

February 24, 2021

Mr. Richard S. Novak, Chairman
Sherborn Zoning Board of Appeals
Town Hall
19 Washington Street
Sherborn, MA 01770

**Re: Coolidge Crossing
Comprehensive Permit Peer Review
84-86 Coolidge Street
Sherborn, Massachusetts
Responses to Comments**

Dear Mr. Novak:

Baystone Sherborn, LLC and Civil Design Group, LLC (CDG) are in receipt of the peer review memorandum prepared by Tetra Tech (TT), revised as of February 18, 2021, for the above-referenced project. Our responses are provided below in **bold** following each of TT's comments.

SITE PLAN

1. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant stated they spoke with the Fire Chief who found the design to be acceptable for emergency access. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide written confirmation from the Fire Chief regarding emergency access to the rear of the buildings. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval and has reached out to the Fire Chief requesting written confirmation of the same.

2. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant stated they spoke with the Fire Chief who found the design to be acceptable for emergency access. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide written confirmation from the Fire Chief regarding secondary emergency access to the site. Additionally, as noted in our original comment, the proposed emergency access is reliant on the access driveway to the Meadowbrook Commons development which is not under control of this Project. We recommend the Board include an additional Condition in the Comprehensive Permit that limits building permits until the proposed emergency access can be adequately provided. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval pertaining to design of the emergency access. The applicant is currently working with the Fire Chief to establish an acceptable temporary turnaround in the vicinity of Building 3 that would allow for the issuance of building permits until such time that the through access is completed.

3. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant stated the proposed plans are consistent with the language in the easement documentation and they are currently in the process of coordinating with the Utility to determine if any design changes are required. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide written confirmation from the Utility related to proposed work within the easement. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

4. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #3 above.

No response required.

5. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: This item was discussed in the hearing on January 28, 2021 and it appeared the town was amenable to decreasing the stall length to help reduce the overall impact of the project on the adjacent resource areas. We suggest all parking stalls adjacent to sidewalks remain at 20 feet to compensate for bumper overhang, all other spaces could be reduced to 18 feet. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant explore alternative parking space sizing to reduce impervious coverage for the Project. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

6. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Although the trail connection appears to be an alternative solution for most residents, we believe a sidewalk connection may be better suited to serve all residents of the development including those that may have disabilities where using a natural path may be difficult. This will drastically increase the walkability between the two projects as there are no sidewalks on Coolidge Street for pedestrians to use. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant explore a sidewalk connection to the Meadowbrook Commons site prior to preparation of Final Plans. Comment resolved.

It is our opinion that the emergency access connection between the two projects, which will be gated and therefore free of traffic, will serve as a pedestrian linkage in addition to the aforementioned trail network. We feel that a separate sidewalk would be redundant and would unnecessarily increase the proposed impervious area. As such, we respectfully request that the ZBA not include a condition requiring a separate sidewalk connection between the two projects.

UTILITY PLAN

7. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The connection locations have been shown on the Plans. Comment resolved.

No response required.

8. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Invert information has been provided on the Plans. Comment resolved.

No response required.

9. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Detailed stormwater mitigation has been shown on the Plans. Comment resolved.

No response required.

10. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Electrical connections to the garages has been provided on the Plans. Comment resolved.

No response required.

STORMWATER PLAN

11. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Detailed stormwater mitigation has been shown on the Plans. Comment resolved.

No response required.

SITE PLANTING PLAN (L1.0)

12. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant confirm their decision on a proposed well during preparation of the Final Plans and also provide written confirmation from the authorities supplying water to the site regarding use of the water supply for irrigation. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval and will make a determination as to the need for an irrigation well upon finalizing the details of the project's water supply. The use of municipal water for irrigation would be subject to any restrictions imposed by the municipality.

13. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant stated they are actively working with the adjacent Meadowbrook Commons developer to maintain an existing wooded buffer to help screen the two projects. Additionally, we agree with the Applicant that proposed planting on this Site would not achieve the necessary screening due to the grade differential between the two sites on the Meadowbrook Commons site would achieve more effective screening due to the grade differential between the two projects (Coolidge Crossing is lower in grade). Comment resolved.

No response required.

SITE LIGHTING PLAN (L1.1)

14. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: An updated lighting plan was not submitted for review. However, we do not anticipate lighting will be an issue on this Project. We recommend the Board include this item as a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide an updated lighting and photometric plan in the Final Plan submission. Comment resolved.

An updated lighting plan was submitted to the ZBA following our last hearing and was also forwarded to TT on February 19, 2021. We believe that the updated lighting plan addresses TT's previous comments.

15. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #3 above.

No response required.

AMENITY AREA LAYOUT AND MATERIALS PLAN (L2.0)

16. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant has supplied an updated landscape plan with areas of stormwater mitigation shown on the Plan, plantings do not conflict with proposed stormwater mitigation. Comment resolved.

No response required.

TYPICAL BUILDING PLANTING PLAN (L3.0)

17. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We agree with the assessment that landscaping at the rear of the buildings would not provide additional benefit. Comment resolved.

No response required.

STORMWATER

18. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Test pit logs have been provided but do not contain ground surface elevations which will be required to accurately correspond the information provided to the proposed basin elevations to determine their compliance with the Standards. We contacted the Engineer who has since sent a table of these elevations. However, this information should be included in the test pit logs in the Final Stormwater Report. Additionally, Basin CC-3 requires mounding analysis since the basin bottom is within four feet of the groundwater table. We recommend the Board include this item as a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide existing ground elevations on the test pit logs and provide groundwater mounding analysis for Basin CC-3 in the Final Stormwater Report. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval that the ground surface elevations be incorporated into the test pit logs. Furthermore, the final plans and

stormwater report will either be updated to provide four feet of separation to the water table or to include a mounding analysis for Basin CC-3.

19. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant has included areas of run-on from the adjacent properties in the pre-development analysis for the Project. The post-development watershed plan excludes portions of off-site area from the analysis which appear to be mitigated by a proposed swale which straddles the property line between the two sites as shown on Sheet 6 – Grading & Drainage Plan. The Applicant stated they have an agreement with the Meadowbrook Commons developer for proposed minor grading work shown on the abutting property. Comment resolved.

No response required.

20. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We believe the proposed design is consistent with the general setback requirements of the Handbook given the Applicant's design criteria provided for the impacted basins. Comment resolved.

No response required.

21. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #3 above.

No response required.

22. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant has included provisions in the O&M Plan for snow removal and transport off-site to approved disposal locations if required. Comment resolved.

No response required.

EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL

23. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide proof of coverage under the NPDES CGP prior to construction. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

24. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: It is our understanding that a Notice of Intent has been filed with the Sherborn Conservation Commission. Comment resolved.

No response required.

WATER

25. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant secure adequate water supply prior to receiving any building permits for the Project. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

26. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #25 above.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

SEWER

27. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant secure adequate sewer service prior to receiving any building permits for the Project. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

28. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide detailed pump station and force main design during Final Plan review. Comment resolved.

The applicant intends to commission a full design of the sewer pump station in conjunction with the ongoing municipal sewer connection approval process and anticipates that the approving authority will be review the pump station design details. This work will be completed prior to receiving a building permit.

29. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #27 above.

No response required.

TRAFFIC

30. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant revise the proposed grading prior to Final Plan review to ensure proper sight distance is achieved and accurately documented in the Plans. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

31. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant inventory trees which may impede sight lines and include those as well as sight triangles to the Final Plans. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

32. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved.

No response required.

33. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved.

No response required.

34. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: This item was discussed during the Hearing on January 28, 2021. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant coordinate with Sherborn DPW to provide off-site striping improvements to the intersection to delineate the two lanes prior to development of the Final Plans. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

35. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant coordinate with MWRTA regarding bus service and associated turnaround and bus shelter prior to development of the Final Plans. Comment resolved.

The applicant has no objection to TT's suggested condition of approval.

36. Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The entry sign has been relocated and sight line triangles will be added to the Final Plans. Comment resolved.

No response required.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (2/18/21)

37. The Project is reliant on fill to be able to develop the property and meet applicable stormwater standards. We recommend the Applicant include cut-fill analysis on the Plans to confirm magnitude of filling operation and potential issues during construction with truck traffic on Coolidge Street and the studied intersections. A Construction Management Plan should be developed to outline the impacts and associated mitigation to ensure the surrounding community is not negatively impacted by construction of the Project.

Noted, the site grades were set in order to meet the applicable stormwater standards in particular the requisite separation to the water table. The final set of design plans will be updated to include a cut-fill analysis as recommended by TT. The applicant would have no objection to a condition of approval requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan for the imported soil materials.

38. Approximately 150 feet of the entrance driveway, the clubhouse rooftop and Forebay CC-1 (and its catchment area) are proposed to discharge to the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). The Applicant shall coordinate with Sherborn DPW to determine if the connection is allowed or if other means to maintain stormwater on the site are required.

The stormwater runoff from this small section of the entrance drive is proposed to be treated and we believe meets all of the applicable MS4 standards. The applicant will reach out to the Sherborn DPW to discuss the proposed stormwater design in this area and confirm the same.

39. All basins are proposed in fill which is not recommended in the Handbook. However, the Applicant is proposing to remove unsuitable soils beneath the proposed basins and backfill with sand which should provide adequate conditions for groundwater recharge and overall functionality. The basins should function as analyzed given the procedures outlined in the details on the Plans.

No response required.

40. Basins CC-1 and CC-2 do not contain the necessary one-foot of freeboard from the 100-year event. Additionally, monitoring wells are required at all basin locations to monitor groundwater elevations beneath the basins.

Noted, the final set of design plans will be adjusted to provide one-foot of freeboard in the 100-year storm event.

41. We recommend the Applicant consider use of pervious pavers or other pervious surface for development of the proposed outdoor area hardscapes adjacent to the clubhouse. Reduction in impervious surfaces on a densely developed site such as this will help reduce impact of the site on the adjacent resource areas and their buffers.

While not required to meet the applicable stormwater standards, the applicant will explore using pervious pavers for the clubhouse grill area.

42. Foundation drains have not been included on the Plans. We expect drains may be required if buildings have basements that are in or near the water table. Foundation drains should not discharge to proposed stormwater infrastructure.

No foundation drains are proposed as all buildings will be slab on grade.

43. Maintenance of the dog park has not been included in the Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan (LTPPP). Animal waste can be a source of impairment to the adjacent resource area and proper inspection and maintenance procedures are warranted to reduce impact.

Noted, the applicant would have no objection to a condition of approval requiring the dog park to be added to the LTPPP. A bag/trash station will be provided at the dog park along with signage encouraging pet owners to pick up after their pet.

CIVIL DESIGN GROUP, LLC

ENGINEERING. LAND USE. PLANNING. PERMITTING.

21 High Street, Suite 207
North Andover, MA 01845
Tel 978.794.5400
www.cdengineering.com

We trust that the responses provided above and the enclosed plans sufficiently address the comments expressed by TT. Please feel free to contact our office should you have any questions or required further clarification.

Respectfully Submitted,
CIVIL DESIGN GROUP, LLC



Matthew A. Leidner, P.E.
Principal