TOWN OF LUDLOW PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
March 11, 2021

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

Christopher Coelho – Chairman (Present)
Joseph Queiroga – Vice Chairman (Present)
Raymond Phoenix (Present)
Kathleen Houle (Present)
Rafael Quiterio (Present)
Joshua Carpenter, Associate Member (Present)

The meeting began at 7:01 p.m. in the Selectmen's Conference Room via Telephonically (by order of the Governor's March 10, 2020 order titled "Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c.30A, § 20" due to the COVID-19 Virus Outbreak)

PUBLIC HEARING – DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION – 0 Ventura Street (Assessors' Map 30, Parcel 112) Whitetail Wreks, LLC c/o Armand Deslauriers (construction of Phase III of the existing "Hundred Acre Wood" residential subdivision and associated site improvements consisting of (18) eighteen lots.

SEE ATTACHED MINUTES

SITE SKETCH – 44 Sewall Street (Assessors' Map 14B, Parcel 136) Suburban Realty Trust – Richard Kelleher & Barbara Kelleher, Trustees (update site plan chart)

The applicants were not present for the appointment.

Mr. Stefancik explained that Mr. Kelleher updated the chart, and that the Planning Board approved the Change of Occupancies at the last meeting of February 25, 2021 with the condition that the chart be updated on the existing site plan to show the new businesses going into the building (hair salon, gift shop, smoothie shop, and church). Mr. Stefancik said that they meet the parking requirements.

Mr. Phoenix: I believe at our last meeting we had decided to let this move forward as long as we got this in. Now that we have it in hand and they're asking for the waiver request, I would like to make a **MOTION** to formally approve the waiver requests for the site plan in favor of a sketch, which is essentially the chart, as well as a waiver of the public hearing given the nature of this particular proposal.
SECOND Ms. Houle.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Coelho – yes.

Mr. Coelho read the comments from the Board of Health which stated that the smoothie shop needs to submit an application for permitting with them before they can open their business.

Mr. Phoenix: The chart, I looked at it earlier, it looks pretty comprehensive the way everything's broken down, and as suspected, the total parking required is under what they're providing. It was actually closer than I expected, but it is still under so, I would make a **MOTION** to approve the site sketch as submitted.
SECOND Ms. Houle.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Coelho – yes.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Documents included: Master application; Waiver request; Chapin #4; Sewall Street; Comments from Board of Health

---

APPOINTMENT – Development Agreement & Covenants, Water & Sewer Line Modifications Sodi, Inc. c/o Ralph Capua - Santina Drive (0 Chapin Street – Assessors' Map 11D, Parcel 115)

Ralph Capua, Rob Levesque – R. Levesque Associates were present for the appointment.

Mr. Capua remarked that the water and sewer line is changing by putting the forced main in the tree belt, which DPW has given their approval on.

Mr. Stefancik told Mr. Coelho that he has the Development Agreement and the Covenant for security. He said that several developers have done covenants for subdivisions in the past.

Mr. Phoenix voiced his concerns over taking covenants as security. Mr. Levesque explained the benefits of taking a covenant for both the developer and the town.

Mr. Phoenix: I'll make a **MOTION** to accept the covenant and to sign the Development Agreement with the understanding that the covenant will be released as a whole and not piecemeal and that when the developer needs the covenant released we'll be getting alternate surety at that time in a manner that is suitable for the Planning Board.
SECOND Ms. Houle.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Coelho – yes.

Mr. Phoenix commented that he would like to have a discussion as a Board making the (above covenant motion) a part of the Rules and Regs moving forward so that everybody knows that's what the Planning Board is willing to do when they come to the table with a subdivision.

Documents included: Development Agreement (February 22, 2021); Town of Ludlow Covenant (February 22, 2021)

File Mail Item #10 – Legal Notice – Ludlow Conservation Commission – Lot 2 West Street (Map 8, Parcel 1C)

File Mail Item #11 – Legal Notice – Ludlow Conservation Commission – 466 Miller Street (Map 26, Parcel 36A)

Consent Agenda:

The Board approved the Consent Agenda under unanimous consent.

- FILE Mail Item 09. - Legal Notices from surrounding communities
- APPROVE/SIGN Minutes of February 11, 2021 & February 25, 2021
- SIGN Special Permits:
  - Estelle Gomulka – 30 Woodland Place (artist/painter)
  - Leonard Gomulka – 30 Woodland Place (band, publishing company)
- APPROVE Change of Occupancies:
  - David Thompson (Westnet Inc.) 100 State Street, Building 110 (from storage to storage)

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Phoenix: With nothing else on the agenda, I would like to make a **MOTION** to adjourn please.
SECOND Ms. Houle.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Coelho – yes; Mr. Carpenter - yes.

Meeting adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

APPROVED:

Kathleen J. Houle

Kathleen Houle, Secretary

su

(All related documents can be viewed at the Planning Board Office during regular business hours.)

TOWN OF LUDLOW PLANNING BOARD
RESCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARING – DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION
0 Ventura Street (Assessors' Map 30, Parcel 112)
Whitetail Wreks, LLC c/o Armand Deslauriers
(construction of Phase III of the existing "Hundred Acre Wood" residential subdivision and associated site improvements consisting of (18) eighteen lots)
March 11, 2021

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

Christopher Coelho – Chairman (Present)
Joseph Queiroga – Vice Chairman (Present)
Raymond Phoenix (Present)
Kathleen Houle (Present)
Rafael Quiterio (Present)
Joshua Carpenter, Associate Member (Present)

The hearing began at 7:08 p.m. in the Selectmen's Conference Room via Telephonically.
(by order of the Governor's March 10, 2020 order titled "Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c.30A, § 20" due to the COVID-19 Virus Outbreak)

In attendance: Armand Deslauriers, Rob Levesque – R Levesque Associates, John Tomaszewski – R Levesque Associates, attendees

Mr. Coelho read the legal notice and reviewed the application. The legal notice included the description of: construction of Phase III of the existing "Hundred Acre Wood" residential subdivision and associated site improvements consisting of (18) eighteen lots.

Mr. Coelho: There we go, we got that out of the way. Now, just to summarize, we're working on Phase III of the Hundred Acre Wood Subdivision, correct?

Mr. Tomaszewski: That is correct.

Mr. Coelho: And we're now speaking with one of the engineers for Levesque Associates, with some of the technical details. So, if you want to go ahead and start over again with the technical details that'd be great.

Mr. Tomaszewski: Sure, I'll sort of go from where I left off. So, the 49 lots will be accessed through three roadways: one will be the extension of Turning Leaf Road to the north, that'll terminate in a cul-de-sac just above Ventura Street to the east; a new roadway, Balsam Hill Road will be constructed to connect Autumn Ridge Road on the west over to Ventura Street to provide a connector street between those two; and then a third road, Equinox Pass will tie between Balsam Hill Road and Turning Leaf Road. Stormwater will be handled by a typical catch basin and underground piping which will be directed to a series of five surface infiltration basins scattered across the site in appropriate locations, each lot will be served by a private well. And the sanitary sewer will be handled by, each one would have its own --- pump which will feed into a forced main that'll run down the center line of the roadways and tie into the gravity sewer which is, which currently exists. --- it's part of Phase II up at Autumn Ridge Road. And those

two intersections, there are --- existing gravity sewer in that area, so all lots will be serviced by ---. Also, as part of the project, we're required to install a fire cistern for fire safety, and that's gonna be located at the intersection of Balsam Hill Road and Equinox Pass. As I said, there was one constructed in Phase I of the project many years ago. It's just an underground tank for fire suppression. Let's see, so like we said before, at this point we're looking to get, create the sixteen lots sort of on the inner loop on the north side of Balsam Hill Road and the south side of Turning Leaf Road up to Equinox Pass. And then in the future, as the development goes along, each of the individual lots will be created along the way and it's ultimately will have the --- you see on Sheet 3. So that's sort of the gist of it. I don't know if anyone has questions or.

Mr. Coelho: --- questions, let me go through the comments from the other town boards and departments and then we'll do some Q&A. How's that sound?

Mr. Tomaszewski: Sure.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, this is from the Fire Department, dated March 11th. *(Mr. Coelho read the comments from Captain Seth M. Falconer, Fire Prevention Officer; Department of Public Works – see file)* Has the developer seen these already?

Mr. Stefancik: They were sent to the developer.

Mr. Tomaszewski: Yeah, we did see them earlier today.

Mr. Coelho: Today, ok. We've got a memo here from the Planning Board. Doug went through it. Looks like you guys are gonna be asking for a waiver of perimeter monuments to be set prior to the submission of the definitive plan, and that was one of the problems that the DPW had as well. Show calculated areas of all parcels, streets, and rights-of-ways. H. Location, names, and present widths of streets bounding, approaching or within reasonable proximity of the subdivision – add 50' width to Autumn Ridge Road and Ventura Street. We have M. #1 next is sewer line – show sewer laterals to properties. Underneath R; Roadway and lot monumentation. I suppose that means they're missing lot monumentation?

Mr. Stefancik: I think the estimate.

Mr. Coelho: Huh?

Mr. Stefancik: The estimate.

Mr. Coelho: Construction estimate, yeah ok. So, ok, they need an estimate for that. Under W. They're asking for a waiver of the location of natural features such as water courses, wetlands, scenic vistas, historic locations, stone walls, locations of species of large trees (DBH greater than 8"), and similar community assets. The plan shall identify which of these features shall be left undisturbed. Features shall be preserved to the maximum extent possible. Removal, modification, or destruction of these features shall only occur with written approval of the Planning Board. They gonna be asking for a waiver for that. And waivers, all approved waivers will need to be added to the approved Definitive Plans, all waivers not approved should be taken off the approved Definitive Plan. Applicant is asking for three waivers. See attached waiver request. Ok, here is a waiver request. *(Mr. Coelho read the waiver request for Section II.B.2. – To waive the requirement that the plan scale be 1" = 40'; Section II. B.2.f. – To waive the requirement that all perimeter monuments be set prior to submission of the definitive plan;*

Section III.D. – To waive the requirement to locate large trees (greater that 8-inch diameter at breast height (DBH) - see file) So, there's their waiver requests. Now we have, it looks like this is the Assessors comments: *If roads are approved apart from the new lots split out, we will create three larger parcels for the remaining land.* Board of Health has no comments. Oh, and that, I'm sorry, that was Joe Alves, Assessor. This is Andrea Crete.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Stefancik: Crete.

Mr. Coelho: Crete, Health Agent. No comments from the Board of Health. Safety Committee, Safety Committee asks that regulation stop signs at intersections of Ventura and any other intersections; LED lighting for street lights is recommended, Penny Lebel, Vice Chair. And it looks like we have, what is this this here, is this just a letter from you to them?

Mr. Stefancik: Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, so we are done with comments. So, let me start with the Safety Committee 'cause I was just there today and it's very fresh in my mind. Basically, they're looking at all the stop signs, and actually the entire project be approved stop signs and meet whatever DOT specifications and approval from the Selectmen. Is that something you guys have a problem with or I understand there's some smaller stop signs around and they're not, they haven't gone through approval within the actual existing subdivision. Is that the case?

Mr. Levesque: Armand, do you have?

Mr. Deslauriers: Yeah, I mean, I could, would agree with the Safety Committee that, you know, --- where they want these stop signs and the size of these stop signs that are provided by me anyhow, I'll gladly put them where needed.

Mr. Coelho: And I guess there's a process where the Selectmen has to approve them or no. So, they don't have to…

Mr. Deslauriers: That I didn't know.

Mr. Coelho: Yeah, I'm not too aware of that myself or…

Mr. Stefancik: I think if they don't have them there the Selectmen could approve them, and that's usually if they want them there per recommendation of Safety Committee.

Mr. Coelho: Yeah, so we, that's basically what's going on. So yeah, we, I know they wanted regulation, and for sure the one on Ventura's got to be regulation, you know. And would also look at getting any stop signs that are within the development itself to be consistent with those types of stop signs found throughout the Commonwealth which I don't think is a stretch. That being said, I'm confused here now. So, do you guys want to address any of these comments? You want me to pull anything out and we can talk about these comments or do you guys have a good grasp on these, Mr. Levesque?

Mr. Levesque: I think it's fair to say that we understand the comments --- changes. All of the comments can be incorporated into the final set. I don't think Armand had any fundamental issues with them. Armand is that accurate?

Mr. Deslauriers: That's completely accurate.

Mr. Coelho: Ok great.

Mr. Levesque: Great. Thank you.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 2 A 9:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Coelho: Ok. So, does anybody from the Board have anything, anything to ask about this or anything moving forward before we move on these waivers?

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Phoenix.

Mr. Phoenix: I actually wanted to ask for the applicant to give the reasoning for some of those waivers if they could. If they could go down the list of three and just explain why they're asking for them. I think some of them, especially like the one for the scale was pretty self-explanatory, but I'm more interested to hear about like the street trees, things like that.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, so let's take this waiver by waiver ok Mr. Deslauriers or Levesque?

Mr. Deslauriers: You got it.

(multiple people talking)

Mr. Coelho: Ok, the first one's a waiver of Section II.B.2. – To waive the requirement that the plan scale be 1" = 40'. That's pretty self-explanatory but, give us something for the record.

Mr. Tomaszewski: Yeah, we feel that for the lot layout plan, just for convenience, to be able to read the plan and get a good grasp, we propose that one-inch equals 80 feet. We get the entire subdivision on two separate sheets, and it seems it's readable, so it made sense to request that waiver.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, the second request is waiver of Section II. B.2.f. – To waive the requirement that all perimeter monuments be set prior to submission of the definitive plan.

Mr. Tomaszewski: We're assuming that those perimeter monuments for each individual lot and obviously when you go in there to construct this to even just do the tree clearing, you're gonna probably knock all of those out and probably redo it, so we generally request that waiver.

Mr. Phoenix: I would just ask what makes this project different than all of the other subdivisions in Town where we do require those property corner monuments be placed before the definitive plan. If we have that rule, I think most, not all, but most developers have been held to do it, what is unique about this --- and why we should waive it?

Mr. Levesque: --- Mr. Phoenix. Mr. Phoenix, correct?

Mr. Phoenix: Yes.

Mr. Levesque: Ok, yeah, this is Rob Levesque. I can speak to it. Yeah, so that's a good question. So, I don't think anything is different here, I think that --- clarify this. The perimeter

monuments have all been identified by Dan O'Brien from Smith Associates and either confirmed and/or set as part of the perimeter survey. So, the perimeter of the subject property has in fact had the monuments set. As far as each individual lot as Mr. Tomaszewski had mentioned, really what happens is when they go in and clear the ground when they're building out here, there's a series of trips made by the surveyors to provide control points and to provide lot stakes, etcetera so they know where they're at. It's not logical to set pins and/or roadway monuments like bounds or anything like that until a time after which probably binder is down --- typically if we go in before the lot's framed, loaders or excavators and all kinds of different equipment is being driven around and often times those internal monuments would get wiped out and/or, you know, messed up or, you know, and it can tend to cause a problem and also requires --- to be done twice. That is a standard waiver that we would request on any subdivision, and I think it's just a clarification that it's not the perimeter monuments, we certainly want them to be on the subject property that they own, we'd really just like to waive the internal monuments and the perimeter monuments have already been set or identified.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Phoenix: I've heard a similar argument a number of times over the years and honestly, I think it kind of makes sense, and I don't want to say that we always need to do things the way we've always done things. I believe that's a silly way of looking at things. So, I guess one of my questions to you, in your expertise having done plans in multiple communities, is this something that is a fairly unique requirement on the books here in Ludlow or is this something you had repeatedly had to ask for a waiver on in other communities as well?

Mr. Levesque: I would say there's probably a few other communities that we have to request this waiver, but it's a fairly standard waiver issued just based on the logic of the construction process.

Mr. Phoenix: I would just say that maybe Doug, can you make a note for us to look at, outside of the scope of this hearing, possibly modifying that language so that it's clear that what we're looking for up front are the perimeter monuments not the interior ones? We can handle that at a public hearing for the Rules and Regs, get that cleaned up so that we don't have to have people make this waiver request every time.

Mr. Coelho: Anybody else? Waiver number three.

Ms. ---: ---

Mr. Coelho: Go ahead.

Ms. ---: I'm just wondering at what point ---

Mr. Coelho: Hold on, I'll be opening it up to public as soon as the Board's done and these waivers are granted. So, in a little bit, in a little while. You'll know when I open it to the public.

Ms. ---: Ok, thank you. Sorry.

Mr. Coelho: No, no problem. A waiver of Section III.D. – To waive the requirement to locate large trees (greater that 8-inch diameter at breast height (DBH). Again, this is one that I do recall seeing quite often on these projects as well. So, why don't you give us some reasoning behind that, and maybe that's something else we need to address too.

Mr. Levesque: Ok, John I'll take this one as well if that's ok. So, typically, what happens, as you're aware, the subdivision road, in order to create them, and in order to create home sites, There's really a swath of land that will be cleared and then grubbed and then excavated to create the roadway. Obviously, Mr. Deslauriers likes to leave as many trees as possible. But what ends up happening is, the area within that subject development area or that footprint, really will be --- cleared, so it doesn't make sense to go in there and locate, if there was a way to save trees and do different roadways --- and all that, but it made more sense to try to go around some of these trees. But as you're aware, subdivision standards --- a very specific layout, a very specific grade, and then, obviously, a single family home site has to get the foundation in and what not , so it ends up being a wasted effort, and a very significant effort in this particular case with the --- acres and the amount of trees that may be over 8" DBH. So, if we were looking at a specific area along the perimeter or the edge, it might make more sense, but the funny thing is once these lots are sold, each individual homeowner, unless there in a buffer zone to a wetland, will clear anything they want. So, we're really identifying stuff that we're not gonna control in the future, or we're identifying stuff that's going to be cleared as part of the roadway and the home site development, if that makes sense.

Mr. Coelho: Yeah, and some of the intent of this would be to keep species of trees that might be, not endangered, but in fear of being endangered or something of that nature, and you guys handle that kind of stuff in the planning process, prior to us getting here, correct? I mean, people take a look at these tracts of land for stuff like that, right?

Mr. Levesque: Correct, there is no endangered species mapped on the subject property at all.

Mr. Coelho: And again, I think one of the things that indicates rocks or something historical of nature. That's also reviewed as well, correct?

Mr. Levesque: That is correct. And there's nothing of note to my knowledge and I don't believe Mr. Deslauriers has anything either.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, so…

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Phoenix.

Mr. Phoenix: I would make a **MOTION,** based on the reasoning that we've just heard, to grant all three waiver requests for the scale of the plan, the requirement that the monumentation be in place prior to the definitive plan, and locating the larger trees on the property. That would be the motion.
SECOND Mr. Queiroga.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Coelho - yes.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, so we have the waivers out of the way. I lost my cheat sheet. Ok, there are no checklists at this point, that's Doug's job, kind of. Ok, now I'm gonna go ahead and open this up. First of all, does anybody on the Board have anything else to add or ask? Ok, I'm not hearing anything else. Now I'm gonna go ahead and open this meeting up to the public. If you could state your name and address for the record and direct all questions through me, the

Chairman, Chairperson, whatever you want to call me, and we'll have the developer respond in kind. Please don't repeat yourselves. Repeated questions waste our time, and at that point I'll, we'll be moving on to another question. So, whoever's on the line. How many people you have there, Doug?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 10:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Stefancik: Eleven.

Mr. Coelho: We have eleven people on the line? So, well let's just start one at a time here, the first person to speak up, please state your name and address.

Ms. Capuano: Ok, my name's Mary Capuano. Yes hi, I'd like to ask a question.

Mr. Coelho: Sure.

Mr. Stefancik: Their audio is off.

Ms. Capuano: I can't tell who is.

Ms. ---: Hi, what do want from me?

Mr. Coelho: Are you Mary?

Ms. ---: No, I'm not.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, Mary was talking. Mary, could you please turn your tv off?

Ms. Capuano: Yeah, I'll do that.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, great.

Ms. Capuano: Ok so.

Mr. Coelho: Is this Mary?

Ms. Capuano: This is Mary Capuano.

Mr. Coelho: Ok Mary, go ahead.

Ms. Capuano: Ok, I have the property adjacent to this proposed property changes here. So, I'm on the Laurel Lane, the end of Laurel Lane, that property where Elizabeth Drive meets it. It's a vacant property there, The Shadow LLC. So, my question is, so the Stormwater Parcel H, I'd like to know the elevation of that and does that parcel or any adjacent parcel to that have to be raised --- and if so, which one? What, if any, impact will that have with the water drainage, towards, there's a wetland there beside it, as well as that comes down and into my property, all the way down there, so specifically how will it affect that wetland, and then the elevation height?

(multiple people talking)

Mr. Coelho: Hold on, if everybody could just be quiet until the developer addresses this first question. Maybe you could mute your phones until we get ya, that'd be great. Ok, Mr.

Deslauriers or Mr. Levesque or somebody, would you like to address her drainage concerns, specifically on the lot adjacent to Laurel Lane?

Mr. Levesque: I'll turn it over to Mr. Tomaszewski.

Mr. Coelho: Sure.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR -2 A 9:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Tomaszewski: John Tomaszewski here. So yeah, you're talking about the Stormwater Parcel H that has a little finger wetland that goes into the subject parcel. Grade wise, it's the roadway, the new roadway and all those proposed lots are gonna be essentially at their existing grade. That basin in particular is gonna be a depression in the existing ground over there. And, you know, as part of the whole design process, we're required to match the preexisting conditions out there, so that stormwater basin is designed to take into account all the additional pervious area and whatnot and ultimately meet those existing conditions, so there should not, there won't be any increase of runoff, or shouldn't be any impacts to that wetland in any way.

Ms. Capuano: Ok, and you're saying that will end up being more of a depression than anything getting raised, and none of the surrounding lots surrounding that Parcel H has to be raised in order to meet?

Mr. Tomaszewski: No, nothing. I mean, from where the roadway's gonna be located, the land generally slopes towards that wetland, so the roads, I'm assuming the houses would be maybe a couple feet above the roadway, and then the lots will drop by grade back down into that wetland to the west. But, in that area there's no significant grade changes proposed, and there really wouldn't be any need to unlike other portions of the site.

Ms. Capuano: Ok, alright, thank you.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, can we move on to the next caller? Somebody else would like to speak, please state your name and address. We're open up for public comments here, please state your name and address and address your question through me, the Chairman.

Mr. Kipetz: Ok, I guess I'll go next as long as nobody else is stepping in.

Mr. Coelho: Sounds good.

Mr. Kipetz: My name is Alan Kipetz and I live at 60 Parker Lane.

Mr. Coelho: Ok.

Mr. Kipetz: And what my question is, is there going to be a traffic study regarding the amount of traffic that's gonna be flowing through this development? I don't believe they've done one yet for the first phase or the second. So, if so, will that be the responsibility of the developer putting in the traffic study? I know we have traffic that's tenfold up here now. I have tractor trailers, cars, dump trucks, probably a couple hundred a day as far as vehicles go. So, just wondering if that's gonna be a responsibility or if that's gonna be requested by the DPW or whoever, the Planning Board or whoever.

Mr. Levesque: Chairman Coelho, this is Rob Levesque. I think I can speak to that if you'd like.

Mr. Coelho: Great. Thanks Rob.

Mr. Levesque: Thank you. Ok, so the first few phases, they did in fact have a traffic study. I think it was done by --- Land Development, Jeff ---. And then recently, the most recent phase here, we did in fact have a traffic study completed and that was done by McMahon Associates. They're a large traffic engineering firm, and as part of the submission requirements we're required to do so, and it was in fact paid for by the developer. The information that came back was actually pretty telling in that the intersections in the surrounding area, and there were three studied. Those intersections essentially, they operate at a very, very good level of service, basically an A or a B, depending on which one you're talking about. And while the development of 50 additional lots here was studied, in all cases they found that the level of service at each of those intersections did not change. So, you know, in perceived traffic versus actual traffic issues, is obviously something that comes up quite a bit, but just to give you some perspective, the rate of growth in that area as far as traffic goes based on the data that's available from McMahon Associates found to be .8%. So, less than 1% growth rate per year. So, that said, you can, I think you can rest assured that it is absolutely been looked at by a very reputable traffic firm and that there is a copy available at least at the Planning Department. I know it's COVID, so I'm not sure on how you get to see it, but Mr. Stefancik can certainly speak to that. And generally speaking, there's a really nice summary in there that talks about site distance, it talks about the number of vehicle trips generated at the peak hours, and the weekday, and it talks about these intersections, how they currently function. And they look at a 2027 build out scenario and a no build scenario so you can kind of compare the two. And all of these scenarios essentially, the intersection will be operating at the same level of service that they do now.

RECEIVED
TOWNSHIP CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:53
TOWNSHIP OF LAND O'

Mr. Kipetz: Ok, so within the traffic study they didn't find that the stop signs which you guys have already addressed, that they're not actually illegal stop sign that has not been approved by the DPW? 'Cause I know the majority ---.

Mr. Levesque: I'm not sure what the existing, I personally, I apologize, don't know the specific stop signs that are there, but I can assure you that we're happy to make sure, and I think Mr. Deslauriers' happy to make sure that all stop signs comply with --- standards and very specific DPW standards. You know, there's no reason to deviate for a stop sign. ---

Mr. Deslauriers: I believe it was just to appease the land owners that was at the bottom of the street. We out the signs up to attempt to slow people down which, unfortunately, never did work, but.

Mr. Levesque: Oh, gotcha.

Mr. Kipetz: And just my other question is, is there anything as far as, I know that generally there's a forestry, I believe it's a timber harvesting permit that the developer gets in regards to building the streets to clear the land which I'm not really sure how this works, but I know he gets a timber harvesting permit which kind of deviates him from actually doing like a plan for the road. He clears the timber which actually makes the road where he wants it. I'm not sure how the permits work on that.

Mr. Levesque: Yeah, I can speak to that ---. --- Mr. Coelho ---. Is that ok Mr. Coelho?

Mr. Coelho: Yeah. Yeah, go ahead.

Mr. Levesque: Ok, ok thanks. Yeah, so basically what happens is, obviously the Planning Board regulates the proposed subdivision, looks at the design and all that. There are conditions under the subdivision approvals, should it be approved there are conditions that the developer has to adhere to. One of those conditions, and that's actually a comment from Mr. Goodreau, with regard to what's called a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The term we use is SWPPP. Ok so, SWPPP, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. That's under the NPDES general permit. That permit is required for any work on the property that exceeds an acre of land. So, Mr. Deslauriers has been required to have that, has had that. That's considered a pocket permit. So, what happens is that gets registered with the EPA and he keeps that up to date on site either with himself or his contractors or subcontractors can fill that out. And what they do is they're responsible for making sure after certain rain events and periodic inspections will be required after rain events and just in general based on their inspection schedule. That all is required under the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. There's no reason why Mr. Deslauriers can't have a forest cutting plan in addition to that, but it's not a specific requirement for him to clear trees under this project. So, should he decide to have a forest cutting plan, he can certainly do that, but to go and clear these trees, actually, believe it or not, does not trigger any specific permits. The permits are triggered when the trees have been cut and then you start to grub or escalate the stumps, that, when there's a disturbance to the ground, that's actually when the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan comes into place and needs to be in place. In this case, we're really just going to be extending that existing permit to these other areas for clearing and excavation. ---

Mr. Kipetz: Yes, ok thank you very much. That's all I have.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, thank you. Ok, anybody else from the public have any questions? Please state your name and address for the record.

Ms. Jameson: Mr. Chairman, this is Cathy Jameson from 290 Ventura Street Ludlow, Mass.

Mr. Coelho: Hello Mrs. Jameson.

Ms. Jameson: Hi there, I am, my neighbor and I are pretty much at the bottom of the slope, and we have serious concerns about the water. We currently have issues with water pooling in our yard, and I was told when these properties were built about 18-20 years ago, there's actually water that came up into the basements and pipes had to be put under the road in Ventura Street to prevent water from coming into the basement. Also, our septic systems are in the fronts of our properties, so we want to know how any water runoff, how we're gonna be protected from that and how that's gonna be addressed.

Mr. Coelho: So, part of this process is that they design this so that water does not run off their property to yours and it's controlled on their property. That's part of the process inherently. But again, I'm gonna go ahead and let Mr. Levesque address this question because it is more technical, so. Mr. Levesque?

Mr. Tomaszewski: --- this is John Tomaszewski. Like the Chairman said we designed this to meet the existing conditions. Mr. Deslauriers, you might be able to address this. I know that there's that one culvert that crosses under Ventura Street and heads toward the east. It sort of discharges beyond those lots on the east side of Ventura, I think at one point. And I don't know the history of it exactly. At one point, that culvert might have been plugged up by somebody and in that time frame there might have been some flooding of Ventura Street 'cause obviously that

water that was rolling over the hill on the slope had nowhere to go other than to topple over onto Ventura Street. I don't know if that may be what you're referring to, but like I said we, at this point we have, we've designed it. It's a pair of basins down at the low point on, near Ventura Street which will, again, it will hold the water for a period of time and then discharge it. It's regulated that the release of water from those basins --- existing conditions as there are today, and all that run off that is heading down the slope, heading towards Ventura Street, will eventually make it to that culvert under the roadway at a much slower rate than would be if we had no control. So, that should hopefully answer your question I think.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 MAR 23 P 2:53
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Ms. Jameson: And thank you very much, and if we see an issue with water or an increase in water pooling in our yards, do we have any recourse once development has started?

Mr. Levesque: This is Rob Levesque. Mr. Coelho I can speak to that.

Mr. Coelho: Ok. Go ahead.

Mr. Levesque: Obviously, that's a great question, and certainly, if you could prove that there is an issue, you have recourse. So, what ends up happening, obviously from year to year, you have different storm events that happen at different times. So, we will just give you kind of a 5,000-foot level of what we're talking about. So, what John is basically saying, John Tomaszewski who just spoke, he is basically saying that we're required to handle all of our water. So, if you think of the way we're doing that, just in general, this is an analogy, but if you think about it like an hour glass, if you think of the sand in an hour glass, that comes out at a very consistent rate right? So, what we're required to do with our stormwater is similar to that. Because we're increasing the impervious surfaces --- over what's existing right now, it's wooded, it's soiled, etcetera. We're gonna be creating roadway, we're gonna be creating houses, driveways, maybe patios, pools, etcetera. So, when we do that we need to do an analysis. And there's a very conservative engineering ---, but very conservative model that requires --- under the DEP Stormwater Management Standards. This came out in 2008 ---, but the bottom line is, we're really required to take the conservative estimate in our modeling for stormwater. When we do that, we are required to handle smaller storm events up to and including the hundred-year storm. So just to give you some perspective, the drainage system here is designed, and John correct me if I'm wrong, is it 6 ½ inches of rain in a 24-hour period for the hundred-year ---?

Mr. Tomaszewski: That is correct.

Mr. Levesque: Ok, so if you can imagine a hurricane or two hurricanes in 24 hours you've got 6 ½ inches of rain, these systems are designed to handle that type of water, ok. Now if they were to fail because you got more than that rain, say you got 10 inches of rain in 24-hour period, which I'm sure is completely possible, what we do is we design these with what we call ---. We design them so that if they were to fail in the event of a larger storm event or multiple hurricanes or ---, we design these in such a manner to not cause down street flooding to the adjacent properties. They will overflow to the existing streams, which, in my opinion, if we get 6 ½ inches of rain, you know, you might be out in a boat in your yard, not because of our project, but because of just the water in general that may pool in certain areas. So, I think you can rest assured that this is a belt with suspenders approach to handling the stormwater. Obviously, Mr. Deslauriers is well aware as we are that we do not want to cause any downstream flooding problems. And if you can think of our system as essentially that hourglass. If that hourglass starts emptying, and then we have these big storm events that the hour glass fills up, right, that the water is metered out at that narrow rate at the bottom of the hourglass. So, that's how these

systems work. We can't take water away from a wetland, so we won't be dewatering these wetlands because that's a problem as well, and Conservation would never approve us if we were dewatering it. So, the streams and the groundwater and the general nature of what you're experiencing now, you mentioned you have had some groundwater problems, you will continue to have those, but I would not expect a major increase or decrease in that based on our storm cistern. That would likely fluctuate year to year with the storm events. But, generally speaking, it's a question that comes up often, we do hundreds of projects a year that all have to meet these requirements. Very rarely, and I'm not saying there's never a construction-based problem, but generally speaking, as long as the basins are constructed properly, and they are required to have a operations maintenance plan that is overseen by the homeowners association in perpetuity, so you can expect that these will be maintained. And as long as they're developed, built correctly, they will function properly. They will protect you folks and other folks from any downstream flooding, and there is a failsafe in place in the event they fail, they'll fail properly as not to cause problems downstream. Hopefully that helps.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 13 A 9:52
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Coelho: And Mr. Levesque, during the construction project, do you guys confirm that your specifications are being met, correct?

Mr. Levesque: Yes, we're required to, there's an engineering certification at the end of the project and there's periodic inspections that we do during the construction process. We typically look at subsurface basin material and elevations. There's an as-built plan that's required in order for us to review and sign off on all aspects of the subdivision project.

Mr. Coelho: Ok.

Ms. Jameson: Thank you sir.

Mr. Levesque: Thank you.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, anybody else on the line have any questions? Again, please state your name and address for the record. I'm gonna call it out one more time. Anybody else like to ask a question of the developer, now is the time.

Mr. Kapinos: Matthew Kapinos, 71 Parker Lane.

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Kapinos.

Mr. Kapinos: I'm calling in regards to a couple of different things. The traffic study, does that traffic study have information based on the speeds of the cars for that flow rate?

Mr. Levesque: Yes sir, it does.

Mr. Kapinos: So, we can get record of that then?

Mr. Levesque: That is correct. And I might be able to pull that up. If you ask your next question if possible, I can pull that up while you're asking the next question.

Mr. Kapinos: So, next question is in regards to, so I have a seven year old son and a two year old daughter. So, my biggest concern where I live on the lower end of Parker Lane, not only the traffic, but the lack of street lights. I'm on the sidewalk side and two nights ago tried pulling out

of my driveway, and my driveway's pretty well lit with a spotlight and two giant lights pointing down the driveway, but had a walker and couldn't see him. And lucky enough, I saw him last minute, but it's pretty dangerous for pedestrians to be walking on a sidewalk with no street lights. So, I understand that the next phase will have all of their, you know, nice LED lighting, but just curious what'll happen with the lower end. And with that along with the lighting, just the let's say, the --- of the current road that has been here for the residents that started building their homes back in the early 80's before Phase I even started up on the upper end of Parker Lane.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:54
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Levesque: Mr. Coelho, I can probably answer that question too.

Mr. Coelho: Yup.

Mr. Levesque: So, with the proposed subdivision as you previously mentioned, there's a requirement for lighting. The previous phases and/or existing roadways that have already been accepted by the town or at least have been around for a while, typically, there's no specific requirement for the developer to go beyond the limits of their roadway. If there was a specific safety concern, which it does sound like it is, a legitimate concern it sounds like, you could probably, you know, reach out to DPW and see if there is a safety issue, and I can't speak for DPW, but you could certainly reach out to them and let them know that there's a concern, and there's an area that there's a safety hazard, you now, I think the Town of Ludlow's certainly reasonable on that. As far as the destruction to any roadways and any damage to any roadways, typically what would be done by the DPW and probably Mr. Goodreau, they would go out and take a look at the roadway. They'd call it kind of a preconstruction review with Mr. Deslauriers, and Mr. Deslauriers has been working with the town for years now, and again, they could look at the roadways and if there's any damage, there's a bond. There's a covenant and a bond typically for these projects. So, Mr. Deslauriers has a lot of responsibility as part of the construction of his roadway. One of those that the Town looks at it is the surrounding roadways and any damage there too 'cause obviously the Town doesn't want to be responsible for that. So, that typically gets worked out with the DPW Department and Mr. Deslauriers and hold him to a certain standard --- standpoint on the proposed road and making sure that he's not damaging surrounding roadways. So, you can certainly keep an eye on it yourself, but generally speaking that's something the DPW will keep an eye on. And if there is some damage during construction then they would probably ask Mr. Deslauriers to handle that and I would expect that that would be worked out between Mr. Deslauriers and DPW. If not, they do have the option when Mr. Deslauriers goes for the release of the lots and/or the release of the bond, they can certainly argue that there was damage and ask for money to pay for any damages. So, that's all part of the subdivision process in general --- but that's an option for the Town should there be an issue.

Mr. Kapinos: One of my other questions is access for the trucks that will be working on the next phase of development. Are they gonna be accessing it from Dinis or predominately Parker like they have been?

Mr. Levesque: I'll let Mr. Deslauriers speak to that.

Mr. Deslauriers: Yeah, so access predominantly will be spread out evenly --- and Parker.

Mr. Kapinos: How will we, I guess, manage or know that it's gonna be divided?

Mr. Deslauriers: You can call me. I'll give you my cell phone number. So, we keep track of the --- construction trucks --- take different alternative routes ---.

Mr. Kapinos: My other question is the Balsam Hill that is off of Ventura, at what point in time will that be opened up to Ventura.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:54
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Deslauriers: That's the first street we're starting.

Mr. Kapinos: Ok. Is there any way that the workers that will be accessing the next stage come in from Ventura onto Balsam ---?

Mr. Coelho: Excuse me, somebody's got their tv or something, if you could mute that. It's not very helpful to us. Great, thank you. Ok, go ahead, ask your question again.

Mr. Kapinos: Ok, so what I had said was is it possible to have access. You there?

Mr. Coelho: Yeah, I'm getting this feedback again.

Mr. Kapinos: You guys can hear me?

Mr. Coelho: Not well, whatever's making that noise, if you could mute it, that'd be great.

Mr. Kapinos: We good now?

Mr. Coelho: I think so.

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Chairman, I saw which phone was having the noise coming through. I was able to mute it from here. It's a number that showed up from Wilbraham. So, when the speaking is done I can unmute that phone.

Mr. Coelho: Great. Thanks Ray.

Mr. Kapinos: So, for me, is there any way that most of the access should come from Balsam Hill to limit one, the amount of traffic from Dinis predominantly more Parker Lane, 'cause I've seen more of the construction trucks coming up my way. Is there any way that the trucks could use Balsam Hill since now they would have access right from Ventura?

Mr. Deslauriers: So, because we're starting Balsam Hill first, the closest access is Ventura and Dinis. So, it would naturally happen anyhow.

Mr. Kapinos: Ok, I guess that's it for my questions.

Mr. Coelho: Ok thank you.

Mr. Kapinos: Thank you very much.

Mr. Coelho: You're welcome. Anybody else on the line have any more questions? Once again, anybody else on the line have any more questions for the developer?

Mr. Condon: I have a concern.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, state your name and address for the record please.

Mr. Condon: My name is Mark Condon, 42 Parker Lane.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR -2 P 3:51
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Coelho: Ok.

Mr. Condon: It's more of a concern than a question, and I would like to echo with what Mr. Kapinos said before regarding speed of traffic going up and down the road including construction vehicles. I'd mentioned to some interested parties to see if we could litigate, you know, the amount of traffic which is difficult, but at least the speed of traffic. Some of them are residents, but often it's the construction trucks. Now, I'm retired so I'm home. I'm skeptical of the traffic study, but that's something that's difficult to question, but I am home and see an incredible amount of increase in traffic during the day and the speed in which people travel the road is scary. I know Mr. Kapinos has young kids. I have neighbors that have young kids. I do not have any younger children at home but being out in the yard and outside a lot as a retired person, I've had opportunity to try and flag a construction vehicle down periodically and ask them to slow down. I don't know if, you know, there's any responsibility for the builder to have a conversation with those folks to just get them to slow down. It's really pretty scary and it's dangerous. So, it was simply a comment and then I'll get off the line and listen to an answer, thanks.

Mr. Deslauriers: So, Mark, it's Armand. Certainly, I address these guys as the situations come up and more importantly, it's a policing issue that's gonna solve it, so I'll be talking to the Ludlow Police to pay more attentive attention to the speed that's going up and down there.

Mr. Condon: Ok, thanks.

Mr. Levesque: Mr. Chairman just real quick. The other gentleman had asked for some speeds. I do have some information regarding that and the traffic study. So, on East Street, there are no speed limits posted, just so everybody's clear. So maybe that's an issue, so they could always look at that. The speed limit on Miller Street is 30 MPH, and it's posted each direction. --- and a speed limit of 30 MPH is posted in each direction on Ventura Street. The, on Ventura Street at least, the traffic 85th percentile speed has been listed northbound as 40 and southbound as 42, with a combined average of 41, so northbound 40 and southbound 42, so about approximately 10 miles over the speed limit.

Mr. Coelho: Ok.

Mr. Kapinos: So, this is Matthew Kapinos again, 71 Parker Lane. There's no mention of Parker Lane at all as far as that traffic study you just mentioned.

Mr. Levesque: No, there is. There just is no posted speed limit --- traffic report. They took into consideration Parker Lane being ---, you know what, maybe they did not. I was thinking East Street, sorry about that.

Mr. Kapinos: So, do we have speed limits for Parker Lane?

Mr. Coelho: Any place in this Town, we just passed something for any not posted speed limits 35, I think.

Mr. Kapinos: Yeah, that's unheard of in heavily trafficked area like us. It should be 30 or less --.

Mr. Coelho: Maybe it's 30, and again...

Mr. Stefancik: I think it's lower, like 20, 15-20.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 13 A 9:54
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Coelho: I know we just, we are not, I think it was Town Meeting, and anywhere it's unposted there is a speed limit that the police department is allowed to enforce, whether it's 25 or 35, I forget, and whether it's appropriate or not, I don't know either. But, it's the state mandated speed limit on non-posted areas. So, we did adopt that last year. And it is enforceable.

Mr. Kapinos: Well I get that, but my question is still unanswered with what was the clocked speed limit for Parker Lane? We have East Street. We have Miller. We have Ventura. We have no Parker Lane, no Dinis.

Mr. Levesque: Yeah, I don't know if I have that, but that is something that we don't control regardless. DPW controls, I'm sorry, police department --- it would have to be petitioned in order to change or enforce, obviously to the police department, any of these traffic issues. Certainly Mr. Deslauriers can communicate with the construction folks and you know, maybe through signage and/or a note to all his subcontractors and any building contractors, but as far as enforcement, maybe there's a conversation that needs to be had with the police department to let them know you're experiencing these issues. If you are, that'll probably put a quick stop to it.

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Phoenix.

Mr. Phoenix: I'm not sure if Ludlow actually made it more strict, but in Massachusetts in thickly settled the top speed limit is 30 by default if it's not posted.

Mr. Coelho: Yeah, I think...

Mr. Phoenix: So, we can't make the speed limit any higher than that, so whatever it is it has to be 30 or below.

Mr. Coelho: Right. ---

Mr. Phoenix: --- tougher than that.

Mr. Coelho: --- then developers don't enforce speed limits on streets that are already developed. But, I'm sure he can have a talk with his construction people and keep them under control a little bit better. That's ---.

Mr. Levesque: Absolutely, and the Safety Committee is pretty active in Ludlow ---. So, Penny from the Safety Committee who's very active and has been involved in a number of projects that we dealt with. That would certainly be someone to talk to and maybe something can be done through them as well.

Mr. Coelho: Ok.

Mr. Kapinos: So, this is still Matt Kapinos, if you don't mind me still speaking.

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Kapinos, if we're gonna be talking about traffic anymore I'm gonna have to move on.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:54
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Mr. Kapinos: Ok.

Mr. Coelho: So, this is a traffic related question?

Mr. Kapinos: It's just the fact that there's no reported Parker Lane and Dinis are the ones that are used for access. So, to not have a traffic study based on those two most commonly used streets is a little bit, you know, I don't really agree with ---.

Mr. Deslauriers: --- traffic study. Can I jump in? This is Armand. --- speed limit signs, but the traffic study covers Dinis and Parker.

Mr. Kapinos: It does? I'll have to get the report. So, is there a clocked speed? We have speeds for the other three and we haven't had any for Dinis and Parker.

Mr. Deslauriers: --- the DPW allows it --- Safety Committee.

Mr. Kapinos: No, my question was in regards to the traffic study for speeding, for speeds. We have clocked speeds for three others, but we don't for Dinis or Parker.

(multiple people talking)

Mr. Deslauriers: I believe they've clocked speed in all egresses.

Mr. Levesque: --- three intersections. I just want to confirm to see. I'm just looking for you sir. Just one second.

Mr. Coelho: Yeah, I agree. We're gonna have to move on from the traffic situation because unfortunately.

Mr. Levesque: Yeah, we don't control it regardless, but...

Mr. Coelho: Yeah.

Mr. Levesque: --- at those intersections. I have speeds for Ventura. I have sight distance, but based on the scope of that traffic study based on required. That was not part of it in terms of speed on those streets. I guess the, you know, they were thinking, probably on Ventura, they wanted to make sure that there was safety egress. That said, if there were an issue, that would be something you could certainly address through the DPW and probably the police department. It sounds like you're saying that folks are going a little bit faster than they should.

Mr. Kapinos: Yeah, I just wish that there was clocked speeds for the most used roads that access that development, that's all.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, duly noted.

Mr. Kapinos: Thank you.

Mr. Coelho: Ok, are there any other questions?

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:54
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Ms. Settembro: Yes, my name is Janet Settembro. I live at 284 Ventura Street. I am the house that faces Stormwater Parcel I, and Balsam Street there. I just want my neighbor asked all the questions and you answered them great. I just want to know what is the stormwater parcel gonna look like? ---

Mr. Levesque: Sure, absolutely. So, basically, --- it'll be grass, it'll be maintained.

Ms. Settembro: Ok.

Mr. Levesque: It's basically an earthen basin with an inlet pipe and an outlet control structure, and then a little bit of stone --- portion of it. But generally speaking, are you, you're down on Ventura, you said?

Ms. Settembro: Yes, I am, I face it. When I look out my front window I'm gonna have to look at it, you know?

Mr. Levesque: --- ok, so you'll see --- of grass. That's basically what you'll see.

Ms. Settembro: Ok. And what about the fence? Will there be a fence around it?

Mr. Coelho: Yes.

Mr. Levesque: Good question. Sometimes that comes up, and I'm not sure if it's required. John, did you put a fence around it? ---

Mr. Tomaszewski: --- Yeah Rob, that was one of the comments that Jim Goodreau had from DPW. Sorry, he has required that we have a chain link fence around the basin for safety purposes.

Ms. Settembro: Ok. So, the grass will be in front of the fence and after the fence? The fence will be in between the grass? Ok, so it will look nice?

Mr. Tomaszewski: It will be maintained. That is correct.

Ms. Settembro: Ok, what about mosquitos? Will that be, will they be spraying for mosquitos, if it's still water?

Mr. Levesque: Good question. So, these basins are designed to drain. Is that 72 hours, John?

Mr. Tomaszewski: Correct.

Mr. Levesque: Ok, so in a major storm event there will be a little bit of water in there for up to 72 hours. Beyond that, these will drain out and they're designed that certain times of the year there might be a little bit of water, like, for example, winter and you get a little bit of frozen

ground conditions, you might get a little bit of puddling in the bottom because there's ice and whatnot, but normal times of the year, these are designed to drain out and not pond and puddle.

Ms. Settembro: Ok. Alright, and where do they drain out? In the ground?

Mr. Levesque: They have a --- outlet, and they also recharge back into the ground.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:54
TOWN OF LUDLOW

Ms. Settembro: Ok, alright. Will it go under the road?

Mr. Levesque: Nope, this is actually designed to, these are designed to handle the roadway runoff from the proposed road. And the discharge points are basically back to the wetlands where they want the water to basically go.

Ms. Settembro: Ok.

Mr. Levesque: And that particular basin there is that culvert that does go under Ventura, so.

Ms. Settembro: ---

Mr. Levesque: That's ultimately where it will go if it discharges from the pipe, from the basin ---.

Ms. Settembro: So basically, it will go slower than what we have now because of all the catch basins that are ---.

Mr. Levesque: Yeah, it's arguably the same rate. It will not increase.

Ms. Settembro: Alright, ok, thank you very much, thank you.

Mr. Levesque: Thank you.

Mr. Coelho: Thank you. Anybody else? Once again, if you have a question state your name and address and ask it through me the Chairman. I'm not hearing any.

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Coelho: Mr. Phoenix.

Mr. Phoenix: I would make a **MOTION**, I believe there's a standard form one for this, but I would make a MOTION to approve the Definitive Subdivision Plan as submitted with the waivers that we've already taken into account with the condition that the applicant meet the criteria that were laid out in the letter from the Engineering Department and that those be taken and put onto the plan prior to the plan being signed.
SECOND Mr. Quiterio.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Coelho - yes.

Mr. Phoenix: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a **MOTION** to close the public hearing.
SECOND Ms. Houle.
5-0 in Favor.
Roll call vote: Mr. Quiterio – yes; Mr. Queiroga – yes; Mr. Phoenix – yes; Ms. Houle – yes; Mr. Coelho - yes.

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE
2021 APR 12 A 9:54
TOWN OF LUDLOW

The public hearing closed at 8:15 p.m.

APPROVED:

Kathleen J. Houle
Kathleen Houle, Secretary

su

Documents: Master Application/Definitive Subdivision Application (February 8, 2021); Request for waivers; Comments from Town Departments: Assessors, Board of Health, Safety Committee, Fire Department, DPW ; Traffic Impact Study – Hundred Acre Wood Development (December 2020); Appendix for Traffic Impact Study – Hundred Acre Wood Development (December 2020); Stormwater Drainage Report – Proposed Residential Subdivision – Hundred Acre Wood – Phase III Ludlow, MA (January 25, 2021); Definitive Subdivision Plans - Hundred Acre Wood – Phase III (January 25, 2021)

(Documents pertaining to this hearing are available for viewing in the Planning Board Office during regular business hours).