

NOTE: The Applicant comments included below are reflected in bold italic font.

Tetra Tech (TT) has reviewed specific submittal materials for the above-referenced Project to assist the Town of Walpole Zoning Board of Appeals (Board) in its Comprehensive Permit review of the proposed Multi-Family Residential Development at 981, 989 and 1015 East Street hereafter referred to as the “Gilmore 40B Project”. The following letter provides comments generated during our review of Applicant submittals and generally focuses on substantive concerns that speak to issues whose eventual resolution may substantially impact Project design or could otherwise result in potentially unsafe conditions or unanticipated impacts.

The comments below are intended to guide discussion as well as inform development of the revised plans and we expect to provide more detailed comments as the design and discussion advances. We understand revised submittals have been provided to the ZBA. The comments below are based on the prior submittals and do not reflect any changes or supplemental information that may be included in the revised submission. Our review is based on the following materials available on the ZBA’s website as of August 30, 2023:

- A plan set titled "Preliminary Civil Engineering Plan Set" for Proposed Multi-Family Development, 981, 989, & 1015 East Street, Town of Walpole, Norfolk County, Massachusetts (Site Plans), dated May 31, 2023 prepared by Bohler Engineering (Bohler).
- A series of figures including a Landscape Plan (Sheet C-701) dated May 31, 2023 and an undated “Proposed Site Lighting” figure prepared by Bohler.
- A “Fire Truck Turn Exhibit” Sheet 01, dated May 31, 2023, prepared by Bohler.
- Two (2) untitled figures both noted as Sheet 01 and dated May 31, 2023, prepared by Bohler. A 20 scale drawing showing a proposed crosswalk and flashing beacon and green arrow depicting pedestrian route and a 40 scale drawing showing only the pedestrian route.
- A letter to Patrick Deschenes, Department Director “RE: Engineering Memorandum - Proposed Multi-Family Development - 981, 989 & 1015 East Street - Walpole, MA” dated May 31, 2023, prepared by Bohler (Engineering Report).
- A “Transportation Impact Assessment” for a Proposed Residential Development - 1015 East Street (Route 27) - Walpole, Massachusetts (Traffic Report) dated October 2022, prepared by Vanasse & Associates Inc (VAI).
- A memorandum from VAI dated April 27, 2023 with subject line title “Transportation Impact Assessment Update” (Traffic Report Update).
- Related Exhibits
- Comment letters from Town Boards, Commissions and Departments.

The Plans and accompanying materials were reviewed for good engineering practice, overall site plan efficiency, stormwater, utilities, traffic, and public safety. In general, the plans and supporting materials were thoughtfully prepared and we appreciate the clarity and completeness of documents provided. However, some critical drainage design information is missing that in our opinion should be provided to confirm the program described is capable of meeting applicable stormwater design standards. Our initial comments are provided below and are generally organized by submittal.

We want to first introduce the Exhibits that are being attached/included in conjunction with this written submittal as they will be frequently referenced in the written responses below. The Exhibits are as follows:

- Exhibit 1 Updated Civil Engineering Plan Set prepared by Bohler and dated 9.29.2023***
- Exhibit 2 Updated Loading Truck Turning Movement Plan prepared by Bohler and dated 9.29.2023***
- Exhibit 3 Garbage Truck Exhibit prepared by Bohler and dated 9.29.2023***
- Exhibit 4 (three sheets) Sight Distance Plans prepared by Vanasse and Associates***
- Exhibit 5 Sidewalk Existing Consisting Plan prepared by Vanasse and Associates***
- Exhibit 6 Ground Floor Plan/Bike Room prepared by Embarc***
- Exhibit 7 Mass DOT Crash Data***

Site Plans

Demolition Plan (Sheet C-201)

1. The limits of abandonment vs. removal are unclear. We recommend any utilities discontinued by the Project within the public way be removed to avoid potential future settlement, utility congestion or confusion that would otherwise become the Town's responsibility to address.

Response: The Project utility plan, including those utilities to be discontinued, have been updated in the recent submittal. More specifically, the updated utility plan also reflects the removal to the service main in East Street. Please Refer to "Exhibit 1", the revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Plan Set prepared by Bohler, dated September 29, 2023.

Site Layout Plan (Sheet C-301)

2. It's unclear how the loading area is intended to operate given the location of the proposed garage entrance. We recommend the applicant be required to provide a plan showing expected loading operations including clear indication of vehicle staging.

Response: Refer to "Exhibit 2", which illustrates a loading truck parked parallel to the building, which allows car access and egress from the parking garage.

3. The sidewalk awkwardly terminates at the garage/loading area precluding the ability for a resident to walk around the building on a sidewalk.

Response: Sidewalks are provided around majority of the building and in proximity to most of the onsite parking stalls. Pedestrian access is not proposed to extend across the parking garage entrance. The proposed project does NOT have thousands of daily vehicle trips,

as such, pedestrians should not have challenges circumventing the property safely with what will only be a small break in the interior sidewalk.

4. Vehicles exiting the garage will have a difficulty seeing vehicles approaching from the east due to the exiting approach angle and the garage wall. Recommend applicant consider providing a mirror or similar device to providing exiting vehicles a means of considering approaching traffic.

Response: The Applicant proposes to add a stop bar at the garage egress lane and a stop bar and sign at the westbound drive lane approaching the garage. Refer to Exhibit 1.

5. There appears to be no substantive space to store snow. Recommend the applicant provide a summary of how snow will be managed on site given the apparent lack of space available.

Response: The Operation and Maintenance Plan included in the Drainage Report will be revised to note that "snow removal shall be the responsibility of the property owner. Salting and/or sanding of pavement/walkway areas during winter conditions shall be done in accordance with all state/local requirements and approvals. Snow will be removed if it cannot be stored on-site outside of parking spaces, drive-aisles, sidewalks or within areas required to maintain vehicular sight distance." A revised Drainage Report will be submitted under separate cover at a future date.

6. A small portion of the patio area near the southwest corner of the building extends into the public way. Typically, private patio space would not encumber the public way.

Response: Per Section 12(B.1) of the Bylaws, "The location of... walkways, outdoor gathering places... should reflect a thoughtful approach that focuses primarily on providing optimal access and mobility for pedestrians on and between sites". The Applicant proposes to enhance and maintain pedestrian connections between the site and the public way, which provides an added benefit to the Town. As such, we acknowledge a very small portion of are patio area extends into the public way, but the design has been formulated based upon many different meetings and requests issued by the Board of Selectmen and other municipal departments.

7. There is almost no landscape relief or vertical interest in the parking area. Recommend the applicant consider forgoing 2-3 parking spaces to allow for interior landscape islands with street trees to break up the long run of parking along the building's north side.

Response: The ZBA has unequivocally stated through the public hearing process its desire to have the maximum number of on-site parking spaces. As such, we have decided based upon that guidance not to sacrifice parking spaces in the interest of adding trees. Should the ZBA soften its position on the parking space supply, we would be willing to explore some selective plantings. In addition, the applicant did however add additional plantings to the project at the request of the Board. The additional plantings were included in the landscape plan revised through 8/30/2023 which was previously submitted into the public record. Moreover, the landscaping plan included in Exhibit 1 is the definitive landscaping plan moving forward.

Grading and Drainage Plan (Sheets C-401)

8. Building finish floor elevation appears to be mislabeled as 442.0 instead of 412.0. Please address in future submittals.

Response: *The building finish floor elevation has been corrected to elevation 142.0 on Exhibit 1.*

9. A wall is shown along the northwest property boundary that retains approximately 5 feet of grade on the abutting property yet does not provide any offset from the property line in which to accommodate the construction without impacting the abutting property. Recommend the applicant provide a description of how they intend to construct the wall in the location shown without impacting the abutting property or otherwise modify the layout.

Response: *A new retaining wall has been proposed on the Project site along the northern property line. The retaining wall is proposed to be designed by a stamped structural engineer; however, it is anticipated that the wall will be constructed of vertical blocks without tiebacks and with no impact to the abutting property. The wall detail has been included within Exhibit 1 and a detail included on sheet C-902 to show design intent.*

10. The design includes several underground infiltration systems but does not appear to provide any test pit information verifying assumed soil conditions or estimated seasonal high groundwater. Recommend the applicant provide test pit results verifying assumed soil and groundwater conditions to demonstrate viability of the proposed stormwater design.

Response: *Bohler performed onsite soil testing on August 17, 2023. Testing information and estimated seasonal high groundwater (ESHGW) is provided in Appendix C of the Drainage Report prepared by Bohler, dated August 30, 2023.*

11. Infiltration System 1 shows no outlet despite the model indicating a 12" discharge and the system is not sized adequately to empty by infiltration nor is any overflow provided. As shown, the system will overflow to East Street via CB-101. Recommend the design be modified so that no discharge is directed to the public way.

Response: *Acknowledged. A revised Drainage Report will be submitted under separate cover at a future date and will address this comment. Bohler is currently working on developing an updated plan to reflect this request.*

12. Off locus drainage work is proposed at the northeast corner of the site which is critical to the design and functionality of the proposed stormwater improvements and the outlet elevation which is also critical is noted as "approximate" and appears to conflict with contour and wetland information shown in the same area. Recommend the plans be modified to address the issues noted and show how the proposed system will discharge and all improvements required. Documentation provided does not demonstrate a viable stormwater design.

Response: *Acknowledged. Additional survey work is currently being conducted in the northeast corner and along the eastern edge of the site. Revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Plans will be submitted under separate cover at a future date to address this comment.*

13. The plan indicates a Bordering Vegetated Wetland (BVW) is located at the northeast corner of the site and that drainage work is proposed within it and a substantial portion of the parking lot (including Stormwater Management Area 3) is within the 100-foot buffer zone subject to jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act.

Response: *Acknowledged. The Project will file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) and Walpole Conservation Commission. The filing of the NOI is anticipated to occur after the conclusion of the Comprehensive Permit process.*

Utility Plan (Sheet C-501)

14. The proposed sewer relocation results in sewers with very shallow slopes including at least one section whose slope is substantially lower than recommended by NEWPC TR-16 which is the recognized standard for public sewer design. The Project proposes an 8-inch public sewer at 0.26% slope when TR-16 recommends a minimum 0.4% slope for 8-inch sewers. Recommend the applicant provide documentation demonstrating the proposed sewer relocations comply with minimum standards described in Chapter 2 of TR-16.

Response: *The initial sewer design as submitted was reviewed with Carl Balduf, Town Engineer. Carl, the Department of Public Works (DPW) Director, and Water and Sewer (W&S) Superintendent. The Town is currently soliciting a proposal from the Town's wastewater consultant, Weston & Sampson, to further assess the existing conditions.*

The Applicant would anticipate a condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require a successful conclusion to comment #14 as a condition of a Building Permit. Moreover, Bohler is in receipt of a sewer markup from the Town Engineer dated 8/30/23, which proposes to shift the relocated sewer easement to align in parallel with the east side of the proposed building. These changes will be further reflected in the Civil Engineering Plan Set of Record which will be submitted prior to the conclusion of the public hearing process. The details of the plan will be coordinated with the revised stormwater design which will be submitted under separate cover at a future date.

Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan (Sheet C-601)

15. The alignment of the stone construction entrances creates an awkward entry onto East Street. Recommend the entrances be oriented at right angles to East Street as shown on the construction detail.

Response: *The stone construction entrances have been modified and oriented at right angles to East Street, as requested. As noted on the revised plans, the limit of stone shall be maintained per the detail if modified to allow for the construction of the building, onsite utilities, and other site features.*

16. The plan does not show any perimeter controls (ie. compost sock) along the eastern site boundary despite proposed grade being directed towards the abutting parcel. Recommend the plan be modified to incorporate perimeter controls wherever grade slopes away from the subject parcel.

Response: *Acknowledged. Additional survey work is currently being conducted along the eastern edge of the site. Revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Plans will be submitted under separate cover at a future date to address this comment.*

Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Notes and Details (Sheet C-602)

17. The "Compost Sock" detail shows hay bales rather than compost filter sock.

Response: *The Compost Sock detail has been revised accordingly.*

Landscape Plan (Sheet C-701)

18. The plan shows a single canopy tree in the southeast planting area which is inconsistent with that shown on the Cover, Sheet A010 and Sheet A401 of the Architectural Package suggesting otherwise. Recommend the Landscape Plan and the Architectural Plans be coordinated to present a single expectation.

Response: *The single canopy tree referenced above was removed in the last round of renderings discussed at a previous public hearing. Sheets 701 and 702 in Exhibit 1 are the definitive landscaping plans moving forward. Future architectural submissions will remove sheet A010 which is now outdated.*

19. The plan shows landscape improvements within the public way. Recommend any decision approving the Comprehensive Permit include a condition requiring the Project to maintain any landscaping proposed within the public way.

Response: *Acknowledged.*

20. The submittals include conflicting Landscape Plans with identical dates and titles. Please clarify which plan applies, Exhibit H or Landscape Plan included in the Civil Plan Set and include applicable plan in future Civil Plan sets.

Response: *Refer to Exhibit 1 for the most current Landscape Plans and details.*

Lighting Plan (Sheet C-703)

21. The plan indicates light from the project will spill onto abutting parcels along the entire project boundary and at significant intensity (> 2 fc) at several locations.

Response: *The lighting plan has been revised to reduce intensities to 0.2fc or less on abutting parcels and is included within Exhibit 1*

22. The plan does not appear to be consistent with proposed fixture layout. For example, light levels near the light fixture in the northeast parking area are shown to increase as you move away from the fixture. Recommend the plans be modified to reflect the fixture layout shown and that light spill onto abutting property be eliminated or at least reduced to no greater than 0.2 fc unless otherwise approved by the abutting landowner.

Response: *The lighting plan has been revised to align with the current fixture layout and to reduce intensities to 0.2fc or less on abutting parcels and is included within Exhibit 1.*

Detail Sheet (C-902)

23. The retaining wall detail provided suggests significant excavation and the installation of geotextile fabric anchors will be required on the abutting railroad property. Recommend the applicant confirm intent or otherwise modify the design.

Response: *The retaining wall is proposed to be designed by a stamped structural engineer; however, it is anticipated that the wall will be constructed of vertical blocks without tiebacks and with no impact to the abutting property. The wall detail has been updated within Exhibit 1 and per detail on sheet C-902 to show design intent.*

Detail Sheet (C-903)

24. The details for the stormwater storage systems lack critical information required to confirm system dimensions and required separation from groundwater. Recommend the applicant be required to provide basic design information needed to reasonably conclude the systems are capable of meeting design criteria of the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook. At a minimum, the information should include (1) separation from ESHGW, (2) system bottom elevation, and (3) isolator row elevation.

Response: *Bohler performed onsite soil testing on August 17, 2023. Testing information and estimated seasonal high groundwater (ESHGW) is provided in Appendix C of the Drainage Report prepared by Bohler, dated August 30, 2023 and previously submitted into the public record. Further revised Preliminary Civil Engineering Plans and an updated Drainage Report will be submitted under separate cover at a future date to further address this comment.*

Existing Conditions Plan

25. The existing conditions plan suggests the site is partially within Riverfront Area but it's unclear how that was determined or if the location is accurate. The performance standards for work within Riverfront can be very stringent and should be considered in the design but it appears the site area within the Riverfront is mostly impervious already completely suggesting the Project has a fair amount of flexibility.

Response: *The Project proposes impacts within previously disturbed easement areas located within the 100' Riverfront Buffer Zone. The Proponent proposes to offset these impacts with significant improvements to the site including stormwater mitigation and recharge and landscaping and pedestrian improvements.*

26. The plan indicates the existing drain line leaving the site is a 12" line. It's unclear how the Project can propose replacing the 12" drain with a 24" drain without increasing peak discharge rates. Please clarify.

Response: *Acknowledged. An updated Civil Engineering Plan Set as well as an updated Drainage Report will be submitted under separate cover at a future date to address this comment.*

Bohler Engineering Memorandum

27. The memorandum does not include figures depicting existing or proposed watershed boundaries used in the analysis. Recommend applicant provide figures showing the boundaries to assist in our review of the analysis. Please note, the analysis identifies a single discharge point (DP1) when the proposed plans indicate runoff will discharge from the site directly to East Street and to the abutting property to the east. The analysis should compare pre- and post-development conditions at each point where runoff leaves the subject property to insure no increase in discharge to any abutter.

Response: *Refer to Appendices D & E of the Drainage Report prepared by Bohler, dated August 30, 2023, for the Existing Conditions and Proposed Conditions Drainage Maps, respectively. Additional survey work is currently being conducted along the eastern edge of the site. The abutting parcel is higher in elevation than the subject site, and therefore additional area drains will be required to capture runoff along the eastern property line. An updated Civil Engineering Plan Set as well as an updated Drainage Report will be submitted under separate cover at a future date to address this comment.*

28. The memorandum indicates soil conditions were assumed and groundwater was estimated based on “boring data prepared by McPhail Associates” neither of which complies with methods prescribed in the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook. We recognize the memorandum notes that “Test pits will be completed to confirm onsite soil classifications and depth to seasonal high groundwater and will be provided in a drainage report prepared and submitting during subsequent permitting efforts.” However, that information is foundational to determining if the project as currently described can be constructed in compliance with applicable standards. We recommend the applicant conduct at least two (2) test pits to provide a more conclusive assessment of soil conditions given (1) draw down times approach the maximum 72-hour limit, (2) presence of nearby wetlands suggest water surface may be higher than indicated in borings, (3) analysis indicates almost no “wiggle room” in the pre- vs. post peak runoff comparison and (4) options for expanding or relocating systems is limited. If test pits show inconsistent results additional pits may be needed.

Response: *Bohler performed onsite soil testing on August 17, 2023. Testing information and draw down calculations are provided in the Drainage Report prepared by Bohler, dated August 30, 2023 and previously submitted into the public record.*

29. Pond #1 does not match conditions shown on plans. Please address inconsistency.

Response: *An updated Civil Engineering Plan Set as well as an updated Drainage Report will be submitted under separate cover at a future date to address this comment*

30. Drawdown calculations are based on an assumed infiltration rate for the higher of two potential type “C” soils without any supporting field investigation. If actual field testing indicates soils are slower infiltrating soils, then drawdown times would exceed maximum allowed by a significant amount. Recommend applicant be required to provide at least some basic on-site testing to support critical design assumptions.

Response: *Bohler performed onsite soil testing on August 17, 2023. Testing information and draw down calculations are provided in the Drainage Report prepared by Bohler, dated August 30, 2023. Based upon the soils discovered during testing, infiltration rates of 2.41 in/hr are modeled at test pits (TP) #2-6 for Stormwater Management Areas #2-4 and 1.02in/hr at TP #1 for Stormwater Management Area #1.*

Traffic

31. The building program, including number of residential units, parking supply and parking layout (surface versus garage parking spaces) presented in the traffic study update, updated architectural plans and updated site plans are inconsistent. Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant confirm the currently proposed building program.

Response: *The current development program features the construction of 142 residential units that will be supported by 171 parking spaces. The October 2022 Transportation Impact Assessment (the "October 2022 TIA") was based on a 148-unit development program with 187 parking spaces, slightly larger than the current program. The current plan sets of record reflect the current building program.*

32. The Applicant is seeking approval for a reduction in approximately 40 percent in the parking supply required by local zoning bylaws. The Applicant has submitted a parking narrative (dated September 6, 2023) describing the anticipated parking operations at the site and a comparison of the proposed parking supply to other area residential developments. Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant also provide an estimate of peak parking demand based on empirical data from other similar residential developments or using industry standard parking rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers to ensure that adequate parking will be provided.

Response: *Parking demand data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)¹ for multifamily residential communities in a similar setting (within 0.5 miles of a train station) indicates that the average peak parking demand is 1.12 parking spaces per residential unit and the 85th percentile peak parking demand is 1.27 parking spaces per residential unit. The Project will provide a parking ratio of 1.20 parking spaces per unit, which is consistent with the ITE parking demand data.*

33. The traffic study included a crash analysis of the study intersections which indicated that the unsignalized Elm Street/East Street and Elm Street/West Street intersections experience above-average crash rates. Per the TIA, the Applicant commits to conducting a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at these locations to identify potential short-term and long-term improvements to enhance safety. The TIA also states that the Applicant will design and construct short-term improvements identified in the RSAs. Any improvements proposed for these locations will require review and approval by the Town. We recommend any decision approving the Project include a condition requiring the Project to perform the RSA and construct any short-term improvements approved by the Town prior to occupancy.

¹*Parking Generation*, 5th Edition; Institute of Transportation Engineers; Washington, D.C.; January 2019.

Response: *The Applicant has agreed to facilitate the completion of the RSAs at the subject intersections and to provide funds to the Town to design and construct the short-term improvements that are recommended as an outcome of the RSAs. The Applicant would expect the requests to be reflected as a condition(s) within the Comprehensive Permit.*

34. The TIA states that the Applicant commits to designing and implementing traffic signal timing, phasing and coordination improvements at the coordinated signal system along Main Street at its intersections with East Street, Stone Street/Glenwood Avenue/West Street and Common Street/Elm Street. Any improvements proposed for these locations will require review and approval by the Town. We recommend any decision approving the Project include a condition requiring the Project to perform the work described prior to occupancy.

Response: *Per the Terms of the Memorandum of Agreement dated November 22nd 2022 executed between the Applicant and the Board of Selectmen, The Applicant has agreed to provide the Town with necessary funds to design and implement an optimal traffic signal timing, phasing and coordination plan for the subject intersections.*

35. Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant provide the supporting MassDOT crash data used in the TIA crash analysis for the Town to review.

Response: *The MassDOT crash data that was reviewed as a part of the October 2022 TIA has been included as Exhibit 7.*

36. The TIA states that secure bicycle parking will be provided in a bike room within the parking garage, yet no such space is shown of the proposed garage floor plan. Tetra Tech recommends that the bike room be shown on the garage floor plan noting the anticipated bike path between the bike room and the surface lot. Please note any adjustments to parking count that result.

Response: *A bike room has been added and is reflected in Exhibit 6 which is the ground floor plan. Secure tenant bike storage room is now featured on the first floor. The bike room will feature a prefabricated bike stacking system, a bike repair station, and space for an oversized bike, and can accommodate approximately 25 full-sized adult bikes. This room will open to an internal corridor which has at grade secure exterior access.*

37. The fire truck turning exhibit shows the fire truck accessing the site to/from the east via East Street. Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant also evaluate emergency vehicle access at the site to/from the west. Additionally, Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant describe emergency vehicle access to the proposed underground parking garage and the south side of the proposed building through the 12-space parking lot. The Applicant should review the updated site plan with the Walpole Fire Department to ensure that safe and efficient access to the site will be provided.

Response: *Comments were provided by the Fire Chief, Paul Barry, in a letter dated July 25, 2023, and responded to by Bohler in a letter to John Lee and the Zoning Board of Appeals on September 6, 2023. The fire truck circulation exhibit was updated to address Chief Barry's comments to minimize the fire truck crossing lanes of traffic as part of the normal circulation pattern and to show the fire truck exit west when leaving the*

property. It is the Applicant's understanding that there are no additional comments from the Fire Department.

38. Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant describe anticipated delivery and moving truck operations and conduct an AutoTurn analysis to confirm that these services/vehicles can be adequately accommodated on-site without impeding on-site access, circulation, and/or parking as well as operations on East Street.

Response: ***Refer to "Exhibit 2", which illustrates a loading truck parked parallel to the building, which allows car access and egress from the parking garage.***

39. Exhibit G suggests a package delivery pull off area will be provided which is inconsistent with the Site Plans and the Lighting Plan. Please clarify.

Response: ***The proposed development program represented in Exhibit 1 has been updated to show a vehicular pull off area at the southern parking area along the internal curb line adjacent to East Street. Plan sets have been updated accordingly.***

40. Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant describe the anticipated trash pick-up operations and conduct an AutoTurn analysis to confirm that trash pick-up can be adequately accommodated without impeding on-site access, circulation, and/or parking as well as operations on East Street.

Response: ***Trash and recycling will be collected in totes within the trash room in the garage and will be wheeled outside of the garage for pick-up and placed in an area that will not impede circulation within the Project site. The totes will be returned to the trash room after pick-up. In addition, each floor of the building is served by a trash room with a trash and recycling chute. These chutes terminate at the main trash room (A101) which has grade access at the rear of the building. There are compactors and additional bins located in this room. In the first-floor tenant trash room, there is access to additional cardboard recycling. Removal of oversized items will be coordinated through property management. There are no dumpsters on site. Approximately two (2) to three (3) times a week a private waste management company will park in the loading zone and empty the trash, recycling, and cardboard bins. It is expected that each time they will be onsite for approximately 15-30 minutes. These times will be coordinated and determined by the Property Management company and established to confirm no interference with anticipated tenant move-ins and move-outs.***

41. Tetra Tech agrees with the proposed site access improvements to provide a Stop bar at the site driveway approaches to East Street. Tetra Tech recommends that a Stop sign be installed for vehicles exiting the garage and that all proposed traffic signage and pavement markings for the project be MUTCD-compliant.

Response: ***A STOP-sign and marked STOP-line will be provided for vehicles approaching the garage driveway from the east due to the sight line limitation posed by the wall along***

the north side of the garage ramp. Vehicles exiting the parking garage will also be placed under STOP control. All signs and pavement markings to be installed within the Project site will be MUTCD compliant. Refer to Exhibit 1.

All traffic signage and pavement markings shall be MUTCD-compliant as noted in the General Site Notes provided on the General Notes Sheet in Exhibit 1 (C-102).

42. The TIA states that the Applicant commits to implementing a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program for the Project. Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant coordinate the specific elements of the TDM program with the Town as a condition of approval.

Response: The Applicant will accept a condition to the Comprehensive Permit which requires the implementation of a TDM program as outlined in the October 2022 TIA and in coordination with the Town.

43. Tetra Tech recommends that the site plans be updated to include stopping sight distance (SSD) and intersection sight distance (ISD) plans and profiles at all proposed site driveways on East Street to confirm that minimum American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AAHTO) SSD and ISD criteria is met based on the observed 85th percentile travel speeds. The Applicant should ensure that any proposed landscaping, signage, and walls do not obstruct sight lines for vehicles and for pedestrians. Additionally, there is an existing horizontal curve on East Street adjacent to the westerly side of the site. The Applicant should confirm that sight line easements from nearby properties will not be required to meet minimum SSD and ISD criteria.

Response: Sight triangle plans have been prepared for the Project site driveway intersections and is included as Exhibit 4. The sight triangle plans demonstrate that the sight lines for the Project site driveways are located within the Project site and the public right-of-way. A note has been added to the sight triangle plans that states that no objects shall be placed within the sight triangle areas that would exceed 2.5 feet in height and that snow accumulation (windrows) that exceed this height will be promptly removed. A sight line profile was not prepared as there are no vertical obstructions that would inhibit sight lines at the Project site driveway intersections along East Street.

As stated previously, STOP-signs and marked STOP-lines will be provided at the parking garage driveway intersection with the internal drive in order to address the potential sight line limitation posed by the wall along the north side of the garage driveway.

44. The October 2022 TIA included an evaluation of SSD and ISD at one site driveway location. The site plan shows four site driveways proposed along East Street. Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant conduct a sight distance evaluation of all proposed site driveway intersections with East Street. The evaluation should be based on the observed 85th percentile travel speeds and the calculations should be provided to the Town for review.

Response: *Updated sight distance measurements were conducted at the Project site driveway intersections along East Street following the methodology defined in the October 2022 TIA and using the measured 85th percentile vehicle travel speed along East Street (30 mph). Table 11R summarizes the updated sight distance measurements.*

Table 11R
SIGHT DISTANCE MEASUREMENTS^a

Intersection/Sight Distance Measurement	Feet		
	Required Minimum (SSD)	Desirable (ISD) ^b	Measured
<i>East Street at the East Project Site Driveway</i>			
<i>Stopping Sight Distance:</i>			
East Street approaching from the east	200	--	500+
East Street approaching from the west	200	--	349
<i>Intersection Sight Distance:</i>			
Looking to the east from the Project Site Driveway	200	290	358
Looking to the west from the Project Site Driveway	200	335	385
<i>East Street at the Center Enter Project Site Driveway</i>			
<i>Stopping Sight Distance:</i>			
East Street approaching from the east	200	--	500+
East Street approaching from the west	200	--	349
<i>East Street at the Center Exit Project Site Driveway</i>			
<i>Stopping Sight Distance:</i>			
East Street approaching from the east	200	--	500+
East Street approaching from the west	200	--	349
<i>Intersection Sight Distance:</i>			
Looking to the east from the Project Site Driveway	200	290	358
Looking to the west from the Project Site Driveway	200	335	385
<i>East Street at the West Project Site Driveway</i>			
<i>Stopping Sight Distance:</i>			
East Street approaching from the east	200	--	500+
East Street approaching from the west	200	--	349
<i>Intersection Sight Distance:</i>			
Looking to the east from the Project Site Driveway	200	290	358
Looking to the west from the Project Site Driveway	200	335	385

^aRecommended minimum values obtained from *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, 7th Edition; American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO); 2018; and based on a 30 mph approach speed along East Street.

^bValues shown are the intersection sight distance for a vehicle turning right or left exiting a roadway under STOP control such that motorists approaching the intersection on the major street should not need to adjust their travel speed to less than 70 percent of their initial approach speed.

As can be seen in Table 11R, the available lines of sight at the Project site driveway intersections with East Street were found to exceed the recommended minimum sight distance to function in a safe (SSD) manner based on a 30 mph approach speed, which is consistent with or above, with both the measured 85th percentile vehicle travel speed along East Street (27/30 mph) and the posted speed limit in the vicinity of the Project site (25 mph).

45. The Applicant has provided a sidewalk exhibit which presents a conceptual sidewalk extension from the proposed westerly site driveway on the north side of East Street to the existing crosswalk at Glenwood Avenue. Per the Applicant's September 6, 2023 response to DPW comments, the Applicant

indicates that the conceptual sidewalk improvements shown in the Exhibit would be engineered and installed by the Town. Tetra Tech recommends that this assumption be confirmed with the Walpole DPW and that the Project construct the portion of the sidewalk along the site frontage.

Response: *See response directly below. The Applicant believes Tetra Tech's comment #45 appears twice?*

45. The Applicant has provided a sidewalk exhibit which presents a conceptual sidewalk extension from the proposed westerly site driveway on the north side of East Street to the existing crosswalk at Glenwood Avenue. Per the Applicant's September 6, 2023 response to DPW comments, the Applicant indicates that the conceptual sidewalk improvements shown in the Exhibit would be engineered and installed by the Town. Tetra Tech recommends that this assumption be confirmed with the Walpole DPW and that the Project construct the portion of the sidewalk along the site frontage.

Response: *Per the Terms of the Memorandum of Agreement dated November 22nd 2022 executed between the Applicant and the Board of Selectmen, the Applicant has committed funds for the Town to design and construct the sidewalk segment along the north side of East Street between the Project site and the existing crosswalk at Glenwood Avenue, which will be improved to include a pedestrian actuated Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB) with accompanying pedestrian crossing warning signs and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant wheelchair ramps.*

46. Given that the trip generation estimates summarized in the TIA and TIA update take credit for available public transportation and that the Applicant is seeking approval of a parking supply approximately 40 percent less than required by zoning, Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant inventory the existing pedestrian connections between the site and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Walpole commuter rail station. This should include the connection between the MBTA station and Elm Street. As part of this inventory, Tetra Tech recommends that the Applicant identify potential improvements to any existing deficiencies, including but not limited to the installation of rectangular rapid flashing beacons at crosswalks and safety enhancements at any rail crossings.

Response: *An existing conditions sidewalk exhibit has been included as Exhibit 5 and illustrates the condition of the existing sidewalks and pedestrian facilities that will link the Project site to the MBTA Walpole Commuter Rail Station. As identified in response to Comment 45, the Applicant has committed funds to the Town to reconstruct the sidewalk along the Project site frontage on East Street and to extend the sidewalk to the existing crosswalk at Glenwood Avenue.*

As depicted on Exhibit 5, the following existing deficiencies were identified between the Glenwood Avenue crosswalk and the MBTA Walpole Commuter Rail Station:

- *A lack of sidewalk along the north side of East Street between the Project and Glenwood Avenue (to be constructed along the Project site frontage in*

conjunction with the Project and by others between the Project site and Glenwood Avenue);

- *The rectangular rabid flashing beacon (RRFB) at the crosswalk across East Street west of Glenwood Avenue does not work as of September 2023 (the RRFB will be completed and operation before a Certificate of Occupancy is provided for the Project); and*
- *No pedestrian control equipment is provided for crossing the MBTA commuter line railroad at the Walpole Station.*

Email Correspondence 1 – Email Dated 9/11/23 by Sean Reardon (Tetra Tech)

**comments have been marginally reworded by Bohler for clarity*

Comment #47 Bohler shall include tailwater conditions in their drainage analysis. In addition, sewer and drain modifications should be reviewed more closely, and any impacts associated with the Project should remain onsite and should be quantified.

Response: ***Acknowledged. Additional survey work is currently being conducted at the northeast corner of the site. An updated Civil Engineering Plan Set and an updated Drainage Report will be submitted under separate cover at a future date to address this comment.***

Comment #48 The Project proposes a reduction in peak rates at Spring Brook and proposes to reconstruct the existing outlet pipe from 12" to 24". The Applicant should justify the pipe size increase, as this seems counter-intuitive. This will require re-work of the existing stream channel walls and should be reviewed with the Town to further understand how Spring Brook works under existing conditions.

Response: ***Acknowledged. Additional survey work is currently being conducted at the northeast corner of the site. An updated Civil Engineering Plan Set and an updated Drainage Report will be submitted under separate cover at a future date to address this comment.***