



*Town of Walpole Commonwealth of
Massachusetts*

DPW/Town Engineer
Carl J. Balduf, P.E., P.L.S.

Town Hall
135 School
St.
Walpole, Ma. 02081
Phone (508) 660-7335
Fax (508) 668-1594

TO: Ashley Clark,
Director of Community and Economic Development

FROM: Carl Balduf,
Town Engineer

RE Proposed Multifamily Development 51-53-55 Summer Street
Aka Cedar Crossing and Cedar Edge Comprehensive Permit (40B) 1st Review

DATE: February 21, 2020

We have received a full initial submission package which included the following:

- A forty three (43) page 24”X36” Civil plan set titled “Site Plan For Proposed Multifamily Development 51-53-55 Summer Street Walpole, Ma.” dated January 10, 2020 and prepared by Howard Stein Hudson of Chelmsford, Ma for 55BHLC of Westford, Ma.
- A single page memorandum from the Board of Appeals dated January 21, 2020 to Town Departments requesting comments by February 18, 2020.
- A multi-page application binder with cover sheet titled “Cedar Crossing and Cedar Edge Greater Housing Choice”, applicant 55 SS LLC Westford, Ma.
- A multi-page binder with cover sheet titled “Traffic Impact and Access Study Proposed Residential Development 55 Summer Street Walpole, MA” dated January 6, 2020 Prepared by; Bayside Engineering of Woburn, Ma.
- A multi-page binder titled “Walpole, Massachusetts Proposed Multifamily Development Summer Street” Prepared for; 55 BH LLC Westford, Ma. 01886 dated January 2020.

In conjunction with the DPW Director, the Assistant Town Engineer and the Sewer & Water Superintendent the following comments are provided by the DPW. The comments apply to both the Rental & Condominium applications:

Related to MassHousing Determination and Recommendation dated January 13, 2020.

1. The current submission does not appear to comply with state law, regulations and standards related to stormwater management.

The plans and calculations have been updated to show all items required by the Massachusetts Stormwater Management requirements. The plans show all stormwater management Best Management Practices (BMP's) and the compliance has been documented in the Supplemental Data Report. See updated plans and calculations.

2. The applicant has not provided detailed information with regard to water & sewer use, potential impacts on existing capacity and appropriate mitigation (see memorandum from Sewer & Water Commission to Board of Appeals dated February 20, 2020)

See responses to the memorandum from Sewer & Water Commission to Board of Appeals dated February 20, 2020.

3. The applicant has not addressed sidewalk connections and updated infrastructure within the submission (see discussion in this correspondence on workshop dated 2/13/2020)

Bayside Engineering, Inc. (Bayside), the project traffic consultant prepared a pedestrian memorandum which showed that the existing crosswalks function at a high level of service. The crosswalks and sidewalks are existing infrastructure deemed safe enough by the Town to service the existing neighborhood and therefore not the responsibility of the Applicant. (See Bayside TIAS Pedestrian Analysis dated March 10, 2020, copy attached).

However, in the context of receiving a permit acceptable to the applicant without resorting to an appeal, the Applicant will agree to provide funding (not construct) for the construction of a sidewalk east of the site on the north side of Summer Street along with an accessible cross walk across Neponset Street. This sidewalk is shown on the Conceptual Sidewalk Improvement Plan dated April 10, 2020. The crosswalk funding would include the removal of the existing diagonal crosswalk across Neponset Street to Summer Street.

4. There does not appear to be anything in the submission addressing partnering with Walpole's Emergency Management Cert Program or provide any proper emergency planning, evacuation and sheltering on site.

The Applicant and the Applicant's property management company will comply with existing regulations related to this issue.

5. With the exception of a very brief discussion regarding the Energy Star program and the possibility of considering solar power the applicant does not appear to incorporate additional energy-saving and sustainability features into the project. We see no evidence of "trash and recycling efficiencies, renewable energy resources, geothermal heating and cooling, drought tolerant landscaping, pervious surfaces, green infrastructure, and/or bike storage and electric vehicle infrastructure" as required in the above noted Determination and Recommendation.

Although the Cedars final plans will include charging stations, drought resistant and tolerant landscaping and likely will include other green applications, the Applicant is not asking for waivers from any local regulations related to these topics. The green items the applicant chooses to incorporate into the development items will be incorporated based upon consumer demand, engineering, costs and the availability of various incentive programs at the time construction drawing are created.

Related to Submission

6. The Traffic Impact and Access Study should be stamped by a Massachusetts Registered Professional Engineer.

The January 6, 2020 Traffic Impact and Access Study (TIAS) was prepared under the direction of Mr. Kenneth P. Cram. Mr. Cram is a Registered Professional Traffic Engineer in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

7. The Existing Conditions Plans within the Civil plan set should be stamped by a Massachusetts Registered Land Surveyor.

See attached plan.

8. The Civil plans are generally not complete;
 - a. Pipe sizes and types for water, sewer and drain mains are noted in some locations but are missing in many locations and are not noted for most services. All drains are sized at 12" which is not feasible. Larger sizes will be required on lower branches of the drainage system.

The revised plans and calculations show proper reach sizing and HydroCAD analysis to show the sizing is appropriate.
 - b. The sewer system lacks inverts.

The sewer system has been designed and has been revised to show pipe sizing and inverts.
 - c. Some labels for detention basins do not match the proposed contours.

The revised plans show all inverts and coordinating contours.
 - d. Many curb radius do not match the opposite side or the labelled roadway width.

The proposed Layout and Materials Plans have been updated to show curb radii, pavement width and appropriate opposite radii.
 - e. Proposed detention ponds 3, 4, & 5 appear to be designed in the groundwater table or at groundwater. DEP requires 2' separation minimum and possibly more.

Soil testing has been completed in each of the stormwater infiltration areas and grading has been adjusted to meet the required 2-foot separation from estimated seasonal high groundwater.
 - f. The Fire Truck Turning Plan is not drafted at a scale that will allow proper review.

The Fire Truck Turning Plan has been broken out into 1"=40' scale sheets for ease of review.
 - g. No roadway/utility profiles are included with the submission.

The revised plan set includes plans and profiles for all roads within the development.

Related to Review

9. We recommend the Board of Appeals engage peer review for the entire submittal which should

include review of the all the materials noted at the beginning of this memorandum. Although Town staff has considerable resources, peer review would bring expertise to all areas (transportation interior and exterior to the site, drainage, environmental, utility, grading and overall site design) and will help maintain the schedule for the expedited review as well as fill in gaps in Town review capability and workload. The peer review scope should include the current submission as well as subsequent submissions including any re-submission required as a condition of approval for both site and offsite work.

The Applicant has agreed to and funded the peer review.

General

10. Street names need to be verified and cleared with Police/Fire. Some observations;
 - a. Red Tail Drive may not be suitable as it is similar to an existing Red Gate Road.
 - b. Partridge Lane and Chestnut Lane are already used.
 - c. Spruce Lane & Balsam Lane should be verified with Police/Fire.

The Applicant will work with Police/Fire to ensure street names at the Cedars do not conflict with existing street names.

11. Although not within DPW jurisdiction, this department strongly recommends that a fence be installed along the entire site perimeter with the railroad (subject to discussion and approval with the Conservation Commission) for the safety of the proposed communities children and residents in general.

The Applicant has added a six (6) foot tall black chain link fence along the eastern boundary of the proposed developed areas of the project, only eliminating sections within the two vernal pools and wetlands to minimize impact at these resource areas.

Roadway

12. 12' travel lanes are narrow. The interior roads excluding the double barrel main entry should follow Subdivision standards which are 13' travel lanes (26' width curb to curb). See also our comments in the Details section of this review for additional requirements.

The proposed roadway, being sensitive to the environment, has been designed slightly smaller than the Walpole roadway cross section. A twenty-four (24') travel width consisting of two (2), twelve (12) foot lanes has been utilized in this design. This is a typical roadway section used by many municipal jurisdictions and is adequate for two-way travel especially at low internal speeds.

Sewer

13. Reference is made to a memorandum from the Sewer & Water Commission to Board of Appeals dated February 20, 2020.

See responses to the memorandum from Sewer & Water Commission to Board of Appeals dated February 20, 2020

14. Invert elevations are not shown on the Utility Plans.

Inverts for all drainage and sewerage are labeled within the revised plan set.

15. No details on sewer pump stations are shown. The Town specifies Gorman Rupp suction lift package stations which are recommended for this development. The Town will not accept or maintain any part of the private wastewater system.

The plans have been revised to depict pump types and pump station design. Where this is a private development, the Applicant will maintain the sewer infrastructure on site.

16. Buildings 1, 2, 4, and the clubhouse should be modified to discharge directly into sewer manholes.

The sewer services at buildings 1-4 and the clubhouse have been modified to flow directly into a sewer manhole. This is shown on the revised site plan drawings.

17. Sewer services for all 48 unit buildings should be 8" SDR 35. All other services shall be 6" SDR 35. All buildings are required under plumbing code to have either 4" cast iron (commercial) or 4" schedule 40 PVC to 10' outside building. All services should then transition to SDR 35.

The sewer services for the apartment buildings are shown as 8" SDR 35, townhomes as 6" SDR 35 and single-family house as 4" SDR 35. The transition from 10 feet outside the structure will be shown on the Construction Drawings provided by the Plumbing Engineer and will not be reflected within the Site Plans.

18. Any 48 unit building with a garage will be required to have floor drains in the garage. Floor drains will need to drain to a properly vented oil/water separator which shall be connected to the sanitary wastewater system. This will require permitting with the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA).

Acknowledged. The garage floor drain system(s) will be provided with an oil/water separator system in accordance with MWRA requirements. The separator has been added to the revised Site Plans outside of the two apartment structures that contain garages.

19. The 48 unit buildings with elevator will be required by code to have a sump pump in the elevator pit. The sump pump discharge shall be shown.

Acknowledged. The sump pump discharge shall be shown on the plumbing/civil drawings as appropriate.

20. The current design shows 60 individual sewer injector pumps which serve the single family and some 3-4 unit multifamily homes. The injector pumps lift to a common force main which would then discharge to another sewer pump station. Given the sloping topography of the site we feel that a gravity collection system may be designed to drain to as few as two larger lift stations. This would be a better solution in the long run as a condominium association will be created and a professional manager will be present for the rental buildings and units. The Sewer & water Superintendent and myself would be available to advise on sewer lift station design.

The Applicant appreciated the comment and has shifted to a gravity system with pump or lift stations. The revised Site Plan set show gravity sewer to pump stations at collection points. All individual grinder pumps have been removed from the design.

Water

21. Reference is made to a memorandum from the Sewer & Water Commission to Board of Appeals dated February 20, 2020.

See responses to the memorandum from Sewer & Water Commission to Board of Appeals dated February 20, 2020

22. The water system is not looped. A loop is strongly encouraged.

The water system will be looped back to Summer Street and looped internally where practicable. Please see the revised Site Plan set.

23. The dead end to the north of Building #2 could be eliminated by routing the proposed water main to the west and north of Building #2 to connect where the fire hydrant is shown. The piece of main currently shown between Building #1 and #2 would not be necessary.

The piece of water main extending past Building #2 is required to provide water at the maintenance building, dog park and also provide water to the hydrant requested by the Fire Department.

24. Triple water gate assemblies shall be shown at all intersecting ways including the connection within Summer Street. The triple valve assembly in Summer Street shall be connected to existing main with long body solid sleeves. All other triple gate intersections shall be a tee, nipple with mega-lugs and the (open left) water gate installed as an assembly.

These call outs have been added to the Utility Plans and standard details added to the revised Detail Sheets.

25. All hydrant branches and building/fire services larger than 1" shall be served with an anchor tee and water gate.

These items are shown as standard details on the revised detail sheets.

26. All single family and multifamily units shall be served with 1" type K copper service with a curb shut off near the back of sidewalk or if there is not a sidewalk at similar distance off the back of curb (6'-7'). Curb shut offs shall be Buffalo style boxes.

This has been added as a standard detail on the revised Detail Sheets.

Utilities

27. Throughout the site there is minimal separation between utilities. Water/Gas/Electric appear to be in the same trench. The utility layout should provide as much separation as possible.

All utilities are shown with at least 3 feet of separation. This is more visible within the

detailed roadway cross section.

28. The proposed electric service is not looped or multi sourced. If there is a problem with electricity the homes with injector pumps and small storage capacities will become a problem.

The proposed electric service has been updated within the revised Site Plan to show it looping where practicable.

29. The applicant should verify that Columbia Gas will be able supply the new development without offsite improvements. If offsite gas main work is required plans will need to be submitted and there will be a requirement for curb to curb paving if main work is required. All offsite work will be secured either through the Board of Appeals or by the Board of Selectmen with values being approved by DPW/Engineering.

The Applicant may or may not use natural gas but will work with Columbia Gas or their successor as appropriate.

Details

30. The DPW's Typical Details for Water Main, Sewerage, Drainage, and Roadway construction shall be utilized and included in the design along with other site specific details provided by the designer. In general, the Town will apply design standards from its Subdivision Rules and Regulations where applicable and appropriate.

The Application is not subject to Subdivision rules and regulations; however, the applicant will use the regulations as a guideline where practical.

31. Sidewalks should be 5' wide excluding proposed curb.

The sidewalk detail and notes have been adjusted to show 5 feet in width excluding the curb.

32. Clay brick is required below frames and covers/grates and for sewer inverts.

The detail has been updated to reflect clay brick.

33. 5' of cover is required for water mains and services.

The water main detail has been adjusted, along with the profile, to show a minimum cover of 5 feet.

34. See above comment in "Water" section for comments applicable to details.

Comment unclear – no response

35. We have numerous comments on the Cross Sections

- a. Acceptable subgrade material should be specified.

Subgrade, as shown in the pavement cut sections, will be added to the cross sections.

- b. All sidewalks shall be 5' wide excluding the curb.

The sidewalk width has been updated.

- c. Sidewalk cross slope should be specified as 1.6% with 2% max.

The sidewalk cross slope has been specified in the revised detail.

- d. There should not be bituminous berm shown behind the sidewalk or vertical curb unless a very unusual situation occurs.
All roadway cross sections have been added and updated.
 - e. The material in the islands should be specified.
The material in the islands has been specified within the cross section and more specifically the revised Landscape Plans.
36. The entrance boulevard should have all granite curb. Vertical granite is preferred (TypeVB is acceptable except at rounding's into Summer St. which shall be VA4).
- Vertical granite curb is proposed at the entry to the project. Sloped bituminous is provided within the boulevard to allow for the area to be easily mountable by emergency equipment if necessary.**
37. There should be cross section for each type/segment of roadway. This would appear to be;
- a. Entrance boulevard with 16' travel lanes, granite curb, 8' island, and a bit sidewalk left side.
 - b. Transition section on boulevard to 16' travel lanes and 5' island with sidewalk left side.
 - c. Boulevard with 16' travel lanes, 5' island, and sidewalk left side.
 - d. Boulevard at bridge crossing. Note; we do not recommend reducing to 12' travel lanes.
 - e. 24' roadway with cape cod berm and sidewalk left side.
 - f. 24' aisle with parking on one side or both sides and sidewalk on one side or both sides.

Cross sections for all above cross section types have been added to the revised Detail Sheets within the plan set.

Traffic

38. The Traffic Impact Analysis Report should be peer reviewed by a consultant of the Board of Appeals choice. The developer should anticipate funding this effort which should include, initial review, follow up review, final reviews including several public hearings and review of items required under conditions of approval as well as internal coordination meetings. This effort should be coordinated through the Director of Community and Economic Development.

Tetra Tech was chosen to review the Traffic Impact Analysis by the board at the Applicant's expense.

Preliminary Review;

39. The analysis discusses but does not model Gillette Stadium events at all. Furthermore, the impacts of the events on local roads are not discussed with or without the proposed development during such events.

Gillette events are beyond the Applicant's control and traffic mitigation for events should be provided by the Kraft organization.

40. The analysis does not provide any analysis of proposed development internal circulation, geometric design, design speed, site distance, pedestrian movement, and signage.

Bayside performed an analysis of the internal site intersections and found that all intersections will operate at a good level of service when the project is fully occupied. (See Bayside Traffic Memorandum – Internal Analysis April 16, 2020 regarding internal traffic. Please refer to the updated Site Plans that show internal traffic control measures and signage.

41. The analysis does not analyze off site pedestrian travel at all. Concerns existing for the pedestrian travel through the train crossing on Summer Street, along Summer Street toward South Walpole Common and around the Common with the strongest emphasis on the route through the Common and to the Boyden School. The DPW is also concerned with connectivity and is concerned with a gap in the municipal sidewalk from Delapa Circle to Winter Street.

See the response to Comment No. 3. The municipal sidewalk from Delapa Circle to Winter Street is unrelated to the Cedars and the applicant will not fund this portion of sidewalk.

42. The analysis models five different intersections and eight different movements for the existing, future no-build, and future build conditions. While level of service (LOS) drops in some locations/movements for the future condition without development it drops additionally in several locations with the development. Given this scenario, we find it incomplete of the developer to have proposed only a Transportation Demand Program (TDM) for mitigation. While attempting to manage vehicle trips and encouraging alternative transportation is a worthy effort we would look for brick & mortar improvements in the surrounding area to be linked to this project.

The exiting levels of service for the five intersections and the calibrated existing, as well as future No-Build and Build scenario's, show that the intersections currently function at a high level of service and will continue to do so post development. (see Unsignalized Intersection Level of Service memorandum dated April 23, 2020). Therefore, the Applicant's position is that any improvement of existing infrastructure is not the responsibility of the Applicant. However, in the context of receiving a permit acceptable to the applicant without resorting to an appeal, the Applicant will agree to provide funding (not construct) for the construction of a side walk east of the site on the north side of Summer Street along with an accessible cross walk across Neponset Street. See attached Conceptual Sidewalk Improvement Plan dated April 10, 2020.

Transportation Workshop held at Town Hall 2/13/20

Representatives Walpole Police, Fire, Economic Development, Zoning, DPW, and Town Administration met with David Hale and Ken Cram of the development team to discuss transportation items in an informal workshop setting. A brief summary of the items discussed is noted as follows;

43. Town officials asked that the applicant review and report on the feasibility of making the intersection of Washington St., Water St., Washington St. Ext., Summer St. and Neponset St. a roundabout. The applicant expressed concern about availability of right of way and impacts to the historic South Walpole Common, however, Town officials felt that this analysis/feasibility should be provided.

The applicant's traffic analysis shows that the existing intersections of Washington Street and Summer Street, Washington Street, Neponset Street, Water Street and Washington Street Extension and Summer Street and Neponset Street will continue to function at a good level of service under the future build scenario. Therefore, there is no need to analyze changing the intersection to a roundabout. See the TIAS dated January 6, 2020 and the traffic memorandum dated April 23, 2020.

44. The developer wished to discuss the pedestrian route from the development to the Boyden School. The developer provided a printout of an aerial photo of the south Walpole area for discussion which was quickly noted to be outdated as DPW had paved Water Street recently and re-configured the pedestrian crossing at Water/Neponset/Summer Street. The developer proposed a flashing beacon at this location. Public Safety officials quickly requested a similar beacon at the pedestrian crossing at Washington/Water St.

The Applicant's traffic consultant's pedestrian memo dated March 10, 2020 shows that the existing crosswalks function at a high level. The crosswalks and sidewalks are existing infrastructure deemed safe enough by the town to service the existing neighborhood and therefore not the responsibility of the Applicant. However, in the context of receiving a permit acceptable to the applicant without resorting to an appeal, the Applicant will agree to provide funding (not construct) for the construction of a sidewalk east of the site on the north side of Summer Street along with an accessible crosswalk across Neponset Street. See attached Conceptual Sidewalk Improvement Plan dated April 10, 2020. The crosswalk funding would include the removal of the existing diagonal crosswalk across Neponset to Summer Street.

45. Public Safety officials also requested school crossing guards at the same locations and requested that the developer/development fund this cost. The applicant did not agree to permanent funding scheme but was going to consider the request.

Crossing Guards, if necessary, are the responsibility Town and not the applicant. The future Cedars owners/taxpayers and the Applicant will not pay for crossing guards.

46. Public safety requested a speed study on Washington Street in South Walpole with the goal of being able to lower posted speeds (must be submitted and approved by MassDOT). The existing DOT approved speed limits were presented to the applicant and traffic engineer.

The Public Safety desire for a lower speed limit on Washington street is not related to the Cedars Developments and could be studied by the Town and a subsequent request made to MassDOT to allow a lower speed limit made by the Town. The Applicant will not agree to perform the study.

47. Town officials requested that the developer extend the sidewalk along the west side of Summer Street so that pedestrians would not have to cross Summer Street from the development side at the current crosswalk on the north side of the railroad tracks. The preferred pedestrian path to the Boyden School appears to be on the west side of Summer Street and the north side of Washington Street with a crossing at its current location at the School. It was quickly understood that limited right of way (40') and existing telephone poles at this part of Summer Street appear to make this challenging. The Town requested the developer survey this and evaluate three options:
- a. Installing a sidewalk along this portion of Summer Street as it currently exists.

- b. Installing a sidewalk with additional right of way acquisition on the west side.
- c. Installing a sidewalk with curb and utility pole relocation which would slightly narrow the travelled way to keep the sidewalk within existing right of way.

The Applicant's position is that all existing off-site infrastructure is the responsibility of the Town. However, the Applicant's traffic consultant has surveyed Summer Street and provided a Conceptual Sidewalk Improvement Plan dated April 10, 2020 for a sidewalk on the north side of Summer Street as well as a crosswalk from the north side of Summer Street across Neponset Street where the sidewalk continues along the north side of Summer Street. In the context of receiving a permit acceptable to the Applicant without resorting to an appeal, the Applicant will agree to provide funding (not construct) for the construction of a sidewalk east of the site on the north side of Summer Street along with an accessible crosswalk across Neponset Street. The crosswalk funding would include the removal of the existing diagonal crosswalk across Neponset to Summer Street.

48. The DPW also requested the relocation of an existing crosswalk on Washington Street at Water Street further to the south and east to improve site distance at the crossing.

The Applicant's position is that the Cedars will have little impact on this crosswalk which is existing infrastructure and is the responsibility of the Town. The Applicant will not agree to fund the relocation of the Washington Street at Water Street crosswalk further to the south and east.

49. The DPW requested that the project infill the gap in sidewalk from Delapa Circle to Winter Street.

The lack of a sidewalk between Delapa and Winter streets is unrelated to the Cedars and the Applicant will not agree to fund the construction of this sidewalk.

Stormwater Report

50. We would prefer the soil test pit logs were furnished with the report. It would also be helpful for review if soil test pits are plotted on the Existing Watershed Plan, Existing Conditions Plan, and Grading and Drainage Plans.

The test pits data has been contained on a Detail Sheet within the revised Site Plans. Test pit locations have been added to the Existing Conditions Plan, Grading and Drainage Plans and the Pre-Development Subcatchment Map.

51. The report assumes the site is entirely A soils (well drained) for the purposes of calculating recharge volume which is a conservative assumption that likely over estimates the required recharge volume. However, the report also utilizes an A soil (well drained) aggressive Rawls rate for stormwater infiltration of 2.41"/hour within the HydroCAD calculations and for proposed detention basin drawdowns. Soil maps show a variety of soils on the site and we feel that further investigation is required and that the 2.41" Rawls rate may not be appropriate for all detention

basins. If the rate is reduced to reflect C soils some of the basins as designed would not drawdown within the required 72 hours.

Soil testing in the areas of all infiltration areas have been conducted and Rawl's rates adjusted per the subsoil texture as required in the Massachusetts Stormwater Management Handbook. All infiltration areas have been documented to drain within the required 72 hours in the Hydrology section of the Supplemental Data Report.

52. Proposed detention ponds 3, 4, & 5 appear to be designed in the groundwater table or at groundwater. DEP requires 2' separation minimum and possibly more if mounding calculations are required. The requirement for separation from groundwater is not negotiable as this area is within Walpole's well recharge and water quality is a concern.

Soil testing conducted in the areas of all infiltration ponds. Ponds have been adjusted, where necessary, to allow for a minimum of a 2-foot offset from the estimated seasonal high groundwater.

53. Four of the five proposed detention basins (1, 2, 4, & 5) do not have the required 1' off freeboard capacity above the modelled 100 year storm elevation. They all should have this.

All infiltration ponds have been revised to provide for 1 foot of freeboard. This is reflective in the 100 year storm event for all ponds.

54. The report should include a Rational Method pipe sizing table for the 10 year storm along with a proposed catchment area map for all inlets. The plan is much easier to review if the proposed catchment areas show the various areas for each inlet. HydroCad would also be acceptable if it is run for all inlets and routed through the pipe design.

HydroCAD has been utilized to design the stormwater management design and adequacy of pipe sizing. Please see the attached HydroCAD analysis to show pipe sizing.

Waivers

55. The applicant lists many waivers from local regulations. Among the waivers is a blanket request to waive the Site Plan Review under Section 13 of the Zoning Bylaw. If the Board of Appeals grants this waiver we recommend that Section 13-9 & 13-10 General Site Development Standards and Guidelines and Drainage Standards not be waived as they provide guidelines no site should be without.

The Applicant will adhere to all Section 13 Site Plan Review Section 10. General Site Development and Standards except for (6) requiring all paved surfaces designed for vehicular use to be paved in accordance with Walpole standards. We request a varied roadway cross section that does not adhere to the Walpole standard. Section 11.0 refers to the Drainage Standards. The Applicant's plans and calculations will adhere to these requirements except for E.(2) requiring the use of RCP. The Applicant requests the use of HDPE for all drainage.

The development will meet all state storm water management standards and regulations.

56. The request for waivers for Sewer & Water Fees is addressed in the memorandum of the Sewer & Water Commission to the Board of appeals dated February 20, 2020.

See responses to the memorandum from Sewer & Water Commission to Board of Appeals dated February 20, 2020

We consider the initial submission to be preliminary and reserve the right to provide comment on this submission and later submissions either on our own or through peer reviewers. We remain available should any items require further discussion.

Cc: R. Mattson, C. Johnson, B. Marshall, DPW
Sewer & Water Commission
Conservation Commission
Planning Board

H:\Documents\zba\summerst40b\initialsubmission\comments1.doc