact that they don't conform to zoning.

M. Carter explains that they are part of the cluster.

WW explains they have to be contiguous with the other lots within the cluster and they aren't.

VD suggests discussing that with Phil. Asked Mr. Jones if he is in agreement to pay for an independent traffic analysis and an independent engineer? I have a number of things that need to be addressed and looked at for the next time you come in. We need to find out if Conservation wants this or not. The traffic and school impact that was just discussed. I would like to see a Conventional plan to see how many lots you can get.

M. Carter agrees to fine tune the Conventional plan to show the lots with agricultural zone.

VD would also like to see a list of off site improvements that are proposed. Would like to have the site distance checked and the pump station location.

M. Carter says that there are plans that have been filed with the Board that shows water, sewer, pumping station and some of the other off site improvements.

VD says one of the big issues is to figure out what it is going to be as far as, sewer, onsite septic, on-site sewerage treatment facility.

WW motions to continue the Special Permit & Preliminary Subdivision for Highridge Estates to June 8, 2000 @ 8:00 pm. SC seconds. Vote of 4 (VD, WW, SC and EG) RD abstains.

#### **GIBBS OIL – SPECIAL PERMIT & DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW – PUBLIC HEARING**

RD returns to the meeting.

WW motions to waive the reading of the ad for the Gibbs Oil Special Permit & Development Plan Review. VD seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

Michael Pierce, Atty. for Gibbs as well as John Flynn, Project Engineer, Mr. Intindola, Traffic Engineer and Andy Bealin, Gibbs Project Manager is before the Board to present the project as proposed. You have seen aspects of this over the past year and a half. We have spent a lot of time with Mr. Herr as well as town officials and the traffic safety officer. What we are proposing is utilizes the site. Everything on the site moves to the rear of the property. The building with the convenience store moves approximately 80' from our property line. The canopy will now be 30' from the property line. We have four single dispenser islands, two filling stations on each one, also set back dramatically further from the street. The other modification that is proposed to the site is the drive-thru. We will be using the existing curb cuts. We will also be tying into Crossroads water, sewer and storm drainage. W/S Development is going to draw up a tie in agreement for the record to show that ability. We have a very substantial queuing capacity of over 200' in the back to accommodate the cars waiting to do their pick up. Our parking is set up on the left hand side of the site so that it shouldn't effect the cars waiting for the drive-thru.

WW asked if they had a drawing showing the vehicles waiting at the pumps and how that works.



M. Peirce says that he will have a drawing at the next meeting to show the waiting at the pumps.

VD asked about the drive-thru and the cars parked on the site backing out into the cars exiting the drive-thru. She also asked if the drive-thru was going to be a restaurant and if there was going to be seats?

M. Peirce said no, absolutely not. There will be no seats. It will be a convenience store and drive-thru.

VD asked about a one way in and a one way out? Have you considered that?

M. Peirce said that we have had conversations with Mr. Herr and I would have to ask John Flynn and Mr. Intindola.

RD asked about an exit off the back of the site out into the Crossroads shopping center?

M. Peirce said that people are generally educated by the circumstances they put themselves into. I think putting an egress off the back of the site would take a dramatic redesign in the site. There is a real significant grade change with a retaining wall.

RD explains drive-thru's don't fend very well in pumping stations like that. Especially that the site is non-conforming to begin with.

M. Peirce expresses his thanks for hearing the Board's concerns now.

WW says that we expressed before no drive-thru and here it is again. I don't think the site is a good site for a drive-thru.

M. Peirce explains what we have made an attempt to do is utilize the site in a most efficient possible way. Yes, in a complete manor. Whether you agree to a drive-thru or not, this issue whether people should take a left-hand turn, is not going to change. We would have to look at it, but maybe it would be posted, right hand turns only. This is a tremendous opportunity to upgrade this site. I can't say that the drive-thru won't have an impact. Anywhere you put a drive-thru it will have some impact.

RD mentions if you are selling gas and selling in the convenience store and making money, then what is the need for the drive-thru? We don't need another drive-thru, especially in that location.

M. Peirce explains that the drive-thru is an amenity that keeps us competitive with other stations and it induces people to buy more gas so they would come more often.

VD I truly think that the only way the drive-thru would work is if it accesses through Crossroads.

SC asked if they were going to have some franchise like Dunkin Donuts serving out at the drive-thru?

M. Peirce says he doesn't think it would be Dunkin Donuts, but he feels it would be their desire to have some sort of name brand.

VD asked that all Phil's concerns be addresses for the next time they come before the Board.

M. Peirce agreed.

WW motions to continue the Special Permit & Development Plan Review for Gibbs Oil to June 8, 2000 @ 9:00 pm. SC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

**BLACKSTONE FIELDS – SPECIAL PERMIT & DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION – PUBLIC HEARING**

VD motions to waive the reading of the ad for Blackstone Fields Special Permit & Definitive Subdivision Public Hearing. SC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

Brad Allen, applicant for the Blackstone Fields Subdivision and Special Permit presents to the Board his proposal. We are applying for approval of a open space subdivision and special permit for Blackstone Fields. This project is located on Blackstone Street on approximately 28 acres of land of which we are proposing to develop 10 acres for lots +/- and deed 18 acres over to the Town for open space. It is our understanding with the history of this particular piece of land that the Conservation Commission and the DPW are both in favor of treating this as open space because of the uplands. It is a cul-de-sac off of Blackstone Street and contemplates 12 lots with proper detention and drainage facilities to those lots. We have applied for a street-opening permit as well. We will be widening the rest of the street to an adequate access level to be consistent with the rest of Blackstone Street which is now paved at anywhere from 17 ½' and 19' wide. We have been through some of the background on Blackstone Street in the past.

Frank Gallagher, engineer for the project explains the limits of it. The property does have a four-acre wetlands system that runs through it. There is substantial upland on either side of that. As you enter onto the property from Blackstone Street the roadway is 722'. It slopes up to a point and then there is a high point in the road where it starts to slope back. We have some catch basins set at a low point and further towards the cul-de-sac to collect the storm water, drops it into a detention basin and then discharges into the wetlands. The roadway completely conforms with what the Subdivision Regulations call for as a Lane, which is a 22' wide pavement, cape cod berm and sidewalk on one side. The only waiver we are asking for is there is a requirement in the regulations that call for all of the sheets to be at least a 40 scale and we are asking for a waiver to allow us to do a couple of the sheets at 60 scale. The reason for that is because there is another section in the regulations that say each lot has to be shown in it's entirety on one sheet. With the 18 acre open space lot we can't show it all on one sheet.

WW asked what happens to Blackstone Street after the subdivision?

B. Allen explains his proposal as improving Blackstone Street as it currently exists out to my subdivision. At that point we would install a locked gate for emergency vehicles to come through from the Town of Blackstone. I have obtained the written sign off from the same people who

petitioned to have the road blocked with barriers and boulders accepting my proposal to move the boulders and install the gate.

WW asked who the people were?

B. Allen explains it was Varney, Kimball, Rosenfeld and Remy.

WW asked if Brad made improvements to the Blackstone Town line?

B. Allen says he made improvements to the end of the Form A lots. He explains that he is going to prune the trees to the Blackstone town line as well as smooth it out somewhat with a D-8 blade.

WW says the law says adequate access. If you don't provide that, then it is not a thoroughfare and our bylaw 12-lots on a dead-end street comes into play.

B. Allen says that the road does exist and he can pass through there. I propose to grade the street for fire equipment which is what we need access for.

T. Guerin asked who was removing all the boulders at both ends and is there going to be gates at both ends?

B. Allen explains he will be removing the rocks and installing both gates.

T. Guerin asked what is the extent of the improvements between the gates? I'm looking for the road to be wide enough for passing of emergency vehicles. Who is going to plow the road?

B. Allen says the Town of Bellingham.

T. Guerin asked if they were going to open the gate and plow?

B. Allen says yes.

T. Guerin says that if that is fine with Don DiMartino, then it is fine with him.

WW asked why the Fire Department wants to see the emergency access road to the Milford/Bellingham Technology Park paved and not this one paved?

T. Guerin says he would love to see this one paved as well.

VD asked what's the approximate distance from gate to gate?

B. Allen says it is approximately 1/3 of a mile.

VD if you pave it, it wouldn't be an issue at all. But, if you widen it and clean it up to be adequately accessible, I think it would help. I think paving it is something that should be considered. There are a lot more issues that still need to be addressed.

F. Gallagher explains that what is going to get Blackstone Street constructed is when it becomes feasible for each land owner to improve that section of Blackstone Street to allow for the development of their property. We are proposing to improve it to allow for the development of our property. Should we get together with the Fire Department and the DPW and come up with a decision that is adequate access?

The Board agreed with that.

SC questioned Conservation's concern with the detention pond on the open space?

F. Gallagher explains that originally the detention pond was on Lot 11, but the Board thought it would be better off in the open space.

VD mentions a few issues that Don DiMartino had with regards to looping the water main and improvements to Blackstone Street.

B. Allen explains that they spoke to Don at his office regarding the looping of the water main and the feasibility of that. It actually just loops back to itself. There is no other water main anywhere near that. We told him we would put a utility or access easement in so that in the future he can loop it himself or at some future date to any other parcel that may be developed.

VD feels we need to have the detention basin reviewed by an independent engineer?

B. Allen agreed to that and he agrees to pay for reasonable fees incurred.

VD motions to continue the Blackstone Fields Special Permit & Definitive Subdivision to June 8, 2000 @ 9:30 pm. SC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

VD motions to direct Denis Fraine to obtain an independent engineering drainage analysis relative to this project. SC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

#### **TMC – 1 WILLIAM WAY – DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW – PUBLIC MEETING**

WW motions to waive the reading of the notice. SC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

Lou Reed, Norfolk Environmental we are proposing to put a 9,000 square foot building on Lot #5 on William Way. We received comments from Phil Herr and have no problems except for a couple of questions. One of the issues was to locate any trees larger than 8" in diameter on the site. He also asked us to note on the plans that all work done on William Way will be required to have a street opening permit by the Town of Bellingham. We will do that. Regarding the drainage and grading, we are proposing a catch basin, drainage galley to drain into the swale. The parking area is a total of 23,830 square feet.

WW asked what the use of the building was going to be?

L. Reed explains warehouse for contractor and office.

Matt Clark, applicant agrees to pay for the independent engineer that is hired by the town to review the drainage calculations and storm water design.

VD motions to continue to our next meeting due to the fact that we don't have comments from our consultant Phil Herr to June 8, 2000 @ 10:00 pm. SC seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

**LOT #1 CENTERVILLE LANE – DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW – continued**

Bruce Lord is before the Board to update everyone on the application of Lot #1 Centerville Lane, Mark Staniscia. We have made the changes that were requested. We changed the label of retail/office to commercial. We added the note on the plan that spells out what is allowed in this location per the bylaws back when it was approved within the subdivision. It reads "Construction on Lot #1 is subject to the following Section 4112 1994 Code of Bylaws. The following home occupations are permitted without a necessity of Special Permit. The professions of medicine, dentistry, law, architecture, engineering, machine, wood working metals, art or photo shop, domestic work such as dress making, millinery and cloths washing. Teaching and exercise in professional skills in music, dramatic, arts and crafts and academic pursuits, real estate, insurance offices, inside storage of tradesman's materials and equipment or beauty parlor, or barber shop and accountant unless specifically designated otherwise in the water resource district as set out in Section 4900."

WW asked about the screening and that there really isn't anything but what is existing?

B. Lord explains there is quite a bit of screening.

VD asked if there would be a fence in the rear of the parcel?

B. Lord explains there is plantings proposed.

WW asked if Mark would be willing to put up a stockade fence?

M. Stanascia agreed to install a 6' stockade fence on the backside of the fence.

WW questioned the storm water management and the drainage.

B. Lord explains that it is designed for the 100 year storm but in all actuality, it isn't even required because it was part of the original subdivision that was already designed and approved. We have not only tried to meet your requirements, we have gone beyond your requirements. There is nothing on this plan that is outside, or even close to your regulations. We are well within the design limits.

Paul LeBlanc (abutter on Centerville) explains that they are trying to be good neighbors and we realize Mark has a right to develop that parcel. We just have concerns with the traffic and parking on our street.

B. Lions (11 Centerville) asked what we decided on the number of parking spaces.

M. Simmons says 16 parking spaces.

P. LeBlanc asked how much stockade fence would go up?

M. Staniscia agrees to go from the back corner of the building to the sidewalk.

VD asked JK to send a letter to the Safety Officer regarding signs for "no off street parking" be installed on Centerville Lane to help alleviate the parking problem.

SC asked about a sign for the project?

B. Lord explains there is a location for a sign shown on the plans, but until we get a tenant we have no idea what it will look like. It will not be an illuminated sign.

SC motions to approve the Development Plan Review for Lot #1 Centerville Estates with the following conditions. A 6' stockade fence to be installed along the backside of the lot from the back corner of the building to the sidewalk (per Bldg. Insp. determination for safety distance), sign for the building needs to be reviewed by the Board prior to installation. RD seconds. Vote of 4 (RD, VD, WW and SC).

VD moves to adjourn at 12:50 am. WW seconds. Vote of 5 (RD, VD, WW, SC and EG).

  
Richard V. Dill, Chairman

  
Valerie J. DeAngelis

  
William M. Wozniak

  
Steven Choiniere

  
Edward Guzowski