STAMSKI AND MCNARY, INC.
1000 Main Street
Acton, Massachusetts 01720
(978) 263-8585
FAX (978) 263-9883

JOSEPH MARCH, P.E., P.L.S.
GEORGE DIMAKARAKOS, P.E.

September 1, 2017

Town of Boxborough
Adam L. Duchesneau, AICP Town Planner
29 Middle Road
Boxborough, Massachusetts 01719

RE: **Site Plan Revision #2**
Site Plan Approval – **Plan Revision dated August 30, 2017**
Two-family dwellings, reserved exclusively for elderly occupancy
Boxborough Town Center, LLC
700, 750 & 800 Massachusetts Avenue

Dear Mr. Duchesneau,

The purpose of this letter is to address the comments outlined in the Places Associates, Inc. – Peer Review Letter dated August 9, 2017 along with the remaining items (No. 13 thru No. 27) outlined in the Green International Affiliates – Peer Review Letter dated April 28, 2017. In addition clarification labels, notes and construction details have been added to the plan set.

Submittal Items:

1. Stamski and McNary, Inc. Response Letter Dated September 1, 2017.
2. Stormwater Management Report, Enclave at Boxborough, prepared by Stamski and McNary Inc., dated December 22, 2016, revised June 23, 2017 (Revised August 31, 2017).
3. Site Plan for Enclave at Boxborough (sheets 1-30), prepared by Stamski and McNary Inc., dated December 22, 2016, revised June 22, 2017, revised August 30, 2017.
4. Landscape Plan, Enclave at Boxborough sheets 1-8, prepared by ESE Consultants Inc., dated 12-22-16, revised 6/21/17, revised September 1, 2017.
5. Fire Truck Turning Plan (2 Sheets), prepared by Stamski and McNary, Inc., dated August 29, 2017.

Additional plan updates:

a. Plan view updated to reflect locations of underground electric service to opposite side of road, with transformer and junction box per Littleton Electric Light Department. Gas main, and individual services to dwellings updated accordingly.
b. Minor adjustment to pavement radii at entrance and emergency access to Stow Road.
c. Provided additional labels, notes and details to clarify proposed design.

SMI - Responses to the Places August 9, 2017 review letter

Zoning- based on the 2012 By-law:

Comment No. 4. ***Note 2 on sheet 27 should be revised to remove the word 'generally'..***

Response: The word "generally" has been removed from note.

Site Plan Regulations:

Comment No. 11. ***Details should be added to the plans for all signs and posts, i.e. stop signs, dead-end sign, etc. (Site 3.1-6). The response stated that they are on the Landscape plans. As the site contractor is generally responsible for the MUTCD signs, it is recommended that the signage for the two emergency access connections be included in the layout plans.***

Response: Labels have been added to the indicate the locations of the MUTCD signage on the Layout and Utilities Plan (Sheets 11, 13 & 15) for the crosswalks, stop signs, street signs and emergency access only signs. Note 10. on sheet 11 provides additional requirements per most recent regulations and amendments. Also see Note 15 on Sheet 27.

Comment No. ***12. It is not clear as to whether the proponent will create exterior Exclusive Use Areas (EUA), if so it is recommended that areas that the location of any proposed open space should be added to the plan. (Site 3.1-8)***

Response: EUA's will not be created.

Comment No. 16. ***Solid waste storage (dumpster) and a loading area have not been provided at the Clubhouse building. These areas will require screening.(Site 4.4-3)***

Response: The Builder has indicated that the trash will be removed regularly from the clubhouse by a cleaning service. Based on the operation of similar buildings constructed by Toll Brothers within Massachusetts, the typical uses associated with a clubhouse house will not require the need for a designated dumpster or loading area.

Stormwater:

Comment No. 25. ***The site relies on roof drainage being directed to recharge areas or specific SMA, implying that there is a roof drain collection system tied into gutters. No details of the collection system were found in the plan set. It is recommended that the Board include in their decision a requirement for gutters on the buildings.***

Response: All Buildings will be provided with gutters and downspouts that will connect to the stormwater management system. Labels have been added to each Building on the Layout & Utilities Plan (Sheets 11-15) indicating direction of connection tie-in of perimeter roof drain line that will collect runoff from the downspouts.

Comment No. 31. ***A proposed drainpipe appears to pass through the roof recharge system (RD2) on sheet 16. Based on the elevations provided it appears the pipe will be in conflict with the Stormtech Chambers. Revised plans show a greater spacing but lack detail for the construction of this recharge system to match the drainage calculations. Additional detail has been provided. The greater separation has been provided to permit overflow pipe from conflicting with recharge area. To be conservative, the additional storage and recharge has not included in the report.***

Response: Additional detail and labels have been provided to clarify RD2 on Detail (Sheet 25) and Profile (STA 8+55 on Sheet 16). Drain pipe travels thru at bottom of stone elevation and connection pipes from roof drain and overflow are located at the top stub locations f chambers to avoid conflict. Drainage Calculations have also been clarified.

Additional Comments from the June 2017 revision:

Comment No. 1 ***The plans do not indicate how the various SMA will be accessed for maintenance which is limited with the steep grades, use of retaining walls and landscaping. Of particular concern is SMA 4, SMA 6 and SMA 8. Contours have been adjusted to clarify access locations for the proposed stormwater basins.***

Response: Maintenance Access Paths have been added to the Site Development Plan (Sheets 5-9). Access to SMA – 1, 2, 3 & 4 will be from Drive A (STA 26+40, 21+00, 18+00, 13+80 & 6+75); SMA-8 from Stow Road Emergency Access STA 7+30). Access to SMA-6 only requires typical maintenance similar to surrounding landscape areas, so a dedicated access is not necessary since landscape equipment will travel across lawn areas to cut and remove any accumulated debris.

Comment No. 2 ***SMA 7 is shown with an outline which is not reflective of the contours shown on the grading plan. The detail sheet shows this area with chambers which are reflective of the outline. Please clarify which one is correct. If a basin, the outlet structure needs to be detailed.***

Response: The contours shown above the chamber outline of SMA-7 is the sediment forebay. The site layout allows us to provide the forebay which will accept the first flush of runoff from the road from the adjusted diversion manhole. The manhole will then

divert excess runoff into the subsurface chambers below. The manifold and outlet structure for SMA-7 have been provided on the Plan (Sheet 9); the Layout (Sheet 15); the Profile (Sheet 19) and Detail (Sheet 25). Drainage Calculations are updated.

Comment No. 3 ***The plan and profile sheets show multiple areas where the structures are very close together, both horizontally and vertically. As the plans use a typical symbol for drainage and other utility structures, it is recommended that the engineer run a check using the outside diameter of all structures to assure there is sufficient separation to allow the construction and particularly a plate compactor for pipe bedding.***

Response: Minor adjustments have been made where necessary. Water at Drive A (STA 0+95) will be installed below drain. DMH 11/SMH 9 at Drive A (STA 6+60) are on opposite sides of the road in plan view so they will be fine. FD17 has been adjusted away from SMH16 along Drive B (STA 1+71). Additional minor adjustments are also conducted in field based on site conditions.

a. ***Drive A, Sta 0+95 – cross culvert and water crossing. It is suggested that water purposely be located below the drain or specified that the drainage be installed prior to water to avoid a potential conflict.***
b. ***Drive A, DMH 11/SMH 9 and DMH 16/SMH 16 – check separations.***

Comment No. 4 ***The footing drains (FD) are deep in areas. While most of these deep sections are in fill, it is recommended that where in natural material, anti-seep collars be provided to control ground water migration.***

Response: Anti-seep locations have been indicated on Plan and Profiles.

Comment No. 5 ***Test hole 16-38 in SMA 8 shows a loamy sand (firm) from 12-48". Since the design of SMA 8 utilizes the highest recharge rate (8.27) it is recommended that this restrictive layer be removed below the bottom of this basin.***

Response: Restrictive layer will be removed.

Comment No. 6 ***There is an inconsistency between the drainage calculations and the outlet details shown on sheet 25:***

a. ***Inverts of the outlet pipes for SMA1, SMA2, SMA 3, SMA 4 are not consistent***
b. ***Calculations identify a weir at the elevation of the top of the structure. Some indicate an 8' width, others 12' width. We believe that this implies that 2 or 3 sides of the structure are open to the water surface in the basin – please clarify the details and make consistent with grading and calculations.***

Response: The Outlet Details (Sheet 25) and the drainage Calculations have been clarified relative to inverts, weir elevations and widths, plans have been adjusted accordingly.

Comment No. 7 ***Drywell #2 dimensions on the detail sheet do not match the calculations (see previous comment 31). Dimensions have been clarified.***

Response: Detail (Sheet 25) and Drainage Calculations have been clarified with additional detail and notes.

Comment No. 8 ***The grate capacity analysis in the drainage calcs indicates that 3 catchbasins shall be double grates. We could not find any indication on the plans for a double grate on CTB 14, 15, and 24.***

Response: "Double Grate" Labels have been added to the Profile (CB 24 - Sheet 19; STA 5+66) and (CB 14 & CB 15 - Sheet 21; STA 0+25 to compliment double grate symbols shown within structures on all Plan Views.

Comment No. 9 ***Vortsentry sizing is in the calculations and a detail on the plan set but we could not find where the use of them is proposed.***

Response: The Vortsentry is labeled as Contech. It is proposed to be installed along the existing drain line between DMH 'B' and Outfall 'B' (Sheet 22; STA 5+50 – 60' to the Right) in our site within "Drainage Easement A" associated with Sheriffs Meadow driveway drainage system.

Landscape Plan Comments: **(Provided by ESE Consultants)**

Comment No. 33 ***Screening to adjacent properties. The revised plans depict increased screening to the abutters principally in the form of a privacy fence. We identified three significant areas in our original comment. Some still remain:***

a. The outside play areas to the west of the club house are 20' (bocce court) and 30' (Pickle court) off of the westerly property line. This area has been provided with extensive landscape screening; however, due to the proximity to the abutter and the active nature of the proposed activities (pickle and bocce) we recommend that the privacy fence also be added to this area. No fencing screening or buffering to the immediate neighbor is proposed. The limit of clearing line (clouded tree line) depicts clearing up to the property line in this area.

Response: Privacy fence is shown along the property line, extending from the pickle ball court to the end of the bocce court.

b. To the west of units 8-10 (Private Drive C) the limit of clearing has been moved ~ 20' off the common property line and a six foot tall privacy fence is proposed at the edge of lawn. We agree that this is an improvement to protect the privacy of the abutters; however, no landscape plantings are proposed in the rear of these units to aid in noise reduction. We recommend that some plantings be placed in the rear yards to decrease noise travel and impacts.

Response: Additional landscape plantings have been provided. Also please note that the elevation difference from the proposed units to the property line. Units 8-10 sit significantly lower than the abutting property, which in of itself, will greatly reduce any noise caused by typical occupants of an age-qualified home.

c. To the south and east of units 36-31, a6' tall privacy fence has been added in this area and some landscaping placed between the fence and abutters. These plantings should extend behind the proposed unit 35 and continue to the east to the rear of unit 32 to enhance privacy and noise reduction to the abutters in this area.

Response: Additional landscape plantings have been extended along the rear of units.

Comment No. 34 ***Landscape Trees/Lawn Areas: The number of lawn and landscape trees has been increased; however there are still large areas of the project that are devoid of any trees.***

a. See the areas behind units 17, 16, 15 and 18. While much of this area is comprised of drainage basins, there are areas that can support trees without affecting the basins.

Response: Additional plantings have been provided so as the root systems from any new proposed plantings will not affect the integrity of the proposed retaining walls located in the areas noted above.

b. ***Areas behind 19 to 22 should have some shade producing trees to break up the space and address the large open area created by the drainage systems.***

Response: See same response as noted above in 34.a.

c. ***A large number of trees and shrubs are located behind units 23 to 25 to create screening of the effluent disposal area. Generally these areas are large, level grassed areas that can be used for active recreation. The area behind the effluent disposal area is woods with no abutters nearby making this screening not necessary for abutter protection. They may want to screen this area for the benefit of the unit owners; however, we believe that these plantings can be best used elsewhere on the project.***

Response: This comment is in contradiction to comments 34.a and 34.b with regards to leaving large open areas devoid of trees. We would also request the reviewer to note the age demographic that will be occupying this community and the likelihood that the occupants would use this area for active recreation in lieu of the provided clubhouse and amenity. The applicant will continue to propose landscape plantings in this area, however the species and locations have been revised accordingly to help prevent any potential negative impact from proposed trees in this area.

In addition, it is not appropriate to plant sugar maples (or any large trees) within the potential spread of the roots for the tree, as they may disturb the leaching area. The plan depicts sugar maples and blue spruce within 10' of the edge of the leaching area. As proposed, the likelihood of these trees impacting the leaching area is more than probable.

See response above.

d. ***There are two areas (indicated by cloud lines) that are proposed to be outside the limit of clearing. These are located to the west of unit 41 and in the center of the loop for private drive B. We recommend that the plans be amended to note, "Area of no clearing, woodlands to be preserved". It is our belief that the line type indication is not sufficient to ensure the protection of these areas.***

Response: Text noting the preservation of woodlands in the areas noted above have been added to the plans.

Comment No. 35 ***Parking Lot Planting. They have modified the parking lot planting to address our comment of the use of one type of species and have added "Bowhall Maple" a variety of red maple to the plantings. As noted below, item 37, the new plantings rely on a large number of maples for street trees. The Bowhall Maple is a narrow form of red maple that does not get wider than 15'. The other tree proposed in this area is a "Shademaster Thornless Honey Locust", this tree becomes almost as wide***

as tall. Our comment is both aesthetic and practical: these shapes are not compatible and they seem to now be over-using maples-site wide.

Response: The Bowhall Maple has been replaced with Ulmus Americana 'Princeton', a variety of Elm that is not susceptible to DED. The proposed Elm and Honey Locust trees will complement each other.

Comment No. 36 ***Town Center District (4.4, 5), requires that the use of bituminous concrete be minimized and alternate paving materials be used.***

a. ***Civil plans (Sheet 26 of 30) indicate that most sidewalks will be bituminous concrete. The sidewalk near to the club house will be cast-in-place concrete with vertical granite curb.***

b. ***They have detailed the planted island and entry radius to be granite, as requested.***

c. ***No details for crosswalks are provided. Crosswalks are depicted on both the civil and landscape plan but no detail is provided to indicate if they are painted only or if a textured/colored pavement is proposed. We recommend textured/colored pavement as the spacing between the crosswalks is widely spaced. The enhance recognition of a texturized/colored sidewalk by seniors would be of a benefit to drivers and pedestrians alike.***

Response: Crosswalks will be textured/colored.

d. ***Belgian Block Curbing: The applicant has noted that they have added a detail to the plans for the use of Belgian Block Curb (which is granite cobbles set on end in a bed of cast-in-place concrete). The roadway cross-section detail note that this type of curbing can be substituted for cape cod curbing. No indications of where these substitutions and use are indicated on the drawings.***

Response: The Applicant will utilize the block primarily around the dwelling units at a minimum. The use of cape cod berm is being reserved as the base option.

e. ***Landscape Plan 4 of 6 indicates a "cobble strip" at both ends of access easement C (leading to Stow Road). No detail on the construction of the cobble strip is provided in the civil or landscape plans.***

Response: Detail has been added.

Comment No. 37 ***Street trees:***

a. ***Species:***

1. ***Our original comment on the landscape included a critique of the species proposed. They have modified the species to include five varieties of maple: Armstrong Red Maple, Bowhall Red Maple, October Glory Red Maple, Redpointe and Sugar Maple. While all are indigenous, they comprise a significant number of the tree species. We recommend reducing the***

predominance of maples and add other species with similar characteristics species to increase diversity. .

Response: The landscape selection for street trees and buffer trees has been revised to remove any potential for dominance by one species. Regarding street trees, there is now only one variety of Maple proposed. Regarding the buffer tree selection, we have reduced the number of proposed Sugar Maples and introduced White Oak to better increase diversity.

2. Black Gum (Nyssa sylvatica) This is an unusual choice for a street tree, though it is both indigenous and hardy in this environment. This tree is not usually used as a street tree due to the fact that the lower branches tend to droop down, creating an impediment if located next to a sidewalk and not pruned. If this plant is to be used, it should be noted that the lower branches should be pruned-off, so they do not extend into walking paths or travelled ways.

Response: The Black Gum is often used successfully as a street tree, however a note has been added to specify that any branches lower than 6' at install shall be pruned.

b. Spacing/Placement:

1. Our previous comment was that insufficient street trees were provided. Noting a total of 114 trees were proposed. The current number is 124. Again, given that the area of development will essentially require a clear cut of the developed area (with two small exceptions); we believe that a greater number of street trees should be provided. Overall spacing should average accommodate the subdivision standards, Section 5, E.:
"Street trees shall generally be spaced at intervals of approximately 50 feet on center, but no closer than 35 feet. If approved by the Board, trees may be clustered to provide a more natural appearance. If clustered, the total number of trees required shall be the equivalent of a 50-foot spacing along the entire roadway."

2. We do not believe that the plan addresses the requirements of 4.4 2).

Response: The applicant believes they have satisfied the requirement of 4.4.2 which states that street trees shall be planted on each side of public and private ways, driveways, etc. The town ordinance does not include a calculation used to determine the number of required street trees, only recommended spacing. The only calculation included in the ordinance references a cluster condition for street trees which requires "the total number of trees required shall be the equivalent of a 50-foot spacing along the entire roadway". Under this condition, the applicant can only assume the following calculation; 4,500 LF of Road/ 50'-Street Tree Spacing = 90 Required Trees. The plans have been revised to attempt to increase the number of street trees up to 124 Trees, exclusive of the clubhouse parking lot trees.

3. Street Trees depicted to the north of unit 45 raise concerns about interference with the roadway sight distances.

Response: The applicant acknowledges this comment, however to best conform to Section 4.4.2, the street trees proposed to the North of unit 45 will remain.

Comment No. 40 ***Boxwood Blight is a fungal issue with the Boxwoods. It is recommended that an alternative plant species be specified as the boxwood is used extensively (80 plants) in this design (This comment remains).***

Response: The applicant would note to the reviewer that only (6) Boxwoods are specified in this design, which does not constitute a monoculture or an extensive use.

Comment No. 42 ***The applicant should consider the development of walking paths and/or trails. We would anticipate that some of the residents would want to walk to the club house and may make a trail through the woods as opposed to walking on the sidewalks. The development of casual walking paths along the wood line from the easterly portion of the site (drive b) to the clubhouse and Drive A should be considered.(This comment remains).***

The applicant responded, "The development of walking trails within site typically occur naturally by the residents following development."

It is again our position that walking paths connecting the various clusters created by this development should be connected via walking paths through open space to the clubhouse and other general amenities of the site. This is a senior housing development, not a residential subdivision with children exploring the woods or making short-cuts to bus stops, etc.. The residents of an up-scale development such as this should not be forced to walk through brambles of brush, mud, tick laden vegetation, poison ivy, wetlands etc. to forge casual walking paths. It is very typical for the developer to provide stone dust or wood chip paths through the wooded and open areas. These types of paths encourage outdoor use, birdwatching. The informal paths increases the potential disturbance of wetlands, potential for increase erosion and other unintended/undesirable impacts.

Response: The installation of walking paths through the woodland from the Eastern portion of the site is desirable however impractical. Regardless of material, any path would need to be cleared and properly graded, creating additional wetland permitting and unnecessary disturbance and tree clearing, not to mention an additional maintenance issue for the development's HOA. Residents are encouraged to use the proposed sidewalk system to access the clubhouse and amenity area if they chose not to drive.

Comment No. 43 ***We routinely require on our projects that an arborist to review the remaining trees after clearing operations to determine if additional dead, diseased, damaged or leaning trees should be trimmed or removed. We recommend the Board consider such a requirement. (This comment remains).***

We also note that since they are proposing treed areas to remain, these too should be reviewed by the arborist to ensure that they are viable areas and not a grouping of unsuitable trees or habitat areas.

Response: The applicant acknowledges this comment.

Comment No. 44 ***We recommended that a Landscape Maintenance Guide be provided to the Homeowner's. They have agreed to this recommendation. We suggest that the Planning Board require that they receive a copy of this document to ensure good practices are recommended and invasive species are not allowed to be planted.***

Response: The applicant acknowledges this comment.

Comment No. 45 ***An Irrigation system is proposed, see Landscape Note no. 17. Its design is to be developed after the approval of the project. It is our recommendation that this plan be submitted to the Board for the files. It is also noted that it will be supplied from the proposed on-site water supply. This connection should be made with the appropriate backflow preventers and we recommend the use of a rain sensor for water conservation. NABOH may have other comments regarding the relative to the use of a potable water supply for irrigation.***

Response: The applicant acknowledges this comment.

Additional Landscape Comments from the June 2017 revision:

Comment No. 1 ***Landscape Plan Graphics: The landscape plan graphics vary from those used industry-wide. The proposed plantings are indicated at the size they will be planted, not at a mature sizing (industry standard). There are a variety of plants that grow to large sizes that are depicted as 10-15' in diameter and the plant spacing accommodates this immature sizing. The result is that many of these plantings will become overgrown from being planted far too close to one another.***

By means of example, Landscape Plan 1 of 9, along Massachusetts Avenue depicts two sugar maples to be 12' apart, typical spacing is 30-50' apart. When mature a sugar maple is fully grown they can reach heights of 70'-80' feet with a spread of 30'-60'. Similarly, White Pine is proposed in this planting group. They are depicted as being 10' in diameter and spaced 10' apart. These plants also grow to 60'-80' ht and have spreads of 40'+.

We recommend that the plant depiction and spacing be updated to reflect reasonable spacings.

Response: The applicant acknowledges this comment and has adjusted the sizing and spacing of all plant symbols as requested. The applicant trusts that the reviewer

is aware that this increase in size and spacing will result in a reduction of proposed buffer plant material

Comment No. 2 ***Landscape Plan sheet 4 of 9, depicts landscaping interior to a drainage basin. The location of the landscaping obstructs access to the basin.***

Response: The proposed plantings have been adjusted as requested.

Comment No. 3 ***Landscape Plan sheet 8 of 9, has been modified to include many of our previous comments but no notation as to the amount or depth of loam to be used in seeded, sodded or other non-planting beds has been provided. We recommend a minimum of 4" of loam in low maintenance, non-landscaped areas. We recommend a minimum of 6" of loam in landscaped areas.***

Response: Included is a note specifying a minimum 4" of loam in non-landscaped areas and 6" of loam in landscaped areas.

Site Lighting:

Comment No. 46 ***A total of six light posts are proposed for the project. The posts are proposed as 10' tall with a shielded lantern configuration fixture. This light will not have an extensive light "throw" and will not illuminate a large area. The Board should review if they believe that amount of lighting is sufficient. (This comment remains).***

Response: The Builder will work with Board and Town Planner.

Additional Landscape Comments from the June 2017 revision:

Comment No. 1 ***The applicant submitted a lighting plan prepared by Phillips Lighting. It demonstrates how little on-site lighting is proposed for this development. Many areas are noted as having no footcandles of light except directly in the area of the proposed fixture.***

Response: The Builder will work with Board and Town Planner.

Additional Comments:

Comment No. 1 ***The sight distance at the curve of Drive B, adjacent to the emergency access to Sherriff's Meadow has a combination of a vertical sag curve (low point) and a relatively sharp (100' radius) horizontal curve. When viewed in combination with the retaining wall proposed by Unit 45 and the proposed street trees, the stopping sight distance is very limited. It is also noted that the Landscape plan indicates that there will be a fence on the wall, to be determined later.***

Stopping sight distance is a 3.25' driver's eye height viewing a 6" high object in the roadway. This sight distance will be further limited by snowbanks. We recommend that this area be critically reviewed with the full wall details and the sight distance maximized to the extent practicable. It is recommended that the applicant's traffic engineer review to see if any additional measures are needed to create safe sight distances at this corner.

Response: Travel speeds within the project will be less than typical roadways when traveling close to the dwellings thus requiring less stopping distance. We believe the current layout allows for a site distance up to 15-20 mph along the inside curve which takes into account driveway grade at 4.5%. We believe this to be acceptable for the use.

Comment No. 2 ***Several vertical curves will create very flat areas approaching the low points which create the potential for puddles that miss the drainage structures. (pavers typically will not guarantee no puddles on grades less than 1%). It is recommended that the curve on Drive A 6+25 be shortened or the CB elevations lowered to minimize length with less than 1% and that the vertical curve on Access B 4+80 be eliminated.***

Response: CB Rim Elevations have been lowered by two-inches for CB 17 & CB 18 (Sheet 16) and also for Double Grate CB 24 (Sheet 19).

Comment No. 3 ***What is the building by unit 25B? If this is related to the septic system, it is recommended that there is a parking space/pull off area so that the tanks can be serviced without impacting the road access. It is also noted that there is a large tank in close proximity to the drainage system which will require careful coordination during construction.***

Response: The Waste Water Treatment Facility, to be designed by others, will be located at this location. Parking spaces have been added.

Comment No. 4 ***The plans show tree plantings within 10' of the septic system leaching area. This office is very concerned that the roots could impact the septic and that the plantings also will impact the ability to maintain the leaching area. It is recommended that the areas directly adjacent to the septic leaching field remain as a meadow. It is also recommended that any tree plantings be offset a minimum of 5' from any underground sewer or drainage lines for installation.***

Response: See revised Landscape Plan.

Additional Comments:

Comment No. 1 ***The sight distance at the curve of Drive B, adjacent to the emergency access to Sherriff's Meadow has a combination of a vertical sag curve (low point) and a relatively sharp (100' radius) horizontal curve. When viewed in combination with the retaining wall proposed by Unit 45 and the proposed street trees, the stopping sight distance is very limited. It is also noted that the Landscape plan indicates that there will be a fence on the wall, to be determined later.***

Stopping sight distance is a 3.25' driver's eye height viewing a 6" high object in the roadway. This sight distance will be further limited by snowbanks. We recommend that this area be critically reviewed with the full wall details and the sight distance maximized to the extent practicable. It is recommended that the applicant's traffic engineer review to see if any additional measures are needed to create safe sight distances at this corner.

Response: The travel speeds within the project will be less than typical roadways when traveling close to the dwellings thus requiring less stopping distances.

Comment No. 2 ***Several vertical curves will create very flat areas approaching the low points which create the potential for puddles that miss the drainage structures. (pavers typically will not guarantee no puddles on grades less than 1%). It is recommended that the curve on Drive A 6+25 be shortened or the CB elevations lowered to minimize length with less than 1% and that the vertical curve on Access B 4+80 be eliminated.***

Response: CB Rim Elevations have been lowered by two-inches for CB 17 & CB 18 (Sheet 16) and also for Double Grate CB 24 (Sheet 19).

Comment No. 3 ***What is the building by unit 25B? If this is related to the septic system, it is recommended that there is a parking space/pull off area so that the tanks can be serviced without impacting the road access. It is also noted that there is a large tank in close proximity to the drainage system which will require careful coordination during construction.***

Response: The Waste Water Treatment Facility, to be designed by others, will be located at this location. Parking spaces have been added.

Comment No. 4 ***The plans show tree plantings within 10' of the septic system leaching area. This office is very concerned that the roots could impact the septic and that the plantings also will impact the ability to maintain the leaching area. It is recommended that the areas directly adjacent to the septic leaching field remain as a meadow. It is also recommended that any tree plantings be offset a minimum of 5' from any underground sewer or drainage lines for installation.***

Response: See revised Landscape Plan.

SMI - Responses to Green International Affiliates, April 28, 2017 Peer Review for Traffic Access.
Please refer to the Bayside Engineering letter dated June 23, 2017, relative to Green comments (No. 1 thru No. 12).

Comment No. 13. ***Green recommends that the following additional pedestrian improvements be implemented to complete the pedestrian connections:***

- ***Reconstruct the curb ramps at the intersection of Massachusetts Avenue / Stow Road / Middle Road to be ADA compliant.***

Response: Label has been added to Site Development Plan (Sheet 10) stating that ramps will be reconstructed subject to MassDOT review and approval following completion of MEPA process.

- ***Restripe marked crosswalk across Massachusetts Avenue and stripe a crosswalk across Stow Road to provide high-visibility ladder-style markings.***

Response: Label has been added to Site Development Plan (Sheet 10) stating that crosswalks will be striped subject to MassDOT review and approval following completion of MEPA process.

- ***Provide pedestrian warning signage at the marked crosswalk across the east leg of the intersection facing each direction of Massachusetts Avenue traffic.***

Response: Label has been added to Site Development Plan (Sheet 10) stating that pedestrian warning signage will be provided at crosswalk subject to MassDOT review and approval following completion of MEPA process.

It is also recommended that the applicant remove the existing pedestrian crossing warning sign assembly. All of the pedestrian improvements within the Massachusetts Avenue layout will require MassDOT approval.

Response: Existing signage will be removed or replaced in association with ramps and crosswalks as noted above per MassDOT review and approval.

Comment No. 14. ***The applicant should provide vehicle turning paths to demonstrate that emergency vehicles (and other large vehicles) can safely and efficiently access the site and maneuver within the project site.***

Response: Our office has prepared a Fire Truck Turning Plan (2 sheets), dated August 30, 2017, which illustrates the travel path of a local custom fire ladder truck throughout the site and along the proposed emergency access driveways to Stow Road and Priest Lane.

Comment No. 15. ***In addition to the primary site driveway, two emergency access roads are proposed to connect to Stow Road and Priest Lane. It is appropriate to provide multiple access points to a project of this size. The applicant should coordinate with the Town's public safety officials to ensure that the proposed emergency access roads are sufficient and satisfies any concerns raised by the Fire Chief.***

Response: The emergency access drive to Stow Road has been flared out near Drive B sidewalk to provide additional comfort level for fire truck turning left or right. The current Site Plan reflects adjustments previously discussed with the Fire Chief. Pavement width was minimized accordingly and reduced curb heights provided with signage at each emergency curb-cut along Drive 'B' and Drive 'C'. The Fire Chief has been requested to provide a written review of the Site Plan.

Comment No. 16. ***Only 36 parking spaces are proposed at the clubhouse. This is not consistent with Town Zoning Bylaws Section 6006, which states that the minimum off-street parking ratio for clubs, lodges, and association buildings is one space per two memberships, which in this case would be 50 parking spaces for this site.***

Response: Fourteen "future" parking spaces are designated along Drive 'A' near clubhouse to satisfy fifty-space requirement per Zoning Bylaw.

Comment No. 17. ***At the clubhouse parking lot, aisle circulation width and all parking space dimensions meet or exceed zoning requirements and typical industry practice. Applicant has also provided an appropriate number of accessible parking spaces.***

Response: We concur with this statement.

Comment No. 18. ***The 24-foot-wide internal drives are consistent with Zoning Bylaw requirements.***

Response: We concur with this statement.

Comment No. 19. ***With the internal roadway width of 24 feet, it is recommended that on-street parking be prohibited within the proposed development project at minimum on one side. Curbside parking along the internal roadways could inhibit or impact the flow of emergency vehicles as well as other movements. Areas of restricted on-street parking should be identified on the site plans. In addition to restricting on-street parking, the applicant could explore providing small areas of "visitor parking" scattered at strategic locations within the development. We recommend that the applicant install signs to communicate the parking restriction to residents and visitors of the site.***

Response: Two off-street visitor parking spaces per unit are provided at each garage door to address this concern as opposed to smaller remote visitor spaces. Please review recommended guidance to be implemented by Toll into the condominium rules and regulations for parking along the private ways within development. Appropriate signage restricting parking can be provided following construction if deemed necessary by the zoning enforcement officer or public safety officials.

Comment No. 20. ***We recommend that the applicant provide bicycle parking adjacent to the clubhouse to encourage multimodality.***

Response: Five bicycle spaces have been provided at clubhouse near mail center (Sheet 5).

Response: See Bayside Engineering response Letter dated June 23, 2017.

Comment No. 22. ***Actions that could improve the overall safety of this affected section of road and that could potentially become part of the project's mitigation program should be given thought and outlined.***

Response: See Bayside Engineering response Letter dated June 23, 2017.

Comment No. 23. ***It is recommended that the applicant confirm that STOP lines and STOP signs are proposed at the following locations as they are shown but not clearly labeled:***

- ***Facing Private Drive C at the intersection with Private Drive A***
- ***Facing Private Drive A at the intersection with Private Drive B***

Response: Labels on current Site Plan indicate Stop lines and signs at Drive 'A' & Drive 'C'.

Comment No. 24. ***At the proposed marked crosswalk across Private Drive A, near Private Drive C, it is recommended that pedestrian crossing warning signage be installed and ADA-compliant curb ramps with detectable warning panels. It is recommended that a crosswalk be striped across Private Drive A at intersection with Private Drive B.***

Response: The Layout and Utilities Plan (Sheets 11 & 13) shows Signage and ADA-compliant curb ramps. Crosswalks will also be striped at intersections per MassDOT standards.

Comment No. 25. ***It is recommended that a sidewalk be also constructed along the west side of Private Drive A between the clubhouse parking lot and the intersection with Massachusetts Avenue. A marked crosswalk could then be provided across Private Drive A at the intersection with Massachusetts Avenue.***

Response: The entrance portion of sidewalk has been moved to the clubhouse side and a marked crosswalk is proposed at entrance.

Comment No. 26. ***The applicant should address bicycle parking facilities at the clubhouse.***

Response: Five Bicycle spaces have been provided at clubhouse per Zoning Bylaw.

Comment No. 27. ***The applicant should confirm with the fire and police chiefs in regards to the manner of design and operations of the emergency access roadway.***

Response: Town Planner has requested written responses from the police and fire chief. The Applicant will continue to work with local safety officials.

Please do not hesitate to contact our office if you have any questions or require additional information.

Respectfully,
Stamski and McNary, Inc.

Richard J. Harrington, P.E.

2069 SMI Rev 2.doc