



June 18, 2019

Ref: 12293.33

Mr. Greg Tuzzolo, Chair  
Town of Maynard Planning Board  
195 Main Street  
Maynard, MA 01754

Re: Application for Special Permit and Site Plan Approval - 42 Summer Street

Mr. Tuzzolo,

Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB) has completed a fourth review of the Special Permit/Site Plan review for the submittal of the proposed 42 Summer Street redevelopment project located at 42 Summer Street in Maynard, Massachusetts. VHB received the following items for review from the applicant's engineer:

- Proposed Site Plans (9 Sheets) prepared by Lala Associates Engineering, LLC., dated May 29, 2019
- Survey Plan prepared by Foresite Engineering, dated August 10, 2018
- Storm Water Report prepared by Lala Associates Engineering, LLC., dated May 26, 2019
- List of Waivers Requested, prepared by Lala Associates Engineering, LLC., dated April 19, 2019
- Partial Response to Comments Letter, prepared by Lala Associates Engineering, LLC., dated May 31, 2019
- Planting Plan (1 Sheet), prepared by Elizabeth Hanna Morss Landscape Architect, dated May 3, 2019
- Architectural Plans (10 Sheets), prepared by Peter J. Karb Architect, dated May 20, 2019

VHB has been requested to review the submitted materials for compliance with Maynard's Zoning By-law as well as for compliance with Massachusetts Stormwater Management Regulations and Maynard Stormwater Management By-law and Regulations, as applicable to this type of project. Additionally, VHB has reviewed the plans for constructability issues and general comments based on standard engineering practice on the proposed design.

VHB has reviewed the design plans and documents for conformance with the Maynard *Protective Zoning By-laws, as amended May 21, 2018* and with Sections A through F of the *Planning Board Rules and Regulations, as approved August 14, 2018*. The Maynard *Stormwater Management By-law dated October 26, 2009*, and the Maynard *Stormwater Management Regulations, Massachusetts Department of*

101 Walnut Street

PO Box 9151

Watertown, Massachusetts 02471

P 617.924.1770

F 617.924.2286

Engineers | Scientists | Planners | Designers



**Environmental Protection Stormwater Regulations. The following comments note non-conformance with the specific sections of the Zoning By-Laws.**

Please note that this letter follows the format of VHB's comment letter dated March 1, 2019. Comments in our original comment letter has been reiterated and are provided in plain text, the *responses from Lala Associates Engineering, LLC. are provided in underlined and italic text*, and **additional comments from VHB are provided in bold text. Any remaining comments or additional revisions or documentation required from Lala Associates Engineering, LLC are highlighted in yellow. Items that need a waiver or need to be discussed with the Planning Board are highlighted in Green.**

CONFORMANCE WITH ZONING BYLAWS

6.1.9 Applicant is showing compact parking spaces, according to the by-law compact spaces are only allowed in parking lots with more than 40 parking spaces. The Applicant is proposing 36 parking spaces. Applicant should reassess and modify accordingly.

*Lala Response: 35 spaces are now proposed. A waiver is requested.*

**VHB Response: The number of parking spaces waiver should be requested under Section 9.4.10 of the Zoning By-Law (see comment in this section). The Applicant shall request a waiver allowing the Applicant to use compact spaces in a parking lot with less than 40 parking spaces and shall discuss this with the Board.**

6.1.10.3 No parking space or other paved surface other than access driveway or walkways shall be located within 20 feet of the front lot line or within 10 feet of any other lot line. The Applicant is not showing the dimension from the parking space to the property line. Measuring from the plan at the closest point, the parking is shown at approximately 4-feet from the property line, not 7-feet as the Applicant has listed. The Applicant is requesting a waiver for this.

*Lala Response: Now the front setback to 1st parking space is changed to 6.9ft. A waiver is requested.*

**VHB Response: Though the Applicant is stating in the waiver letter that the setback is 8-feet (plans show 6'-9") from the front property line, there appears to be minimal setback from the side property line which requires 10-ft setback. The Applicant shall request a waiver for this and shall discuss this with the Board.**

6.1.10.4 The lot shall have an access driveway at least 24 feet wide at its narrowest point. The Applicant is proposing an 18-foot driveway wide for two-way traffic next to parallel parking. VHB is concerned that there is not sufficient space for maneuvering into and out of the site, although we understand that the Applicant is limited by the site constraints. The Applicant is requesting a waiver. The Applicant should plan to discuss this driveway width with the Board.

*Lala Response: A waiver is requested.*



**VHB Response: The Plans show an access driveway width of 26'-6" therefore no waiver is required.**

- 6.1.10.5 The parking area should have a maximum slope of 5%. Although, the Applicant has labeled the parking areas as 4% and 5.5%, the proposed contours shown in some areas exceed 8%.

Lala Response: All parking areas now have 5% slope and accessible spaces have 2% slope. The slope at the entrance to the parking garage is maximum 8%. See C2

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- 6.1.10.6 Interior driveways may be reduced to no less than 20-foot-wide for two-way traffic and the stacking area of the access drive shall be between 25 and 50 feet long between the right of way line and the interior driveway, depending on use. The Applicant is showing 18-foot wide interior driveway, VHB understands the Applicants need for this dimension, but we are concerned about the tight site maneuvering space. The Applicant is requesting a waiver. The Applicant should plan to discuss this driveway width with the Board.

Lala Response: Now it is changed to 22ft. See C2.

**VHB Response: The plans are still showing 18-foot drive aisles, the Applicant should modify the waiver request and discuss this with the Board.**

- 6.1.10.10 The Applicant has not submitted any site lighting. The site lighting shall be designed to complement and enhance the intended use. A photometrics plan and lighting details shall be provided and shall show lighting levels throughout the site. No more than 0.5 fc shall be projected across the project's property line onto an abutting property.

Lala Response: A new plan is submitted to meet this requirement.

**VHB Response: The photometrics plan submitted does not show light levels. The plan shall be updated to show the light levels provided within the property lines and what spills over into neighboring properties. VHB recommends that a Condition of the Approval be included that the Applicant will provide a photometrics plan prior to the start of construction.**

- 6.1.11.1 Parking stalls shall be 9-ft by 18.5-ft and drive aisles for 90-deg parking spaces to be a minimum of 24-feet in width. Parallel parking spaces shall be 8-ft by 22-ft. The Applicant is requesting a waiver. Applicant is providing 8 by 18 parallel and perpendicular parking.

Lala Response: A waiver is requested.

**VHB Response: The Applicant shall request a waiver for this and discuss this with the Board.**

- 6.1.12 Handicapped parking shall be clearly identified by a sign and the minimum wide of 12-foot and parallel parking shall be 24-foot stalls (Town Regs). 521CMR requires 8' space



and 5' isle for cars, and 8' isle for van parking. Applicant is providing 8 by 18 parallel spaces. Applicant shall discuss this with the Board. At a minimum a waiver will need to be requested.

Lala Response: All these requirements are met in this new proposal with two spaces at 90 degrees 9'x19.5'. See C2

**VHB Response: Plans show 18.5' which is compliant therefore, comment has been addressed.**

6.1.14 All access drives, off-street parking and loading areas shall be paved with 9-inches of gravel and two- and one-half-inch layers of bituminous concrete or equivalent reinforced concrete. Curbing shall be vertical concrete; or vertical or sloped granite curbing with a six-inch reveal. The Applicant shall update the pavement section detail and all curb locations shall be called out on the plans.

Lala Response: This requirement is met now. See C1.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

6.1.15.3 A minimum of two trees shall be provided within the landscape areas per every ten parking spaces. Locations should be shown on the plans. The Applicant shall also provide a landscape plan that meets the Boards Landscape Regulations.

Lala Response: This requirement is met now. See sheet C4 and site lighting C5. For 35 spaces 7 trees are required but we are saving many more trees on the property. We have space for only few trees and have planned three new trees.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

6.2 All signs on the property shall comply with sign regulations, if applicable.

Lala Response: This requirement is met now. See C2.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

9.4.4 Applicant shall conform with the dimensional requirements as follows:

- Minimum Area of 1,500 SF per residential unit. Applicant to provide agreement between town and owner as to meeting all the needs of section 9.4.5 for providing less square footage.

Lala Response: 24 units at 956 sf per unit are proposed and a waiver is requested.

**VHB Response: The Applicant has requested a waiver from this requirement and shall discuss this with the Board**



- Maximum front yard setback of 10-feet. The applicant is showing greater than 10-feet in some areas.

*Lala Response: A waiver is requested.*

**VHB Response: The Applicant has requested a waiver from this requirement and shall discuss this with the Board**

- Maximum height of 45-feet, applicant to provide building height on the plans.

*Lala Response: This note is added to zoning chart. See C2 notes & C4 elevation.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

**9.4.10 The Applicant is required to provide 1.5 parking spaces per unit which is 36 parking spaces. The plans only show 35 parking spaces, the Applicant should request a waiver for this requirement.**

CONFORMANCE WITH PLANNING BOARD RULES & REGULATIONS

A.2 North arrow is missing on some plans, applicant shall include north arrow on all plans and insets.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

A.4 Property assessor's map and parcel number, and property ID number shall be provided on the plans.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See C2.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

A.6 Plans shall be sealed by plan preparer.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: Plans submitted will need to be stamped in their final version.**

A.7 Plans shall indicate designated agent for project and contact information.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See title in all sheets.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

A.8 The applicant has sheets with scales shown of 1"=10'; all plans scale shall be 1"=20', 1"=40', or 1"=80' (or a waiver shall be requested).



*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: We recommend the applicant request a waiver from this section, as sheet C2.1, C3.1, C4 and C5 are still shown at 1"=10'. The Applicant has miss stated in the waiver request that only one sheet is at 1"=10', there are four (4) sheets at 1"=10'.**

- A.9 Adjacent zoning districts within 200 feet of the subject property, parcel lines or area of impact shall also be indicated. Such features shall be shown on a separate map or as a key map on the detail map itself. Applicant to provide overall key plan within planset.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See C2 - GIS map*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- A.12 All governing bodies or entities having jurisdictional authority impacting the project area shall be identified.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- A.13 Boundaries of existing streets, lots, reservations, easements, right-of-ways, restricted areas, etc. shall be included in the plans.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See C0 & C2*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- A.15 Key map to include references to surrounding area.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See GIS and aerial view on sheet C2.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- A.16 All distances as measured along the right-of-way lines of existing streets abutting the property to the nearest intersection with any other public street. Dimensions shall be added.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See GIS map on sheet C2*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- A.18 Existing contours shall be shown as dashed lines and proposed contours shall be shown as continuous lines.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheets C2, C2.1 and C4.*

**VHB Response: The existing contours are shown on sheet C0. Comment has been addressed.**



- A.19 Location of existing buildings and all other existing structures such as walls, fences, culverts, bridges, roadways, etc. (proposed to remain) shall be noted on the Site Plan as "to remain."

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C0 for the surveyor's plan of the existing conditions.*

**VHB Response: The Applicant has included the existing conditions on sheet C0. Comment has been addressed.**

- A.20 Location of existing buildings and all other existing structures such as walls, fences, culverts, bridges, roadways, etc. (proposed to be removed) shall be noted on the Site Plan as "to be removed."

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C0, C1 and C2*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- A.21 All structures and significant changes in topography within 50' of all properties shall be shown on the plans.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See C2 & C3.1. This is understood as 50ft in the property along its all property lines.*

**VHB Response: While VHB still does not believe that this section has been complied with, the applicant has shown an aerial image of the area that appears to extend beyond 50' of the property in all directions.**

- A.23 Location for signatures of the planning board shall be located on all sheets, sheet C3 refers to "Approved by the Public Works" this should say "Approved by the Planning Board".

*Lala Response: This is now complied with on all sheets.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- A.24 All calculations necessary to determine conformance to the ZBL shall be indicated on the site plan. Calculations shall at a minimum indicate development standards: "required", "provided" and if applicable "existing." Existing is missing from the chart shown.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2. ALSO SEE THE LIST OF WAIVERS IN THE NARRATIVE REPORT.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- A.25 All plans shall show locations of any exterior features to demonstrate compliance with 521 CMR: wherever required (public building and facilities accessible for persons with disabilities).



Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheets C2 & C2.1

**VHB Response: Based on the grades given on sheet C2 the accessible route from the elevated walkway, at elevation 192, and the spot grades provided along the walk we still interpret the slope along the building walk at 18%. The Applicant has stated all walks shown on the plan are ADA complaint, and as this is a building, it will need to meet all building codes shall demonstrate compliance with 521 CMR as it is constructed.**

B.1 Proposed grading, structure height and total floor space shall be included on plans.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheets C2.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

B.2 The location, housing type, and density of land use to be shown on site plans.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

B.3 Elevations and architectural renderings shall be provided.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See architectural sheets

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

B.4 Exhibits shall be provided as appropriate showing the visual impact to the community.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See architectural sheets

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

B.5 Location of all signage shall be included on the plans, if applicable.

Lala Response: Stop sign and accessible space signs are provided. This is now complied with. See sheet C2.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

B.6 All existing non-conformities shall be indicated on the plans.

Lala Response: Not applicable.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

C.1 All existing storm drainage shall be included with pipe size, grades and direction of flow.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C3.1

**VHB Response: The plans do not show any existing drainage within Summer Street or the Town lot to the south. The Applicant should have shown all existing storm**



**drainage as required by this section but given that the developer must DigSafe the project prior to construction VHB feels this requirement is ultimately the developer's responsibility to identify all existing utilities prior to the start of construction.**

- C.4 Location of all proposed water valves, and hydrants as well as sewer lines shall be shown on the plans.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2. No Hydrants exist at street.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- C.5 The site plans should be revised to indicate the location of all existing drainage within 500 feet of a boundary of the subject property and all areas such as paved areas, grassed areas, wooded areas and all other surface area contributing to the drainage.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. None exists except one catch basin at the street.*

**VHB Response: Based on observation it appears there is an additional catch basin at the corner of Summer Street and the Town parking lot entrance. There also appears to be a drainage manhole in Summer Street near the same location. An additional catch basin was observed in the parking spaces along the bike path south of the site. The Applicant should have shown all existing drainage as required by this section but given that the developer must DigSafe the project prior to construction VHB feels this requirement is ultimately the developer's responsibility to identify all existing utilities prior to the start of construction.**

- C.6 The Applicant shall prepare and submit a Photometric plan that meets the requirements outlined in the Planning Board's Landscape Regulations.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C5.*

**VHB Response: The photometrics plan submitted does not show light levels. The plan shall be updated to show the light levels provided within the property lines and what spills over into neighboring properties. VHB recommends that a Condition of the Approval be included that the Applicant will provide a photometrics plan prior to the start of construction.**

- C.8 The Applicant should review the proposed water, drainage and sewer systems with the Department of Public Works and address any comments received. The DPW has recently adopted new Water and Sewer Regulations for the Town. The Applicant MUST meet with DPW and review the proposed project. DPW may require and independent review of the Water and Sewer needs of the project. Documents MUST be provided by DPW to the Planning Board regarding Water and Sewer for the Site prior to Site Plan Approval.



Lala Response: This is now complied with. The review has found the available utilities adequate.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- C.9 Proposed storm water drainage system shall conform to designs based on a 50-year storm record. No pipe calculations appear to have been provided.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. All pipes are adequately sized for the 100 year storm.

**VHB Response: The material presented for review did not contain typical pipe sizing calculations that we could locate, it appears the Applicant used HydroCAD to size the pipe. Standard engineering practice requires that pipes be sized using the Manning's equation that allows for inlet and outlet controls to be factored into the sizing, HydroCAD is NOT designed to allow these controls therefore is not a pipe sizing program. Within HydroCAD the Applicant uses a "reach" to represent pipes, per HydroCAD reaches are intended for designing open channel follows or long pipes that would affect peak rates. HydroCAD is intended for hydrology NOT hydraulics.**

**However, given that we have discussed this issue several times, VHB checked the pipe sizes based on the provided information on contributing drainage areas and has verified that the pipe sizes proposed are adequate to Leaching Field 2. Leaching Field 1 is collecting the entire roof area. According to the HydroCAD model a portion of the roof is discarded. Based on the information shown in the plans there are only two downspouts from the roof and they are both discharging to Leaching Field 1.**

**Comment has been addressed.**

- C.10 Applicant shall provide additional approvals from other reviewing entities or utility companies.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: Applicant or the Town Planner shall provide written approvals from other departments as part of planning board package.**

- D.1 Applicant shall show size and pavement markings for the proposed access drive.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2 & C2.1

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- D.4 Applicant shall provide a traffic circulation/impact study for both the site and surrounding areas.



*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2*

**VHB Response: Though the Applicant provided some traffic information, the information provided is not considered a complete report therefore we recommend that the Applicant request a waiver from this requirement.**

- E.1 Applicant shall identify the size and location of any existing pedestrian, bicycle, and/or other non-motor vehicle networks or accommodations within the project area.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- E.2 Applicant to show the external connections proposed to link the project to the surrounding non-motor vehicular networks.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- E.4 Applicant to show internal bicycle facilities, racks, storage areas, etc.

*Lala Response: None planned*

**VHB Response: Since the Applicant is proposing a seating area for the use of those on the bike path, we recommend that a condition be added that the Applicant provide bike racks on the site.**

- F.1 The landscape plan shall comply with the Planning Board's "Landscape Regulations"

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C4 & C5.*

**VHB Response: See responses in section below.**

#### CONFORMANCE WITH LANDSCAPE REGULATIONS

- 4.2.1 The Applicant shall provide a survey stamped by a professional land surveyor, licensed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on a minimum 24" x 36" plan size.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C0 and surveyors stamped sheet.*

**VHB Response: The survey plan submitted was stamped by a registered professional civil engineer not a professional land surveyor as required. Applicant shall modify or request a waiver from this section.**

- 4.2.2 The Applicant shall provide a photo board depicting existing conditions of the property, including existing vegetation, streetscape, vehicular intersections, and other manmade or natural features relevant to the proposed project.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C7.*



**VHB Response: No sheet C7 exists, it appears that the photo board is sheet C6. Comment has been addressed.**

- 4.2.2.1 The Applicant shall present 8" x 10" minimum size color prints, mounted or displayed on a presentation board for display to the public. Power point presentations are acceptable.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. Presentation prepared by Tim Hess.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- 4.2.2.2 The Applicant shall provide sufficient imagery to adequately depict the breadth of the existing conditions.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C6.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- 4.2.2.3 The Applicant shall provide at least one-color aerial photograph of the site (Google and Bing are acceptable sources).

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- 4.3 The Applicant shall provide a landscape plan prepared by a licensed Landscape Architect that includes all the provisions documented in Section 4.3 of the Landscape Regulations.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. A waiver is requested for PE stamp in lieu of LA stamp.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- 4.4.1 The Applicant shall provide a landscape maintenance plan which includes a description of how the development will maintain the aesthetic appearance, health and viability of the landscape (per Section 11.15 of the Landscape Regulations), identify funding sources for landscape maintenance, and identify type of maintenance, frequency of service, and any other special activities required.

Lala Response: Will be provided for the final submittal.

**VHB Response: We recommend that the Applicant request a waiver from this requirement if the information is not going to be provided.**

- 4.4.3 Lighting design - The Applicant shall provide lighting design plan with photometric information and cut sheets for all proposed lighting fixtures.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C5.

**VHB Response: The photometrics plan submitted does not show light levels. The plan shall be updated to show the light levels provided within the property lines**



**and what spills over into neighboring properties. VHB recommends that a Condition of the Approval be included that the Applicant will provide a photometrics plan prior to the start of construction.**

CONFORMACE WITH MAYNARD STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

2.3.a The Applicant shall include a locus map in the proposed stormwater management plan.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. The usgs topo & FEMA plan show the locus.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

2.3.b The Applicant shall include existing zoning and land use at the site.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See the C2 Locus Plan with zoning line and notes.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

2.3.c The Applicant shall include proposed land use and zoning.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

2.3.d The Applicant shall include location(s) of existing and proposed easements, if applicable.

*Lala Response: Not applicable as no easements exist nor planned.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

2.3.e The Applicant shall include location of existing and proposed utilities.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C1 for the existing conditions.*

**VHB Response: Based on observation it appears there is an additional catch basin at the corner of Summer Street and the Town parking lot entrance. There also appears to be a drainage manhole in Summer Street near the same location. An additional catch basin was observed in the parking spaces along the bike path south of the site. The Applicant should have shown all existing drainage as required by this section but given that the developer must DigSafe the project prior to construction VHB feels this requirement is ultimately the developer's responsibility to identify all existing utilities prior to the start of construction.**

2.3.f The Applicant shall include site's existing and proposed topography with contours at 1-foot intervals.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C1, C2, C3.1 C4.*



**VHB Response: The Applicant has included the existing conditions on sheet C0. Comment has been addressed.**

- 2.3.h The Applicant shall include description and delineation of existing stormwater conveyances, impoundments, and wetlands on or adjacent to the site or into which stormwater presently flows or is proposed to flow.

*Lala Response: None exists. Not applicable.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- 2.3.i The Applicant shall include a delineation of 100-year flood plain, if applicable.

*Lala Response: None exists. Not applicable.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- 2.3.j The Applicant shall include estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation using the Cape Cod Commission adjustment method (Cape Cod Commission Technical Bulletin 92-001, as amended) in areas to be used for stormwater retention, detention or infiltration.

*Lala Response: No ground water exists within several feet. Not applicable for any adjustment.*

**VHB Response: Applicant should include a plan showing the locations of the test pits. VHB recommends that a Condition of the Approval be added that additional test pits will be performed prior to construction and if the design needs to change the Applicant must return to the Planning Board.**

- 2.3.m The Applicant shall include all measures for the protection of water quality, and proposed hydrology and supporting calculations.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See hydrology report and narrative for the 10 standards. We added a catch basin before the Leaching Field 2 with solid cover to provide a 4ft sump.*

**VHB Response: As previously requested, the Applicant shall provide a separate spreadsheet showing that 44% pretreatment is provided prior to discharging into the infiltration system. The detail for the subsurface system shows an isolator row. The Applicant should show both the deep sump hooded catch basin and isolator row in separate spreadsheets showing they have 44% pretreatment and the subsurface infiltration system has 80%. Comment has been addressed.**

- 2.3.o The Applicant shall include timing, schedules, and sequence of development including clearing, stripping, rough grading, construction, final grading, and vegetative stabilization.

*Lala Response: This is complied with and is included in the narrative report.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**



2.3.p The Applicant shall include a maintenance schedule for the period of construction.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. Included in the narrative report.*

**VHB Response: The Operation and Maintenance plan appears to only include maintenance after construction. Applicant to provide O&M during Construction operations. Per the MA DEP Stormwater Handbook, the O&M plan should include the following: Only the Bold items need to be provided:**

- Narrative; (included)
- **Construction Period Operation and Maintenance Plan;**
- **Names of Persons or Entity Responsible for Plan Compliance;**
- Construction Period Pollution Prevention Measures; (included)
- Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan Drawings; (included)
- **Detail drawings and specifications for erosion control BMPs, including sizing calculations;**
- **Vegetation Planning;**
- Site Development Plan; (included)
- Construction Sequencing Plan; (included)
- **Sequencing of Erosion and Sedimentation Controls;**
- **Operation and Maintenance of Erosion and Sedimentation Controls;**
- Inspection Schedule; (included)
- Maintenance Schedule; (included)
- Inspection and Maintenance Log Form. (included)

2.4.2 The Applicant shall include an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. The Applicant shall refer to Section 2.4.3 of the Maynard Stormwater Management Regulations for all content required. It is recommended that this information be on a separate plan so as to not clutter the site plans.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.1. This sheet includes all construction measures and only other item like structural information for the elevated walkways.*

**VHB Response: While, the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan should be on a separate sheet, the Applicant has provided Erosion Control details in various locations throughout the set, we believe that the information is at least on the plans. However, silt sacks must be provided for all catch basins in vicinity of the project.**

2.5 The Applicant should include an Operation and Maintenance Plan (post-construction). The Applicant shall refer to Section 2.5 in the Maynard Stormwater Management Regulations for all content required.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See the narrative report.*



**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

#### STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COMMENTS

1. The applicant then must verify that adequate cover is provided to install pipe beneath the frame & grate and roof slab, with additional space required if a hood is proposed. Applicant should also verify that there is enough cover above the pipe to support H-20 loading.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with and a 18" cover is provide above the pipe inverts. The 8" pipes have 16" cover with concrete slab above.*

**VHB Response: Unless VHB is misunderstanding the applicant's response, there appears to be less than 12" of cover over the proposed pipes. Per the detail shown for the catch basin there is minimum of 18" from the invert to rim. From VHB's experience the only type of drainage pipe in which 12"-18" of cover is recommended is Class 3 - Class 5 RCP pipe. The applicant has stated that any pipe with less than 18" of cover will be constructed with a concrete cap. The applicant should confirm that this is represented clearly on the plans or should modify the inverts to provide increased cover.**

**Invert information should also be included at the downspout locations if they connect to a subsurface pipe. Rim and invert should also be provided for the proposed trench drain at the garage entrance. According to the inverts and slope shown on the pipe from the catch basin in the parking lot to the infiltration system in the building this pipe would come through the side of the garage wall above the FFE.**

**The Applicant shall provide manufactures information on PVC pipes proposed that indicated the proposed cover is adequate for H-20 loading, the manufactures information provided does not include this information.**

2. Per the Zoning By-Law, Section 10.5.7 3, provisions for control and retention of stormwater runoff shall be provided so as not to cause a downstream flooding in the 100-year storm, nor to discharge to downstream properties at a peak rate for the 2- and 100-year storms to exceed the peak rate discharge for those same storms under current conditions. To the extent feasible, the volume of runoff should also be balanced for the 2- and 100- year storms. While the Applicant states that no adverse impacts, calculations should be provided to show that there is no downstream flooding.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See he explanations in the hydrocad details for the two leaching fields.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**



3. While the infiltration systems have been designed to infiltrate the 100-year storm event, VHB recommends that the Applicant determine the feasibility of providing an overflow connection to the Town's drainage system within Summer Street or town parking lot to the east. If an overflow connection is not feasible the Applicant should assess the impacts if their system fails, what impacts that might have to the surrounding properties.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. With class A soils and no water table in sight, the failure of the system is almost impossible. No overflow connection is proposed and not required by the calculations.*

**VHB Response: No overflow connection has been provided according to the Applicant, but the Applicant believes this is ok. Comment has been addressed.**

4. The watershed area shown on the existing and proposed drainage area plans do not match the notation provided in the HydroCAD report. Applicant should review the plans and HydroCAD to clarify the information matches in both.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

5. The Applicant should analyze all stormwater coming onto the site and include this information in the Stormwater Report.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with as present topography does not contribute any runoff from adjacent properties.*

**VHB Response: Applicant is stating that no offsite drainage enters the project site but based on grade information provided on the project plans, this has not been demonstrated. While VHB recommends that information be provided, as an industry professional, if the Applicant is Certifying the design, VHB believes that our comment has been addressed**

6. The Applicant is proposing three (3) drywells and two (2) subsurface infiltration basin on sheet C3.1, the Applicant should show a drainage area for each BMP, to confirm they are adequately sized. Additionally, the drainage areas shown do not appear to accurately represent the proposed grading.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. The drywells are voluntary inclusions without any credits in runoff comparisons.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

7. The plan only shows one roof drain connection to the subsurface system, the Applicant should confirm the accuracy of this as the roof lines shown in the video presented at the last planning



board hearing would indicate not all the roof area is getting to this system and it could be oversized.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. The roof slopes are connected to gutters and the pitch carries all runoff to the high point in the ground leaders that discharge to the Leaching field #1.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

8. The Applicant should add a scupper to the roof drain to prevent stormwater from backing up into the building system.

Lala Response: This is now complied with as there will be no parapet walls or curbs at the proposed flat roof. Upper flat roof will be pitched to shed runoff in to the gutters.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

9. Applicant should provide pipe calculations to demonstrate that they meet the minimum 50-year storm record per the zoning by-law.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. The pipes are sized for the 100year storm runoff. See the hydrocad calculations for the pipes.

**VHB Response: See comment in Planning Board Rules and Regulations number C-9. Comment has been addressed.**

10. Although the Applicant has provided one test pit, they are required to provide three (3) test pits for each infiltration basins and drywells. The site plans and/or stormwater report should indicate the elevation of estimated seasonal high ground water (ESHGW). Applicant shall confirm that a minimum of two feet of separation is provided between ESHGW and the bottom of the proposed infiltration system. If groundwater is within four feet of the bottom of the infiltration system a mounding analysis should be provided. Applicant to also confirm that there is no indication of contamination in the area of the proposed subsurface infiltration basin.

Lala Response: Since the size of the basins is very small, the variation in soils does not exist to justify more than one test pit. The topography and the soil log suggest no water table is existent. The separation to the water table is more than 4feet. Thus this is now complied with. During the construction of the field, if any variation in perc rates is found, the size will be revised.

**VHB Response: We recommend that the PB require as a Condition of Approval that additional test pit information be provided to the PB as construction progresses, and if any design changes are required, the Applicant shall return to the PB for an amendment to the site plan Approval.**



11. The Applicant is proposing an illicit connection to the sewer system by connecting the garage catch basin to the infiltration system. Catch basins in garages must be connected to the sewer system through an oil and grit separator.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

12. The TSS removal spreadsheets shows for the oil and grit separator can not be included in the spreadsheet.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

13. It appears there is an error on one of the TSS removal spreadsheet which includes deep sump hooded catch basin twice, the Applicant should remove the second one.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

14. The MADEP Stormwater Handbook has specifications on the use of street sweeping included in the TSS removal spreadsheet. The Applicant should demonstrate how they reached 9%, based on the information provided in the Operation and Maintenance Plan VHB interprets that they should only receive 5% for street sweeping.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

15. The NRCS Web Soil Survey is missing parts of the side the Applicant should provide another survey which includes the entire site and the hydrologic soils group.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: The NRCS Web Soil Survey provided does not include hydrologic soils group (HSG) information within the NRCS Web Soil Survey. The Applicant has provided test pit information that demonstrates the HSG. Comment has been addressed.**

16. The Stormwater Checklist for Standard 1 indicates that the Applicant has provided supporting calculations and VHB cannot locate these calculations in the package provided.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: This comment has been addressed.**



17. The Applicant indicated on the Stormwater Checklist that the 72-hour drawdown analysis has been included, but VHB cannot locate this calculation in the package provided.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. Hydrograph tables are included to full infiltration.*

**VHB Response: HydroCAD is not the appropriate method to calculate 72-drawdown analysis. However, given that we have discussed this issue several times, VHB checked Leaching Field 1 and Leaching Field 2 using the method described in MA DEP Stormwater Handbook and the systems meet. Comment has been addressed.**

18. The Stormwater Checklist has checked off both that all impervious areas are discharging to infiltration basin and that all impervious areas are not discharging to infiltration basins. The Applicant should choice one of these options and provide calculations demonstrating this.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

19. The Applicant should show the calculations for the required recharge for the site and demonstrate where it is met in each system.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with*

**VHB Response: Technically the calculations should be provided, in addition to the Calculation output, however this comment has been addressed.**

20. The Stormwater Checklist indicates for Standard 4 the Water Quality is in an area of rapidly infiltrating soils therefore requiring 44% TSS removal pretreatment. The Applicant should provide additional TSS spreadsheets showing the 44% TSS removal pretreatment.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with*

**VHB Response: As previously requested, the Applicant shall provide a separate spreadsheet showing that 44% pretreatment is provided prior to discharging into the infiltration system. The detail for the subsurface system shows an isolator row. The Applicant should show both the deep sump hooded catch basin and isolator row in separate spreadsheets showing they have 44% pretreatment and the subsurface infiltration system has 80%. Comment has been addressed.**

21. For Standard 4, the Applicant should provide calculations showing the required 1" inch water quality volume and demonstrate the water quality volume provided by each system.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with*

**VHB Response: Technically the calculations should be provided, in addition to the Calculation output, however this comment has been addressed.**



22. The Stormwater Checklist for Standard 4 indicates that the Applicant a proprietary BMP and has provided documentation supporting the use of the product. The plans do not indicate the use of any proprietary BMPs, the Applicant should provide the location and supporting information of any proprietary BMPs proposed on site.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. The item is removed from the checklist.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

23. The Applicant did not check any boxes with in the Standard 7 Redevelopment but indicated in the narrative that they are a redevelopment. The Stormwater Checklist should be updated to reflect this information.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

24. The Applicant should provide a Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan and illicit discharge statement to comply with Standard 10.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: VHB could not locate an illicit discharge statement in the review material. Per MA DEP Stormwater Handbook, Checklist for Stormwater Report, Section A, the Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan must be included in the Stormwater Report and include the following information:**

- **Good housekeeping practices;**
- **Provisions for storing materials and waste products inside or under cover;**
- **Vehicle washing controls;**
- **Requirements for routine inspections and maintenance of stormwater BMPs;**
- **Spill prevention and response plans;**
- **Provisions for maintenance of lawns, gardens, and other landscaped areas;**
- **Requirements for storage and use of fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides;**
- **Pet waste management provisions;**
- **Provisions for solid waste management;**
- **Snow disposal and plowing plans relative to Wetland Resource Areas;**
- **Winter Road Salt and/or Sand Use and Storage restrictions;**
- **Street sweeping schedules;**
- **Provisions for prevention of illicit discharges to the stormwater management system;**
- **Training for staff or personnel involved with implementing Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan;**
- **List of Emergency contacts for implementing Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan.**



25. In accordance with Standard 8, the following information should be incorporated into the Construction Period Pollution Prevention and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan:

- a. Names of persons or entity responsible for plan compliance

*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: While the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan should be on a separate sheet, the Applicant has provided Erosion Control details in various locations throughout the set, we believe that the information is at least on the plans.**

- b. Construction sequencing plan

*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

26. The stormwater narrative for Standard 7 appears to end mid-sentence. The Applicant should update the narrative to complete the sentence.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed**

27. O&M plan shall include a figure indicating the locations of BMPs.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

#### GENERAL ENGINEERING COMMENTS

1. For clarity, The Applicant should provide an existing conditions plan showing all existing site features and grading.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheets C0 & C1.*

**VHB Response: The Applicant has included the existing conditions on sheet C0. Comment has been addressed.**

2. The Site Utility Plan should include all subsurface utilities including storm drainage.

*Lala Response: The plan is split in two sheets for the clarity, thus this is now complied with. See sheets C2 and C3.1*

**VHB Response: The Applicant has certified that the utility information provided does not conflict with each other. Comment has been addressed.**



3. At a minimum, the Applicant shall provide details of the following site features, not limited to these items if applicant is proposing other features not shown on the plans, those should also be included:
- Curb ramps at driveway and/or sidewalk crossing the driveway
  - Sidewalk section and sidewalk section is relation to curb
  - Site stairs
  - Parking stall and site striping
  - Sign detail and sign summary
  - Dumpster pad and screening
  - Sewer Manhole
  - Oil and Sand Trap
  - Retaining wall detail
  - Trench Drain
  - Drain Manhole
  - Water Taping sleeve (or connection to water main)
  - Inlet protection
  - Roof drain connection

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C1, C2.1, C3 & C3.1 for general details.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

4. The Applicant should show the existing and proposed sidewalk and roadway conditions as well as dimensions on Summer Street. The Applicant should propose to replace the existing sidewalk along Summer Street for the entire frontage of their property.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

5. All proposed storm drain structures shall be labeled with type of structure, rim elevation and invert elevation. All proposed storm drain pipes should include material, size and invert elevation.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C3.1.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**



6. All proposed sewer structures and pipes shall be labeled with structures showing type of structure, rim elevation, and invert elevation; and pipes shall show material, size and invert elevations.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C3.1.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

7. Since this site is a redevelopment the Applicant should identify any existing utilities that services the existing building as well as identify how these utilities will be removed or abandoned. The Applicant should also coordinate with the DPW if they have specific requirements for discontinuing the utility service. We understand that a separate evaluation of this project with the DPW and a memo from the Applicant or the Town's Consultant will be for forth coming.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C1.

**VHB Response: This comment has been addressed.**

8. The existing sidewalk to be removed shown on sheet C2 should be updated to align with the proposed access driveway. The Applicant is also calling out an existing sidewalk ramp to remain, the location of the ramp does not meet the proposed driveway, therefore the ramp should be relocated to the edge of the proposed access driveway. The ramps should meet all the requirements of ADA and 521 CMR curb ramps as well as include a detectable warning panel.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2 & C3.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

9. The proposed catch basins shown on sheet C2 should coordinate with the proposed catch basin detail shown on sheet C3.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: See comment from Stormwater Management Comments number 1.**

10. All proposed pipes should be shown and labeled from catch basins, drywells, roof drains and subsurface chambers, including manifold pipes connecting to the chambers if required. Verify cover for chambers is adequate for H-20 loading. Show locations of all chamber clean outs on the plans. These are labeled as optional inspection ports on C3, but are required for inspection and cleaning as part of the "operation and maintenance plan". How is access to the subsurface chambers provided for maintenance?

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: See comment from Stormwater Management Comments number 1.**



11. Verify all elevations and dimensions for the Cultec Subsurface System and that the 6" pipe invert at chambers is sufficient. Typically, the top of the inlet pipe is 4" below the crown of the chambers. Verify chamber depth (cross section depth = 33.5" and longitudinal section depth = 26.5"). The Applicant should also confirm with the Architect and Cultec the feasibility of the construction of the subsurface infiltration below the parking garage. In addition, the catch basins located within the parking garage cannot discharge to the subsurface infiltration system, they must connect to an oil and grit separator, ultimately discharging to the sewer system. Applicant should consider connecting the roof drains to the subsurface infiltration system below the garage and the catch basins in the parking lot to the subsurface infiltration system below the exterior parking lot.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. The two sections on C3 are used to show two types of chambers and elevations for the two leaching fields.*

**VHB Response: We recommend that we review this design with the Applicant. Based on the information given, the chamber requires 16" below the pavement section which is 12.5". This would be 28.5" above the top of chamber. The invert information only shows 21" from invert to pavement above the leaching chamber 1 and 24" above leaching chamber 2. It would be assumed that the top of the leaching chambers would be higher than the invert therefore it appears that there is not enough coverage over these systems.**

12. The proposed Cultec units under the building will need to be maintained post construction. Is it feasible to service these chambers and what type of access is needed to perform this maintenance? Applicant should confirm frequency of maintenance with Cultec's standard Operation and Maintenance plan. The maintenance requirements of the Cultec System beneath the garage floor shall be documented for the Boards records.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with.*

**VHB Response: The Applicant should provide any product specific maintenance to the Operation and Maintenance plan.**

13. Provide sewer manhole with sand and oil trap detail for all proposed sewer manholes shown on sheet C2.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.1*

**VHB Response: See Stantec Sewer Memo dated May 7, 2019.**

14. Provide detail(s) for drywells including structure inside diameter and depth and dimensions of crushed stone surrounding structure, geotextile filter fabric, etc.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C3 for the details and plan C3.1 for the internal diameter and depth.*



**VHB Response: See Stantec Sewer Memo dated May 7, 2019.**

15. It appears the location of the proposed retaining wall is on the property line, is this feasible to construct without impacting the abutters property? Has or will be a Permanent or temporary easement be secured from the abutter if necessary? The following comments relate to the retaining wall concerns:

**VHB Response: Based on the information provided the wall is a maximum of 7-ft. Walls that are greater than 4-ft from the top of the footing to top of wall require a building permit, therefore the Applicant will apply to the building department for matters regarding the wall.**

- a. The Applicant should provide information regarding detail, location and dimensions of the retaining wall on their plans.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. The retaining wall is moved away from the property line by 9ft. See sheet C2.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- b. The Applicant is calling out the retaining wall having a guardrail/ fence above, the retaining wall detail should show the guard rail on top of the wall and include this on the wall detail.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. The retaining wall is moved away from the property line by 9ft. See sheet C2 & C4.*

**VHB Response: Based on the details provided it is unclear if a fence or other fall protection will be provided on top of the wall above the guard rail. The Applicant should provide a minimum of 42" high fall protection. The wall details and plan information should be updated to include details on fall protection.**

- c. The Applicant should provide additional grading information (both existing and proposed) to both sides of the retaining wall to understand how the wall will tie into the existing grades.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. The retaining wall is moved away from the property line by 9ft. See sheet C2.*

**VHB Response: Based on the information provided the wall is a maximum of 7-ft. Walls that are greater than 4-ft from the top of the footing to top of wall require a building permit, therefore the Applicant will apply to the building department for matters regarding the wall.**



16. Proposed dumpster location is preventing a car from easily accessing a parking space. The dumpster pad also appears to be graded at greater than the 5% slope, which would not be conducive to placing a dumpster or for access by a trash truck.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C1 & C2.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

17. The Applicant should provide figures demonstrating the turning movement for the trash truck entering and exiting the site to the dumpster to determine if it is feasible.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.1.*

**VHB Response: Per discussions with the Engineer, VHB provided with turning templates to the Applicant's Engineer. Revised Turning Template Graphics have not been provided to date to demonstrate that a trash truck can navigate the site, however, the applicant continues to assert that his graphical representation of the trash truck vehicle operation is accurate. It is ultimately the developer's responsibility to assure that access can be made to the dumpster. This issue is complete from VHB's perspective.**

18. The plans show an access bridge and elevated walkway, the following comments are in relation to this:

- a. The Applicant should provide detail and show the limits where these will be located, including any foundation or columns proposed/required.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See C2.1.*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- b. Sheet C2 shows the width of the access bridge at 3'-6", 4' and 5', the plans should be consistent with the width designation.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. Two sides are 5ft wide and the parking side is 3'-6" wide walkway. See sheet C2*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- c. Per 521 CMR 20.5, a 60-inch x 60 inch passing space shall be located at intervals not to exceed 200-feet.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**



19. The snow stock location is behind the parallel parking space; therefore, access appears to be an issue.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.*

**VHB Response: The Developers of the property have indicated that the location of the snow storage is acceptable for their snow clearing measures. Comment has been addressed.**

20. The accessible parking spaces shown do not comply with the below regulations from both ADA and MAAB:

- a. Per ADA 208.2.4 and 521 CMR 23.2.2, the Applicant is required to have a minimum of one van accessible parking space.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2*

**VHB Response: The Applicant should label the parking space designated for van parking.**

- b. Per ADA 502.4 and 521 CMR 23.4.3, the slope of accessible parking spaces cannot exceed 2% slope.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- c. Per 521 CMR 23.4.6, the minimum access aisle for a car shall be 5-feet and for a van shall be 8-feet.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2*

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- d. Parallel parking spaces cannot be compact dimensions.

*Lala Response: A waiver is requested. See sheet C2.*

**VHB Response: The Applicant should request a waiver for this requirement and should discuss with the Planning Board.**

- e. Per 521 CMR 23.6 and 23.4.7.b, accessible parking spaces shall be identified by signs and the van space should have an additional sign designating it as an accessible van parking space.

*Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2*



**VHB Response: The Applicant should label the parking space designated for van parking.**

- f. The Applicant should show the grading and location along the accessible route from the accessible parking spaces to the accessible doors.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2

**VHB Response: See Planning Board Rules and Regulations comment A.25**

- g. VHB has provided a sketch of a suggested rearrangement of the accessible parking spaces; the Engineer should evaluate and provided a redesign of the parking spaces on the plans, once these comments are re-evaluated.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2

**VHB Response: Comment addressed.**

- 21. The stairs proposed at the southwest corner from the building to the bike path are providing access to an amenity (the bike path) and the project needs to also provide an accessible route from the top of the stairs to the bike path. Since the public sidewalk and bike path are not on the property, the project cannot claim those as part of the accessible route since they do not control that land. The project must have an accessible route on their property (this could include access in the interior of the building).

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2 as these stairs are eliminated

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

- 22. The plans show a triangle that designates the "handicap accessible doors" the Applicant should demonstrate the accessible route to all of these locations.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheets C2 and C2.1.

**VHB Response: See Planning Board Rules and Regulations comment A.25**

- 23. The property line type shown on the legend provided on sheet C2 does not appear to be represented on the plan as that line type. The Applicant should confirm that all the line types in the legend match those shown on the plans.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2. the bold line showing the Erosion control line is pulled in from the property line.

**VHB Response: Applicant has not modified the line types as requested, but Applicant states that the information is provided on the plans. Comment addressed.**



24. Based on VHB's observed measurements on an aerial image and observation of the current site, VHB is concerned that the existing oil tank locations may not be accurately shown on the plans. VHB believes that the oil tanks may be closer to the proposed wall and property line. The Applicant should confirm through field survey the location of the tanks located on the adjacent property.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

25. The plans have many lines shown that are unidentified, the Applicant should either include more information on the legend or provide additional call outs on the plan.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: Applicant has not modified the line types as requested, but Applicant states that the information is provided on the plans. Comment addressed.**

26. For clarity, VHB recommends screening the existing conditions base plan to color grey on the proposed site plans.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See C2. Only existing building is shown as there are no other structures.

**VHB Response: The Applicant has included the existing conditions on sheet C0. Comment has been addressed.**

27. The plans show the curb behind the 5-foot wide snow stock pile, the curb should be placed at the edge of the parking spaces or access aisle for the accessible parking spaces to define the edge of pavement. Since the applicant will lose a few parking spaces due to dimensions, access to the landscape area can be created for additional snow storage near the dumpster.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.

**VHB Response: The plans still show the curb behind the snow stock pile behind the parallel parking spaces. The curb should be located along the edge of the parking spaces.**

28. Contour elevations should be added to the proposed contour plans on the south side of the site.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2 & C3.1.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

29. The Applicant should consider stripping and adding a rumble strip to the centerline of the driveway access to the garage as it goes from the 18-foot aisle to the 22-foot aisle in the garage to help define the two-way drive route.



Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.

**VHB Response: The Applicant is only providing striping. Comment has been addressed.**

30. A 12-inch wide, white, painted stop line should be provided at the exit drive at the Summer Street driveway with a stop sign (R1-1, MUTCD Standard). A 4-inch wide, painted double-yellow centerline also shall be added extending from the Stop line approximately 25-feet into the site to delineate access and egress isles at the driveway. This and any traffic-control signs proposed should conform to the standards in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

31. The Applicant shall provide additional detail on the utility connections (sewer, gas, water, etc.) as they do not appear to be connecting to any surveyed/record town systems in the roadway. Applicant shall also show all the existing town systems in the street on the survey and utility plan, including locations, rims and inverts. The Applicant can coordinate with the DPW to determine the location of any utilities in the road they are tying into.

Lala Response: This is now complied with All new connections are required as existing are not adequate size See C1 & C2. The street elevations at sewer & water connections will be provided in construction set.

**VHB Response: See Stantec Memos on Water and Sewer dated January 31, 2019 and May 7, 2019 respectfully.**

32. The grading at the garage entrance does not appear to be level and meet the garage elevation. The Applicant should provide more detailed grading at this location.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

33. The Applicant should show inlet protection on site and at all downstream catch basins.

Lala Response: Not applicable. No catch basins exist on or off site except one on the opposite site not affected by this project.

**VHB Response: Based on observation it appears there is an additional catch basin at the corner of Summer Street and the Town parking lot entrance. There also appears to be a drainage manhole in Summer Street near the same location. An additional catch basin was observed in the parking spaces along the bike path south of the site. The Applicant should have shown all existing drainage as required by this section but given that the developer**



**must DigSafe the project prior to construction VHB feels this requirement is ultimately the developer's responsibility to identify all existing utilities prior to the start of construction.**

34. We are noting that the PE stamp shown on the plan is not that of the Engineer who has been presenting the information.

Lala Response: Mr Sanjay Kaul is an associate at Lala Associates Engineers LLC. He is equally responsible for the development of these plans. Kanayo Lala is the person assisting Mr Kaul.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

35. The Applicant shall review the DPW's new sewer and water regulations and shall comply with any analysis, testing, and/or other requirements mandated by the DPW. VHBs understanding is that the DPW is having their water and sewer consultant review this project. The consultants review, and recommendations should be provided to the Planning Board prior to approval of this site plan application.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. The review is now available for the board.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

36. The Applicant shall provide a separate letter documenting any and all waivers they are seeking. This is not optional, and if waivers are listed on the plans, a separate letter documenting these waivers is required by the Board for the ability of the Board to Vote on and approve/deny the requested waivers at the close of the Public Hearing phase of this project.

Lala Response: This is now complied with.

**VHB Response: Comment has been addressed.**

#### TRAFFIC ENGINEERING COMMENTS

1. The adequacy of the proposed parking supply should be evaluated independent of the Zoning Bylaw requirements. Documentation in the form of data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers, counts of similar facilities, or data from other sources should be provided for review.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. A waiver is requested for the one shortfall in spaces required.

**VHB Response: The Applicant should request waiver from this requirement and should discuss with the Board.**

2. Both the stopping-sight and intersection-sight distance should be measured in both distances for any site driveway, with the available sight lines compared to requirements published by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) for observed Summer Street travel speeds. While some information is shown on sheet C2 related to sight distance, the Applicant shall measure and list/show graphically the required and available sight



distance looking in each direction on Summer Street entering and exiting the site drive. The sight triangles shown should be clarified. This site is a relatively low traffic generator and the traffic volume created from a Summer Street capacity standpoint should not affect overall traffic operations in the area. For a 35 mph design speed, the required stopping sight distance is 250 feet, while the desired intersection sight distance is 390 feet. The applicant should demonstrate that these standards can be satisfied, with any physical constraints requiring removal or modification being identified.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. The speed limit of the summer street at this lot is 20 MPH. See the picture of the speed sign on sheet C6. The two sight distances are met with but are not to be calculated for 35MPH but for 20 MPH.

**VHB Response: Sheet C2 of the planset depicts an intersection sight line looking to the west that is adequate for 250 feet. This corresponds to the minimum required stopping sight distance for a 35-mph design speed, which is referenced on the plan. As the intersection sight distance at least matches the required stopping sight distance, the available sight lines will be adequate even if the desirable levels cannot be achieved. Regardless of the posted 20 mph speed limit sign, this analysis should be based on the 35 mph design speed referenced on the plan. The sight lines looking to and from the south also appear to be adequate. Comment has been addressed.**

3. The updated site plan should depict the locations of the nearby roadways and bicycle facilities noted above.

Lala Response: This is now complied with. See sheet C2.

**VHB Response: See Stantec memo dated May 7, 2019.**

#### CONSERVATION COMMISSION COMMENTS

1. The Applicant should submit a stormwater application to the Conservation Commission.

If you have any questions, feel free to call me at 617-607-1577.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Wayne P. Amico". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

Wayne P. Amico, P.E.  
Senior Team Leader, Transportation

cc: Gregory Johnson, Town Administrator: [gjohnson@townofmaynard.net](mailto:gjohnson@townofmaynard.net)  
Bill Nemser, Town Planner: [bnemser@townofmaynard.net](mailto:bnemser@townofmaynard.net)  
Aaron Miklosko, Director of Public Works: [amiklosko@townofmaynard.net](mailto:amiklosko@townofmaynard.net)  
Kaitlin Young, Con Com Administrator: [kyoung@TownofMaynard.net](mailto:kyoung@TownofMaynard.net)  
Marie Morando, DPW: [mmorando@townofmaynard.net](mailto:mmorando@townofmaynard.net)  
Brianna Belschner, Pat Dunford - VHB: [bbelschner@vhb.com](mailto:bbelschner@vhb.com), [pdunford@vhb.com](mailto:pdunford@vhb.com)