

Jeanne Guthrie

From: jeanne.guthrie@sherbornma.org
Subject: FW: Draft Responses to TetraTech Comments on Washington Lot 3

From: Bob Murchison <bob.murchison@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 3:58 PM
To: Zach McBride <zach.mcbride@sherbornma.org>; 'Zachary McBride' <zfdmcbride@gmail.com>
Cc: 'Bouley, Steven' <Steven.Bouley@tetrattech.com>; Jeanne Guthrie <jeanne.guthrie@sherbornma.org>; Jeremy Marsette <jmarsette@sherbornma.org>; 'Bert Corey' <bcorey@dgtassociates.com>; 'Kevin Riopelle' <KRiopelle@dgtassociates.com>
Subject: Draft Responses to TetraTech Comments on Washington Lot 3

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Zach,

We received TetraTech's comments yesterday and have put together some draft replies for our discussion tonight (see below in green).

We anticipate getting a revised site plan to the ZBA after digesting the meeting tonight.

Thanks,

Bob

A. SITE DESIGN

The Site Plans provide a good introduction to the scope of the Project and its various components. The following specific comments are offered to identify areas where additional information is required, or changes are requested to address questions or support further review.

A.1. The proposed driveway grade at the intersection of the development driveway with Washington Street is approximately 6.5% for the first 150 feet. We recommend the Applicant reduce the slope to meet the 3% required in the Sherborn Planning Board's subdivision regulations. This will provide a "relatively level" area for cars to safely maneuver in inclement weather conditions.

- **We are pushing back on this suggestion from TetraTech. The current design provides 30' of less than 2% grade at Washington Street which meets the Sherborn Driveway Design Standard. We do not think it is necessary or appropriate to impose Subdivision**

Regulations on the development of two duplexes. The requested change would also require the house elevation to move 3' lower which is problematic. Also, note that the driveway was designed in the front of the houses to avoid adding substantial asphalt in the BVW buffer zone.

A.2. We recommend guardrail or other acceptable protection along the steeper section of the driveway to protect vehicles from adjacent slopes.

- **Agreed. We propose using 3' boulders in areas needing protection.**

A.3. The proposed driveway is 15 feet wide where minimum required by NFPA is 20 feet. The Applicant shall confirm if they have reviewed the plan with the Sherborn Fire Department (SFD) for access and emergency response.

- **Agreed. We are in communication with SFD Chief Ward and will widen the driveway if he deems it necessary.**

A.4. The Applicant should provide sight distance at the proposed intersection of the development driveway and Washington Street and include any vegetation management to ensure safe access/egress at the Project driveway.

- **Agreed. We will provide it on the revised site plan.**

A.5. We recommend the Applicant show the zoning setbacks on the Plans for reference during the review process.

- **The Comprehensive Permit Layout Plan (page 5 of the PDF) has a dotted line depicting the 60' front, 40' side and 30' rear setback lines. We are comfortably in compliance with the setbacks in the zoning by-law and are not seeking a variance for them.**

A.6. The Applicant should include electric, telecom and gas utilities on the Plans if proposed. We could not locate this linework on the Plans. We recommend all utilities be located underground.

- **Agreed. We will add electric and telecom (no gas) to the revised site plan.**

A.7. The applicant should provide details on proposed trash and mail service for the Project.

- **Mail (and packages) will be delivered to the duplex buildings. Trash removal will be private (no town pick-up) at the homes.**

A.8. We recommend the Applicant show a limit of tree clearing line on the Plans.

- **Agreed. We will provide the limit of clearing on the revised site plan.**

A.9. The Applicant should provide a cut/fill analysis on the Plans to confirm extent of earthwork proposed for the Project. A construction management plan (CMP) is also recommended.

- **Agreed. We will provide it on the revised site plan.**

A.10. Project scope is proposed within jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (WPA). Permitting with the Sherborn Conservation Commission is expected.

- **Agreed.**

A.11. Grading work is proposed within 100 feet of a vernal pool. The 100-foot buffer from a vernal pool is considered part of the vernal pool resource area under local regulations. The Applicant has requested a waiver from the local wetland's bylaw and presumably by extension, the wetland regulations.

- **Agreed. Note that the town bylaw does not specifically regulate a vernal pool differently from a BVW.**

A.12. The Applicant is proposing modifications to an existing trail easement. The Applicant shall confirm if modifications are allowed and if any additional parties are required to approve the modification.

- **Well litigated MA case law allows a property owner to move the location of these types of easements. As a practical matter, the slightly modified location of the trail (no clearing required) will make the trail more comfortable and natural to the users.**

B. STORMWATER

The Project scope includes development of four (4) units of housing clustered on approximately 4.63± acres of land. Stormwater runoff generated by the Project is proposed to discharge to a stone infiltration trench, subsurface roof runoff infiltration chambers and an at-grade rain garden. As noted, the Project includes development of four units of multifamily housing in two duplexes and does not appear to discharge to a critical area. This condition does not require compliance with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MA DEP) Stormwater Management Standards (Standards) and Stormwater Handbook (Handbook). We have provided comments below related to good engineering practice as it relates to stormwater scope for the Project.

B.1 Proposed Recharger #1 and the proposed rain garden are within 100 feet of the proposed private well. Although not required, we recommend the Applicant maintain compliance with MA DEP Handbook related to this item to protect water quality at the proposed private well.

- **As TetraTech noted the 100" setback is not applicable to this small project. However, we should be able to move the recharger #1 to the west (maintaining required distance to the septic field). Then moving the well also somewhat to the west, should leave the well about 75' from the rain garden and the recharger. This minor relocation of the well will leave it compliant with the Sherborn BOH 150' setback to the septic field. If this agreeable, we will make the change on the revised site plan.**

B.2 We recommend test pits be conducted at each of the proposed infiltration best management practices (BMP's) to confirm soil texture and elevation of estimated seasonal high groundwater (ESHGW) at each BMP location.

- **While we have good information on the soil in the area (and test holes nearby), we are open to a condition of testing at the time of construction.**

B.3 We recommend the Applicant include a manhole with a sump and hood downstream of the proposed trench drain to facilitate treatment of paved runoff and access for proper maintenance prior to discharge to the proposed Rain garden.

- **Agreed. We will make the change on the revised site plan.**

B.4 The Project appears to meet the requirements for coverage under the US EPA NPDES General Permit for Discharges from Construction Activities (CGP). We recommend a Condition requiring the Applicant provide proof of coverage under the NPDES CGP and provide a copy of the approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to construction.

- **Agreed.**