

May 9, 2022

Dudley Planning Board
Dudley Municipal Center
71 West Main Street
Dudley, MA 01571

**Re: Stevens Mill Residential/Retail Building, 8 Mill Street
Site Plan and Special Permit Review**

Dear Planning Board Members:

Bohler Engineering is in receipt of a comment letter from Graves Engineering, Inc., dated May 4, 2022. On behalf of Applicant Stevens Mill Owner LLC, Bohler offers the following responses. For clarity, the original comments are in **italics**, while our responses are directly below in **bold** type.

Zoning Bylaw

Comment # 1 GEI understands that the applicant is proposing 10% of the dwelling units to be affordable. The affordable dwelling units need to be identified on the architectural plans. (§3.10.06.B.1.D)

Response: The applicant will work with the Town to identify the affordable units and ensure they meet the requirements prior to occupancy of the building. We respectfully request this be added as a condition of the approval

Comment #2 The plans need to show the names of the abutters and street numbers of parcels across the right-of-way of Mill Street. (§5.04.04.A.2)

Response: The property information for the abutting properties along the Mill Street right-of-way have been added to the Site Map on Sheet C-101

Comment #3 The plans need to show the existing driveway locations within 200 feet of the site. (§5.04.04.A.7)

Response: The "Site Map" on the cover sheet has been adjusted to show the driveway on the property to the north of the proposed driveway to Mill Street, and we believe it now shows all driveways within 200' of the site.

- Comment #4 The plans need to include location and type of all existing and proposed on-site lighting. A photometrics plan was not provided in the revised plan set. (§5.04.04.A.17)*
- Response:** **A revised photometric plan is being developed and we would request it be added as a condition of approval to obtain approval on same from the Town Planner prior to construction.**
-
- Comment #5 The plans need to specify the type of proposed screening for the dumpster. (§5.04.04.A.19)*
- Response:** **The dumpsters will be within an enclosure to provide screening to the same. The applicant would request it be a condition of approval to work with the Town Planner to develop an enclosure design that integrates with the overall project.**
-
- Comment #6 The plans need to include on-site snow storage areas. (§5.04.04.A.20)*
- Response:** **Snow storage areas have been added to the plans.**
-
- Comment #7 The plans need to include a signature block consisting of five signature lines for Planning Board approval. (§5.04.04.A.22)*
- Response:** **A signature block has been added to the plans.**
-
- Comment #8 GEI is not aware if a written review from the Chief of Police and the Fire Chief was submitted with the plan. (§5.04.04.A.23)*
- Response:** **Letters from the Fire and Police Chief have been included with this response.**
-
- Comment #9 Pipe sizing calculations (e.g., Rational Method calculations) need to be submitted to substantiate design of the drainage system. (§5.04.04.B.1)*
- Response:** **Pipe sizing calculations will be performed as part of the construction preparation for the project in case there are any revisions to the layout of the conveyance system. We respectfully would request that providing these calculations be included as a condition of approval.**

Hydrology and MassDEP Stormwater Management

Comment #10 GEI reviewed the hydrology computations and found them to be in order.

Response: **No response required.**

Comment #11 In the Executive Summary, the total areas noted in the body of the text are not consistent with the areas listed in the corresponding tables. If the Drainage Report is revised for any other reason, then the total areas in the body of the text should be updated.

Response: **No other revisions to the Drainage Report are required as a part of this review so we have not updated the Executive Summary at this time. This comment is noted and should any revisions to the Report be required, we will implement this change.**

Comment #12 Compliance with the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook and Stormwater Standards is reasonable provided the following comment is addressed.

Response: **No response required.**

Comment #13 Per the applicant, additional subsurface investigations are expected to be performed during the early stages of construction to confirm soil composition and groundwater presence in the areas of the proposed underground stormwater management systems. The Drainage Report does not currently include soil information directly within the footprint of the proposed systems. For example, the proposed system UG-A anticipates an excavation of approximately 20 feet from the existing surface to the proposed bottom elevation. The closest test pit (TP-1) was approximately 9 feet deep and did not encounter groundwater. The additional subsurface investigation will need to be performed. Considering the required excavation depth, performing the investigation at the early stages of construction is not unreasonable.

Response: **The applicant is amenable to conducting additional test pits at the start of construction to confirm the assumptions in the report.**

General Engineering

Comment #14 On Sheet C-402, the text for the existing basin indicates referring to Sheet C-901 about proposed seeding. However, the information was not included on Sheet C-901.

Response: The note on the existing basin has been updated to reference the basin seed specification on Sheet C-704.

Comment #15 On Sheet C-403, the proposed grades for the accessible parking spaces have a slope greater than 2%. Per the Massachusetts AAB, the maximum slope in any direction is 2%. The proposed topography needs to be adjusted. There will be a slope of approximately 3% from the bottom of the curb (elevation 437.60) to the proposed 437 topographic contour.

Response: The grades in the accessible parking area have been adjusted to comply with the maximum allowable slopes.

Comment #16 On Sheet C-403, the outflow from FES 200 will be directed across the future accessible river walk connection. The plans currently indicate the river walk location is approximate. The hydrology computations show that water will discharge from FES 200 during all storm events analyzed. The river walk design will have to be coordinated with the stormwater flow path from FES 200. Perhaps the pipe to FES 200 could be extended and the riverwalk configured to pass over the extended pipe.

Response: The approximate location of the Riverwalk and the FES pipe have been revised to show the pipe discharging on the river side of the proposed walkway to address this comment. The final location of the discharge point will be dependent on the final design of the Riverwalk and could change. The applicant will be working with Town Staff on the design of the Riverwalk and would ask that any changes needed in this area can be administratively approved by Town Staff.

Comment #17 On Sheet C-901, the Pavement Section construction detail proposes a one-inch-thick bituminous concrete top course. For pavement durability, consideration should be given to providing a 1-1/2" thick top course.

Response: The Pavement Section has been updated to provide a 1-1/2" thick top course.

General Comments

Comment #18 Consideration should be given to providing landscaping and a shade tree or ornamental tree at the new Mill Street entrance between the proposed parking spaces and the Mill Street sidewalk.

Response: The new Mill Street entrance is located on a property that is not owned by the applicant and approval from the property owner will be required to

provide additional features on this parcel. The applicant will work with the abutting property owner to provide plantings at the new driveway and between the parking areas if allowable.

Comment #19 On Sheet C-301, the Zoning Analysis Table inadvertently indicates the parking spaces are 9 ft. x 18 ft, however, the proposed spaces are 9 ft. x. 20 ft. The Table should be revised.

Response: The Table has been revised to show the proper space dimensions.

Comment #20 On Sheet C-301, the label of "2" parking spaces off the northeastern corner of the existing building at 10 Mill Street needs to be revised to "1".

Response: The parking count label has been updated.

Comment #21 On Sheet C-403, the dimensions for UG-B do not concur with the dimensions indicated in the Drainage Report.

Response: The system has been revised on Sheet C-403 to match what is shown in the drainage report.

Comment #22 On Sheet C-501, the proposed sanitary sewer piping originating from the proposed building inadvertently indicates an incorrect size of "1"."

Response: The size of the sewer service has been revised.

Comment #23 On Sheet C-901, the construction detail "Accessible Stall Markings & Parking Lot Striping Detail" indicates parking stall length and width dimensions that do not concur with the proposed dimensions depicted on Sheet C-303.

Response: The detail has been revised to match the dimensions depicted on Sheet C-303.

Comment #24 On Sheet C-902, the construction detail "Catch Basin Double Grate Type C" needs to indicate a 4 ft. deep sump and needs to include a hood over the outlet pipe's opening.

Response: The dimension in the "Catch Basin Double Grate Type C" detail has been updated to indicate a 4' sump.

Comment #25 On Sheet C-903, the construction detail "Surface Basin Emergency Spillway" inadvertently indicates elevations that do not concur with Sheet C-402 or the Drainage Report.

Response: **The elevations on the "Surface Basin Emergency Spillway" have been updated to concur with the Drainage Report.**

Comment #26 On Sheet C-903, the construction detail "Existing Surface Basin Outlet Control Structure Detail" inadvertently indicates an orifice size that does not concur with Sheet C-402 or the Drainage Report.

Response: **The orifice size on the "Existing Surface Basin Outlet Control Structure Detail" has been revised to concur with information on Sheet C-402 and the Drainage Report.**

Comment #27 On Sheet C-903, the construction detail "Subsurface System Outlet Control Structure Detail" inadvertently indicates elevations that do not concur with Sheet C-403 or the Drainage Report. Additionally, the size of the structures needs to be specified.

Response: **The elevations of the orifices have been revised to concur with the drainage report. Additionally, the size of the structure has been indicated on the detail.**

Comment #28 A construction detail for a concrete pad should be included on the plans.

Response: **A construction detail for the concrete pad has been added to Sheet C-901.**

Comment #29 A construction detail for a bicycle rack should be included on the plans.

Response: **A bike rack detail has been added to Sheet C-901.**

Comment #30 The Site Map on Sheet C-101 should be revised to fully show the new project entrance off Mill Street.

Response: **The Site Map on Sheet C-101 has been revised to fully show the new site entrance.**



We trust the above as well as the attached information are sufficient for your continued review of the project. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (508) 480-9900.

Sincerely,

Bohler

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John Kucich". The signature is fluid and cursive.

John A. Kucich, P.E.

cc. Jeffrey M. Walsh, P.E.
Stephen Madaus, Mirick O'Connell