

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|---|---|-------------|--|
| Professional Services Corporation, PC Comment Letter dated January 12, 2022 | | | |
| PSC 1 | <p>Provide a new sheet, or more detail on Sheet C-18 to explain and illustrate how the green roof components will be connected – e.g., connections between trays filled with growth media and connections to the Watts GRD-640 Green Roof Drain(s) to be located within “curb and parapet walls” lined with a waterproof membrane to contain green roof drainage overall. Confirm how many Watts roof drains will be provided for each of the five green roof areas, and generally show how flow from the Watts drains will be aggregated to flow to the two downflow pipe locations noted on Sheet C-7, on the east and west building sides respectfully: The HydroCAD model indicates that 11 Watts drains are required for GR-1, 3 drains for GR-2, 7 drains for GR-3, 4 drains for GR-4, and 3 drains for GR-5. Please confirm and show on a plan how these will be collected and directed to the final downflow pipes. Also, the green roof description in the Stormwater Management Report is incomplete - it does not address flow that will be directed to the west side of the building.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>As noted in the Stormwater Management Report, the green roof area will be contained by curbs and parapet walls. A waterproof membrane will be provided to contain water within curbs and parapet walls. As shown on the Columbia Green Roof Tray System detail, the bottom of each tray contains drainage holes that allow water to flow in and out and seek its own level within the area contained by the waterproof membranes. The Watt's overflow drains will be placed within the containment areas in the numbers as specified on the plans and connected to internal roof drains. Roof and Plumbing plans detailing the installation will be submitted as part of the Building Permit process.</p> |
| PSC 2 | <p>We understand from a response to an earlier review that drag-in water and snow melt from the covered garage levels will be collected in garage floor drains; and that the floor drains will be directed to an Oil and Gas separator and then discharged to the sanitary sewer system for treatment at the on-site wastewater treatment facility. Please confirm if this is still the case and show the proposed location(s) of the proposed Oil and Gas separator(s) and how separators will be connected to the on-site sewer system.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>Oil/Water Separators are required by plumbing code and will be shown on the plumbing plans submitted for Building Permit. A note is included on Sheet C-9 confirming that an Oil/Water Separator will be provided.</p> |
| PSC 3 | <p>The setback of Subsurface Recharge Areas 1, 2 & 3 from the primary treated effluent disposal area is greater than the minimum 50-foot recommended in the SWH for septic system absorption fields (as a comparable reference). However, the setbacks of Subsurface Recharge Areas 1 & 2 from the reserve effluent disposal area are only 34-feet and 38-feet respectfully. Please defend the adequacy of the less than 50-foot setback given the interaction between effluent disposal and stormwater recharge reported in the latest mounding analysis.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>The Guidelines for the Design, Construction, Operation and Maintenance of Small Wastewater Treatment Facilities with Land Disposal Table 2 provides a setback requirement between the soil absorption area and an infiltration system of 25 feet.</p> |
| PSC 4 | <p>Because the three SRA facilities (stone bottom elevation, 219.5) will be constructed in fill soils on top of existing grades, the Applicant needs to add specifications to the Site Plans to require the removal of top and sub-soils below these systems and require the use of Title-5 sand for replacing unsuitable soils and for raising grades under the recharge systems and areas along the sides of the recharge systems.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>A note will be added to the Final Plans on Sheet C-7 requiring the removal of top soil and subsoils where the infiltration systems are constructed in fill. Title V sand or clean, washed crushed stone will be installed in its place. This shall extend 2 feet beyond the limits of the subsurface system on all sides and into the receiving soil layer.</p> |
| PSC 5 | <p>There is a grading issue south of SRA-3: The top of stone at SRA-3 is elevation 224.6, and therefore the proposed rim elevation of AD-6, only 30-ft away, is also elevation 224.6. Please explain or reconcile grading in this area and show proposed finished grades at the south edge of SRA-3.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>Finished grade at the south end of the infiltration system will be approximately 225.1. Additional spot grades will be added to the final Grading and Drainage Plan.</p> |
| PSC 6 | <p>For enhanced protection of the subsurface recharge areas, we recommend adding a note to the Grading & Drainage Plans, Sheets C-6 & C-7 that all Area Drains shall also be constructed as 4-ft diameter, precast concrete catch basins as detailed on Sheet C-12.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>A note will be added to the final Grading and Drainage Plan requiring Deep Sump Hooded Catch Basin in locations where Area Drains are called for.</p> |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|--|-------------|--|
| PSC 7 | Provide identifying labels for the two un-numbered roof drains, one connected to SRA-2, and one connected to SRA-3, and explain how much roof area each of these captures. | Tetra Tech | Labels will be added to the Final Grading and Drainage Plan which will identify which green roof areas are directed to the two green roof overflows. The roof drain collects all the non-green roof areas associated with the residential building. The connection to SRA#3 will be deleted. |
| PSC 8 | Check and revise the Conduit Table in Appendix G of the Stormwater Management Report regarding four discrepancies: The 12-inch drain invert into DMH-3 does not agree with the invert noted on Sheet C-6 of the plans; AD-3 and AD-4 are noted in reverse order (AD-3 should be the start node); STC-2 and RCA-1B are noted in reverse order (STC-2 should be the start node); and the 12-inch drain invert into DMH-5 does not agree with the invert noted on Sheet C-6 of the plans. | Tetra Tech | Discrepancies have been addressed and will be shown on the final plans and in the final stormwater report. |
| PSC 9 | Provide a schematic or plan to describe the proposed courtyard drainage system, including pre-treatment to be provided prior to storm flow discharge to SRA-2. | Tetra Tech | Typically the Courtyard will be drained by two deep sump hooded catch basins and will connect to a drain manhole. This will be shown schematically on the final plans. |
| PSC 10 | Provide a cross-section detail of the 12-inch drain that discharges overflow from SRA-3 into the Stilling Basin east of the proposed retaining wall. The cross-section should illustrate this pipe from the point where it exits an un-labeled overflow control structure (OCS), through the retaining wall (base elev. 217.5) and into the stilling basin at inv. elev. 217.0. | Tetra Tech | The Outlet Control Structure will be labeled and a Level Spreader detail has been added to final plans. |
| PSC 11 | Provide details and cross-sections to clarify proposed construction of the Stilling Basin. | Tetra Tech | A detail for the Level Spreader will be added to Sheet C-18. |
| PSC 12 | Provide information on the un-labeled OCS noted in Comment 5. Call out an identifier for this OCS, and indicate the proposed pipe sizes and invert elevations, and any overflow control weir configurations and elevations. | Tetra Tech | A label will be added to the Outlet Control Structure. |
| PSC 13 | We do not recommend inclusion of the proposed changes in the emergency access drive, where the originally proposed porous pavement drive of single width (20') is now proposed as a double-barrel road with two paved lanes scaling as only 7.5-ft wide each, with a 5-ft wide grass median in sloped areas and 5-ft wide rain garden / bioswale in the flat area. Some issues of concern include the following: | Tetra Tech | The proposed changes to the Emergency Access Drive have been reviewed by the Fire Chief. A copy of the letter from the Fire Chief to the Weston Zoning Board was included in the November 22, 2021 submittal package. |
| PSC 13.a | In order to use the emergency access drive, large emergency vehicles will have to straddle the grass median and bioswale. The grass median could be reinforced to accept the vehicle load; however, the bioswale, which details (Sheet C-18) show to be 6-inches deep with an additional 6-inch depth of soft soil/filter layer at the bottom, will not support vehicle loads. An emergency vehicle that fails to straddle the bioswale with a wheel(s) entering the bioswale will damage the bioswale, and of greatest concern – the vehicle is likely to become disabled precluding an effective response to the emergency and potentially injure the vehicle's occupants. | Tetra Tech | The proposed changes to the Emergency Access Drive have been reviewed by the Fire Chief. A copy of the letter from the Fire Chief to the Weston Zoning Board was included in the November 22, 2021 submittal package. |
| PSC 13.b | The MA SWH provides requirements for rain gardens or bioswales that will infiltrate stormwater runoff. Rain gardens/bioswales receiving any storm flow (other than roof or yard runoff) must be preceded by adequate pre-treatment, which is not provided in this case. | Tetra Tech | The bioswale will only receive stormwater runoff from the Emergency Access Drive, which will not be subject to the pollutant loading that a typical access drive would. The grass median and soil media will serve to filter out sediments, such as sands. Therefore, it is our opinion that the swale will function adequately. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|--|
| PSC 13.c | Rain gardens require careful landscaping and maintenance for them to continue to function with the intended purpose of improving water quality and providing recharge. Procedures are provided in the O&M Plan, but rain gardens require extra attention and landscaping input, and they are often not properly attended to by property owners. | Tetra Tech | As noted in the comment, maintenance procedures for the swale are outlined in the O&M Plan and it is understood by ownership that routine maintenance is required for the long term success of the swale. |
| PSC 13.d | A rain garden located in a roadway medial would be subject to damage from winter snow plowing and de-icing treatments, and as noted, from vehicle damage when deviating from the paved surface with no curb controls. | Tetra Tech | The edge of pavement can be staked annually to provide guidance for winter maintenance contractors. And as with any site feature, any damages will be repaired. |
| PSC 13.e | It is unclear from the plans if the rain garden is to contain plantings, and if such plantings would be appropriate for the proposed feature. The detail on Sheet C-18 indicates planting with grass, however the Landscape Plan Sheet L1.06 indicates that this median area is proposed as a "gravel strip". Please clarify. | Tetra Tech | The intent is to plant the bioswale with a "wet mix" grass seed. |
| PSC 13.f | In the unlikely case that other issues noted above could be resolved, the rain garden / bioswale should have an overflow drain set at the lowest road grade to prevent flooding of the emergency access drive, and this overflow would need to be directed toward the wetland to the east. | Tetra Tech | The east lane of the Emergency Access drive has been set one-tenth of a foot lower than the west lane. This allows stormwater flow over the east lane, towards the wetland in a shallow and unconcentrated manner. |
| PSC 14 | Porous paving should not receive stormwater from other drainage areas (especially areas that are not fully stabilized). The yard area east of the porous pavement in the southeast corner of the Site should not drain to and run-on to the porous pavement as indicated, and yard drains should be included to prevent this flow. | Tetra Tech | The intent is not to drain onto the porous pavement. Additional spot grades will be added to the Grading and Drainage Plan for clarification. |
| PSC 15 | The SWHB advises that porous pavement is "not appropriate for high traffic areas" and "do not use porous pavement in areas of higher potential pollution loads, because stormwater cannot be pre-treated prior to infiltration. Heavy winter sanding will clog joints and void spaces." We strongly recommend against the use of porous pavement and pavers for the entrance road because these high traffic areas are subject to vehicle wear and tear and pollution, and during winter months, even if not applied to the driveway directly, sand will be tracked in from vehicular travel on adjacent roadways. Moreover, heavy and large delivery vans and moving trucks that enter and exit to serve the residents will cause excessive wear to the porous pavement, which is intended only for light duty applications. | Tetra Tech | The project is not considered a land use with higher potential pollutant loads. Routine maintenance of the porous pavement, which includes monthly pavement sweeping is necessary, for the long term success. Additionally, it is recommended that a professional stormwater maintenance contractor, such as Stormwater Compliance, be retained. These contractors are familiar with maintaining porous pavement systems in cold weather climates. |
| PSC 16 | There are eight (8) sloped porous pavement areas that are designed such that the storage bed bottoms are kept level to provide the same effective storage as would exist for a flat location. However, the detail for porous pavement shown on sheet C-12 needs to be revised to provide material and/or means (other than the filter fabric shown) to prevent the migration of storm flow from an upgradient porous pavement zone to a downgradient porous pavement zone. Also, the HydroCAD model should be revised to provide a consistent primary overflow weir definition for all porous pavement zones. Several, but not all of the porous pavement "pond" zones have weir heights of 0.75' above base grade, and some have heights of 0.5,' and some zones have no weir at all. Please revise and/or explain. | Tetra Tech | The porous pavement bed bottoms have been terraced to provide consistent infiltration along the entire length of the sloped driveways. Additional means to confine stormwater are not necessary with the terraced flat base elevations. The weir heights in the HydroCAD model were initially provided to demonstrate that there is no "overflow" during any of the design storms. The standard reservoir course depth is 6-inches. In areas with lower permeability rates, the reservoir course has been increased to 9 or 12 inches. Locations are noted on the Grading and Drainage Plan where a deeper reservoir course is required. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|---|
| PSC 17 | <p>Massachusetts' SWH specifies a 50-foot setback for stormwater infiltration practices from Septic Effluent Disposal (in this case, the wastewater facility Effluent Disposal Area): The Applicant needs to review the location of porous pavement at the southeast corner of the Site, and reduce the placement of porous pavement within 25-feet of the primary effluent disposal area, and 5-feet from the reserve disposal area; or propose standard paving in these areas as was done in response to this question on a prior site layout. Ultimately, regardless of mounding analysis results the long-term design capacity of an effluent disposal area will be affected, and the long-term storage and recharge capacity of the porous pavement in such area will be reduced. Porous pavement is not the hydrological equivalent to natural soil structure with grass cover: Porous pavement is more transmissive, whereas natural / vegetated soils will retain stormwater better, and promote surface runoff when sloped. In our opinion, placement of porous pavement above or near an effluent disposal area is inappropriate and not good engineering practice.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>A meeting was held with PSC, Patrick Garner, the Weston Conservation Agent, Sanborn Head and Tetra Tech on January 15, 2021 to review and discuss the stormwater management. A specific discussion revolved around the limits of porous pavement. Originally porous pavement was proposed over the soil absorption area. It was agreed that porous pavement would be removed over the limits of the soil absorption system and replaced with standard pavement. At the edge of the soil absorption area, pavement was to change back to porous pavement. This revision has been shown since the March 19, 2021 plan submission. The comment is not consistent with the January 15, 2021 meeting.</p> |
| PSC 18 | <p>Results presented in the Groundwater Mounding Report (Figures 10 & 11) indicate that a ground water mound estimated using the more conservative model inputs, results in ground water rising above the recharge base of the three Subsurface Recharge Areas: A rise of between 6" and 24" at SRA-1 and SRA-2 respectfully, and a rise of between 18" and 36" at SRA-3. Such mounded conditions would significantly reduce the recharge effectiveness, and the defeat the purpose of these systems to control peak flow and runoff volume (in fact, once a mounded condition reaches the base of an infiltration area, the rate of recharge is typically reduced by an order of magnitude). Given these findings, the Applicant should provide a detailed drawdown analysis for the three SRA facilities to show that these SRAs will fully drain within 72-hours (per the SWH requirement) and that 4-feet of separation from the residual water table will be restored. Also, see additional concerns noted in Comment 25 below.</p> | | |
| PSC 19 | <p>Provide detailed cross-sections through the areas of stormwater and effluent disposal recharge. Provide at least two north-south sections - one through the stormwater recharge and one through the effluent disposal area with both of sections extending say 50-feet through the retaining walls that are north and south; and at least two east-west sections – one through SRA-2 and the effluent disposal area, including from the building foundation through the retaining wall and sloped area into the wetlands; and one through SRA-3, including from the building foundation through the retaining wall and the sloped area into the wetlands. These cross-section views should depict all structures and final proposed surface grades, proposed stormwater and effluent disposal systems, proposed porous pavement strata, the retaining wall (exposed and buried sections), grades into the wetlands east of the wall, grades into abutting properties north and south, seasonal high groundwater levels, and mounded high groundwater levels.</p> | | |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|--|
| PSC 20 | The results presented in the Groundwater Mounding Report (Figure 11) indicate that a 2 ft. high groundwater mound will extend across the entirety of abutting properties at 534 and 546 South Avenue which if accurate is not acceptable. The Applicant should provide possible solutions for avoiding, minimizing or mitigating for the impact of a mounded water table on abutting properties. | | |
| PSC 21 | Given that mound conditions noted in Comments 18 and 20 above were derived from an analysis that included a 10-year, 24-hour storm event, we recommend that these same analyses that utilized the more conservative inputs for treated effluent and annual precipitation, etc., be combined with a 100-year, 24-hour storm event to check for surface breakout conditions at the Site, at the wetland boundary, and at abutting properties. | | |
| PSC 22 | The prior project submittals have indicated the proposed use of foundation drains. Please confirm that such drains are no longer being proposed. If proposed, please explain in detail and show the underdrains and the mechanism for recharging intercepted groundwater on the drawings. | Tetra Tech | No foundation drains are proposed for stormwater or wastewater controls. Underdrains will be incorporated at the subsurface recharge areas and will be modelled in the calculations and shown on the Grading and Drainage Plans. |
| PSC 23 | The Groundwater Model Report should be revised to check for barrier effects of building foundations and proposed retaining walls in proximity to the three stormwater SRAs and the wastewater Soil Absorption System (SAS). In order to prevent breakout through the face of the proposed retaining walls near to the recharge areas, a poly barrier/sand wick system must be installed along the retained soil side of the walls to stop the horizontal spread of a ground water mound, and the retaining walls in combination with buildings will increase the height of mounding, and therefore such effects should be carefully reviewed. (See other concerns about retaining walls at Comment 66 below.) | | |
| PSC 24 | The Groundwater Model Report should be revised to include topographic figures that combine predicted groundwater mound height with the modelled high ground- water elevations, to show resultant groundwater contours during a mounding event in comparison to proposed finished Site topography at and around the recharge zones. This will facilitate checking for possible points of surface break out of treated effluent and/or stormwater near abutting wetland areas and abutting private property. For example, informal overlay of mound report Figures 10 and 11 indicates that mounded groundwater break out will occur at the ground surface near wetland flag #6 and near wetland flag #11. | | |
| | Related to our concerns noted in Comments 18 and 20 above, we have reviewed comments offered by the hydrogeology firm McDonald Morrissey Associates, LLC in their memo dated January 3, 2022, and we concur with the following excerpts (see last two paragraphs on page 4 their memo) regarding Site stormwater facilities design: | | |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|--|
| PSC 25 | <p>“Provided system schematics state the following: “This system is designed for a groundwater table below system invert. Engineer of record to verify that the design groundwater table is below invert of precast.” This condition appears to be violated where mounded groundwater rises above the bottom of a proposed stormwater infiltration structure and compromises the intended (i.e., gravity-drained) functionality of the device, as is being predicted by SHA’s MODFLOW model during the 10-year precipitation event scenario. Meanwhile, for the same event scenario, the HydroCAD model documented within the Tetra Tech Stormwater Report appears to suggest the proposed stormwater infiltration areas will continue to function free of groundwater interference (i.e., as if the groundwater mound remains well below the system bottom).</p> | | |
| | <p>These observations highlight a critical disconnect between the stormwater and groundwater mounding analyses and indicate additional information and/or analysis should be provided in order to demonstrate the proposed stormwater system will operate properly and in a manner consistent with how it is represented within applicable HydroCAD and MODFLOW models.”</p> | | |
| | <p>The Applicant needs to address this “disconnect” between the stormwater HydroCAD model and Modflow predicted mounding under the SRA areas. Mounded groundwater that comes in contact with the bottom of, or enters into the storage zones of the SRA recharge facilities will significantly reduce the performance of the SRA’s during extreme</p> | | |
| PSC 26 | <p>Provide supplemental plan(s) and narrative to explain the proposed sequence of work to manage stormwater during the Site construction. Provide details and narrative to explain how stormwater will be directed and maintained within the Site disturbance limits during construction, for example through sequenced placement of temporary diversion swales, temporary sediment traps/basins, etc. Keeping stormwater as close as possible to the source of generation is the preferred approach and allowing Site stormwater to accumulate at one collection point is not preferred.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>In order to address this comment completely, input from the Site Contractor who will be selected is critical as this comment gets into means and methods. We would suggest that that this requirement be a condition of approval.</p> |
| PSC 27 | <p>Modify the note that calls for stabilizing any new exposed slope areas with erosion control matting as soon as the grading is completed to add that it will be preferable for the erosion control matting to include mulch, grass seed and fertilizer, and be organic so as to degrade over time without removal.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>The slope stabilization detail calls for North American Green SC 150 matting, which is photodegradable. The note calling for the stabilization mat will be revised as suggested on the final plans.</p> |
| PSC 28 | <p>Update Sheet C-10 and an appropriate SWPPP plan (stormwater report Appendix H) to specifically identify each of the various catch basins and BMPs, and add a note on these plans to call for installation of silt sacks at each catch basin that could receive drainage during the construction period, including any catch basins that may be located downgradient of entrances to the Site within South Avenue;</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>All catch basins and other sediment control best management practices are identified on Sheet C-10 and on the SWPPP Plans included in Appendix H. There does not appear to be any catch basins located along the southern side of South Avenue in the vicinity of the project that should have a catch basin insert installed. There is a catch basin on the north side of South Avenue, opposite the Emergency Access Drive. Given that South Avenue is crowned at this location, a catch basin insert is not advisable.</p> |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|---|
| PSC 29 | Two locations of construction vehicle Site access, via a Stabilized Construction Entrance, are noted on the Sheet C-10 and the draft SWPPP plans. These should be segregated and clearly marked as either "entry or exit only." There is no need to clean vehicles that enter, and vehicles entering an exit zone will degrade the exit zone by compaction. Add a note to Sheet C-10 to require the contractor to establish designated separate entry and exit points at the site for installation of the stabilized construction vehicle zones and require that the Site exit must employ the Tire Wash Practice as detailed on Sheet ESC-11 (stormwater report Appendix H SWPPP plans). | Tetra Tech | A stabilized construction entrance/exit is called for at the main Site Drive. At the Emergency Exit, a stabilized construction exit is noted. |
| PSC 30 | We recommend adding a note to the construction stabilization exit zone that reads "Monitor and maintain the 'Stabilized Construction Entrance / Tire Wash zone' to ensure that this zone is cleaned and functioning correctly to prevent tracking of sediment by construction vehicles that exit the Site". | Tetra Tech | The detail for the stabilized Construction Entrance/Exit notes the required maintenance. |
| PSC 31 | The draft SWPPP erosion control plans (Appendix H) should include the following additional procedural notes to help ensure that the Project contractor is informed of procedures that will be important to the Town and its Conservation Commission, and so that construction activity minimizes erosion and associated impacts: | | |
| PSC 31.a | Prior to any alteration of the site, an on-site meeting between the owner's representative, the construction supervisor, and the Conservation Agent shall occur. The Owner and the Agent may invite other individuals needed. Similar meetings will occur once erosion control measures are in place and thereafter on a monthly basis unless otherwise agreed to by all parties. | Tetra Tech | Recommend that this be included in a condition of approval. |
| PSC 31.b | The inspection of erosion control devices adjacent to the buffer zones will be done by the Applicant's Engineer and once determined to be accurate the Engineer will send a letter to the Conservation Commission attesting to accuracy and describing any potential changes. | Tetra Tech | Recommend that this be included in a condition of approval. |
| PSC 31.c | The plan needs to state how often the Project Construction Supervisor will inspect the Site and the erosion controls. Also, the owner shall submit any changes to sequence or timing of construction or inspections to with the Commission prior to implementation. | Tetra Tech | The Construction General Permit dictates the inspection requirements for all sediment controls. The Applicant will advise the Building Inspector and Conservation Agent of changes in construction sequence prior to implementation and could be included as a condition of approval. |
| PSC 31.d | To keep unauthorized grading machine traffic to a minimum, install a four-foot high, high-visibility limit-of-work (LOW) fence to enclose the work site and any non-active work areas. | Tetra Tech | The SWPPP Plans show a limit of work/construction fence around the perimeter of the entire work area. The construction fence detail calls for a 6' fence with a windscreen. |
| PSC 31.e | Catch basins (on Site and South Avenue) shall be covered until all surfaces in the watershed of the catch basin are stable and the stormwater management areas are fully constructed. If catch basins are required to be operational, these shall be protected by silt sacks as detailed on the plans, and these shall be checked weekly and following any storm event and cleaned if more than 1/4 full. | Tetra Tech | As noted in response 28 above, there do not appear to be any catch basin along the south side of South Avenue. Otherwise, this should be a condition of approval. |
| PSC 31.f | Stormwater must be managed in the work area and not allowed to impact erosion control devices, nor be discharged outside of the Site work area. | Tetra Tech | Construction period stormwater will be managed within the site work area. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|--|-------------|---|
| PSC 31.g | All grades or bare soil within the buffer zone, and any slopes or areas potentially draining near to a proposed infiltration practice or off site must be stabilized within 48 hours, and no discharge of sediment is to leave the Site. | Tetra Tech | Temporary stabilization will be provided to any bare soils that will not be worked for 14 days. Final stabilization will be provided as soon as possible upon completion of a work area, but no later than 7 days. The 48 hour requirement is not practical as it would potentially be triggered each weekend. |
| PSC 32 | We recommend that the Applicant prepare a SWPPP now and submit it with a completed SWP as required by the Town's Stormwater & Erosion Control Regulations. The SWPPP is a document that can always be updated in the future should contractor means and methods change from those proposed by the engineer. | Tetra Tech | We suggest that the SWPPP be submitted to the Town prior to construction. This could be a condition of approval. |
| PSC 33 | The O&M Plan should include a snow storage plan to show operators where snow storage should occur during winter storms. In addition, the Applicant should submit calculations that document the amount of snow accumulation that will be gathered during a typical snowstorm event from paved areas, and the amount of plowed snow storage that will be provided by the recommended snow storage zones. | Tetra Tech | Snow storage is shown on the landscape plans. |
| PSC 34 | The Applicant may need to file for a Major Permit per Section IV.2, and a Major Stormwater Management Permit application needs to meet the requirements stated in the Town's 2-page application checklist. In reviewing the requirements of this, we find that the Applicant's existing submittals will probably meet all submittal requirements except for the following deficiencies: | Tetra Tech | The project is requesting a Comprehensive Permit, which includes all local permits such as the Major Stormwater Management Permit. |
| PSC 34.a | "Locations of all existing bodies of water": The Applicant needs to show the intermittent stream in its entirety past the last intermittent stream flag shown (near wetland flag 1) to a point parallel to the southern extent of the Project Site. Currently the intermittent stream is only partially shown on the Site Plans (for example, see Sheets C-1, C-3 and C-7). | Tetra Tech | The stream is shown up to the southern extent of the project site. |
| PSC 34.b | "Show the foundation drain. Foundation drain is not to be connected to an infiltration system for stormwater": See Comment 22. | Tetra Tech | No foundation drains are proposed for stormwater or wastewater controls. Underdrains will be incorporated at the subsurface recharge areas and will be modelled in the calculations and shown on the Grading and Drainage Plans. |
| PSC 34.c | "An Erosion and Sediment Control Report shall be prepared in conformance with the Design Standards contained in Section 7.B." See Comment 32. | Tetra Tech | An Erosion and Sediment Control narrative will be included as part of the SWPPP, which will be submitted prior to earth disturbing activities. |
| PSC 35 | The Applicant's submittals meet the Design Standards stated in Section 6.0 of the Towns SECR regulations, except for the following: | | |
| PSC 35.a | SECR Section 6.A.2.e. – "Non-typical curve numbers (CN) will be as follows": i. CN 80 must be used for porous pavement - the Applicant has used 98 per the Massachusetts SWH and this would need to be discussed with the Town Stormwater Permitting Authority. The curve numbers that are applicable for Woods in Poor Condition...shall be used for new landscaped areas, based on the applicable Hydrologic Soil Group...": In the Applicant's case, it appears that the CN value of 45 would be required for new landscaped areas and the HydroCAD model should be revised accordingly (the Stormwater Management Report lists a CN value of 39 for landscaped areas). | Tetra Tech | As indicated in the project hearing, the stormwater calculations uses a curve number of 98 for porous pavement and the reservoir course has been sized to store and infiltrate all stormwater events. A curve number of 39 has been used for landscaped areas because the stormwater calculations are also being used in the groundwater mounding analysis, which is under MADEP's purview. Therefore, industry standard values must be used. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|--|-------------|--|
| PSC 35.b | SECR Section 6.A.2.ii.c. – “Unsuitable material is to be removed and replaced with suitable granular material for a distance of 2-ft. horizontally in all directions from the infiltration system; at a minimum, the A and B horizons shall be removed. The excavation for the infiltration system is to extend into the C-layer a minimum of 6-inches.” See Comment 4 above. | Tetra Tech | A note will be added to Sheet C-7 requiring the removal of top soil and subsoils where the infiltration systems are constructed in fill. Title V sand or clean, washed crushed stone will be installed in its place. This shall extend 2 feet beyond the limits of the subsurface system on all sides. |
| PSC 35.c | SECR Section 6.A.2.ii.f. – “Foundation drains will not be allowed to connect to infiltration systems that were designed for stormwater.” See Comment 22. It is not clear if foundation drains are still proposed (Applicant should clarify). | Tetra Tech | No foundation drains are proposed for stormwater or wastewater controls. Underdrains will be incorporated at the subsurface recharge areas and will be modelled in the calculations and shown on the Grading and Drainage Plans. |
| PSC 35.d | SECR Section 6.A.2.ii.g. – “A cleanout with a sump or other structure with a minimum 2-ft. sump will be installed before all new infiltration systems.” The purpose of this requirement is to provide basic pretreatment and maintenance access prior to subsurface recharge facilities. The proposed designs of SRA-1, SRA-2, and SRA-3 provide for adequate pretreatment of stormflow from the pavement and most yard areas. However, the Applicant should confirm that pretreatment is provided for the following three areas of stormflow: Flow from the 12-inch yard drain from the courtyard that discharges to a manhole between SRA-1 and SRA-2; and flow from the two roof drains that flow to SRA-2 and SRA-3 respectively – for these roof drains, we recommend installing some form of pre-screening manhole to prevent wind-blown debris and sediment that collects on the flat roof areas from entering the subsurface chambers. | Tetra Tech | A drain manhole will be added to the roof drain with a 2-foot sump. In the courtyard, the catch basins will have deep sumps and the drain manhole will have a 2-foot sump. The green roof overflows will be adequately pretreated as the stormwater will flow through the soil media prior to being collected by the Watt's overflow drains. |
| PSC 35.e | SECR Section 6.B. – “Approval of an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan by the SWPA is required prior to any site altering activity.” See Comment 32. | Tetra Tech | The project is requesting a Comprehensive Permit, which includes all local approvals, including the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. |
| PSC 36 | SECR Section 7 – Inspections - The Applicant’s project plans need to include notes that refer to the inspection requirements listed in SECR Section 7. Refer to the following: | Tetra Tech | Inspection requirements can be indicated as a condition of approval. |
| PSC 36.a | Pre-Construction Meetings (7.A.1), | Tetra Tech | Inspection requirements can be indicated as a condition of approval. |
| PSC 36.b | Notice of Construction Commencement (7.A.2) | Tetra Tech | Inspection requirements can be indicated as a condition of approval. |
| PSC 36.c | A copy of the approved and signed plans and permits for a SMP shall be kept on the construction site at all times (7.A.3) | Tetra Tech | This would be an appropriate condition of approval. |
| PSC 36.d | The SWPA or its designee shall be granted the right to enter the property at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner for the purpose of inspection. The SWPA, its agents, officers, and employees shall have authority to enter upon privately owned land for the purpose of performing their duties under this Regulation and may make or cause to be made such examinations, surveys, or sampling as the SWPA deems necessary, subject to the constitutions and laws of the United States and the Commonwealth. | Tetra Tech | This would be an appropriate condition of approval. |
| PSC 37 | SECR Section 8 – Construction Inspections - The Applicant’s project plans need to include notes that refer to Section 8 construction inspections requirements, as they are restated from Section 8, below: “The SWPA may require the submission of periodic inspections and reporting by the Applicant as dictated by site conditions. The SWPA may inspect the project site at the following stages, at a minimum: | Tetra Tech | This would be an appropriate condition of approval. |
| PSC 37.1 | Initial Site Inspection of erosion and sedimentation controls prior to any land disturbance to assess overall effectiveness and functioning to protect resources. | Tetra Tech | This would be an appropriate condition of approval. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|---|
| PSC 37.2 | Stormwater Management System Excavation Inspection: An inspection will be made of the excavation of the stormwater management system to ensure depth to ground water and presence of approved soil type. | Tetra Tech | This would be an appropriate condition of approval. |
| PSC 37.3 | Stormwater Management System Inspection: An inspection will be made of the completed stormwater management system, prior to backfilling of any underground drainage or stormwater conveyance structures. | Tetra Tech | This would be an appropriate condition of approval. |
| PSC 37.4 | Final Inspection: i. After the stormwater management system has been constructed, all applicants are required to submit actual "as-built" plans of any stormwater management facilities or practices after final construction is completed. As-built plans must be submitted both in hard copy and electronically as either AutoCAD drawings or PDF documents; ii. The SWPA shall inspect the system to confirm its "as-built" features. If the inspector finds the system to be adequate, he/she shall so report to the SWPA which will issue a Certificate of Completion. | Tetra Tech | This would be an appropriate condition of approval. |
| PSC 37.5 | Notes indicating the required inspections are to be added to the Site Plan(s). | Tetra Tech | Inspection requirements should be in the conditions of approval. |
| PSC 38 | The Applicant should address the following requirement of PBRR Section 5.09: "Drains shall be at least 12 inches in diameter and shall be of good quality reinforced concrete. A minimum of 3 feet of cover will be required over all pipes. | Tetra Tech | All drain lines will be a minimum of 12-inches in diameter. Drains are called out to be HDPE, a standard material commonly used on private development sites. |
| PSC 39 | Subsection 4.05 NATURAL SITE CHARACTERISTICS states: "The plans shall show location of water resources including ponds, lakes, brooks, intermittent streams, vernal ponds, streams, flood plains and all proposed changes to these features." The Applicant needs to show the intermittent stream in its entirety past the last intermittent stream flag shown (near wetland flag 1) to a point parallel to the southern extent of the Project Site. Currently the intermittent stream is only partially shown on the Site Plans (for example, see Sheets C-1, C-3 and C-7). See Comment 34.a above. | Tetra Tech | The intermittent stream is currently shown up to the southern site boundary. |
| PSC 40 | Sewer and Wastewater Management Plans: Although the proposed wastewater treatment plant, and sewer system (including sewer pumping) and effluent disposal system locations are noted on the plans, the Applicant will need to prepare substantially more detailed engineering plans and reports for submittal to the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MADEP) to obtain approval of design and to obtain a Groundwater Discharge Permit (GWDP). Therefore, should this project be approved by the ZBA, we recommend that the Board request that the Applicant provide a copy of all interim and final sewer design plan & profile drawings, all wastewater treatment and effluent disposal designs, and all design reports, when the plans and reports are submitted to MassDEP to obtain a GWDP. Also, we recommend that any favorable Decision by the Board include provisions for the Applicant to fund review of such future wastewater plans by an outside consultant if deemed necessary by the Building Inspector. | Tetra Tech | A narrative of the proposed Wastewater Treatment System will be provided to the Board. A copy of the MADEP approved Wastewater Treatment System can be provided to the Town as a Condition of Approval. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|--|
| PSC 41 | <p>In a prior review, we recommended that South Avenue 10-inch water main material, age, and adequacy be discussed with the Weston DPW, Water Department and Fire Department, and the Applicant indicated willingness to coordinate with these Departments, however it is not clear if the Board has received the Departments' approval. Therefore, the Applicant should obtain and provide approval in writing from both the Water Department and Fire Department and provide such to the Board.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>As previously indicated, the Fire Department has reviewed the turning movements and proposed access drive and provided a memorandum indicating their approval. The Applicant will continue to work with Town Departments throughout the process of obtaining a Building Permit.</p> |
| PSC 42 | <p>In a prior review, we recommended that a static pressure and fire flow test should be conducted at the South Avenue water main in front of the Site to check for compliance with PBRR §4.22 Water Supply, and to ensure adequate domestic and fire protection flows. Tetra Tech's prior response was that Hydrant flow testing be conducted within six months of applying for Building Permit, and if adequate pressure is not available, booster pumps will be provided. PSC continues to recommend that these tests be done now, so that if pressure and/or supply are not adequate, it will be known by the Board now, prior to any Board decision.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>We suggest that the hydrant flow test be included as a condition of approval.</p> |
| PSC 43 | <p>In a prior review, we recommended that the adequacy of proposed fire protection services at the Site be discussed with the Weston Fire Department, and that a summary memorandum concerning Fire Department approval should be provided to the ZBA. Tetra Tech's prior response was that Fire protection services are typically reviewed during the Building Permit process. PSC continues to recommend that these discussions take place and be reported to the Board via Fire Department memorandum, even if additional final discussion will be required prior to obtaining building permit(s). Please note the highly specialized fire protection requirements for the parking garage.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>Obtaining the Fire Department's approval of the fire protection systems can be a condition of approval.</p> |
| PSC 44 | <p>Provide details of the underground electric conduit after coordinating a design from Eversource. This may require a Board condition for future action, as it appears that Eversource will not open a work order and begin the service design process until local permitting process is complete.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>Electric service is proposed to be placed in an underground duct bank. Should the utility company require an alternative service, such as overhead wires, the Applicant will advise the Board.</p> |
| PSC 45 | <p>Provide to the Board a landscape plan for proposed transformer locations after the electrical service design has been completed with Eversource. This may require a Board condition for future action, so that the Landscape Plan can be updated to provide screening in accordance with Eversource and Board requirements.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>The Landscape Plan depicts the transformer screening.</p> |
| PSC 46 | <p>As agreed by the Applicant in a prior review, the standby generator(s) for the Site need to be designed to operate in compliance with local and state noise ordinances; and the standby generator(s) will need to be exercised in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendation. This should be a condition of approval should the Board approve the Project.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>We concur.</p> |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|---|
| PSC 47 | The size and adequacy (safety) of the existing gas main in South Avenue, the proposed gas service to the Site, and all building meter connection(s), should be confirmed with the gas utility; and meter locations need to be shown on the plans for both the treatment plant building and the residential building with appropriate landscape screen. Tetra Tech has indicated that details of the natural gas services require a design from National Grid, that will not be available until after local permitting is complete. This may require a Board condition for future action, so that gas locations can be finalized and so that the Landscape Plan (for screening of the gas meters) can be updated to provide screening in accordance with National Grid and Board requirements. | Tetra Tech | An updated Landscape Plan will be submitted National Grid completes the gas design and approves meter locations. |
| PSC 48 | The Applicant needs to provide a detail of the proposed conduit to be used to carry the underground cable/data lines. Tetra Tech has indicated that details of telephone, cable and data services will not be available until after local permitting is complete. This may require a Board condition for future action, for the Applicant to provide these systems' final layout and design. | Tetra Tech | Telephone, cable and data services are currently shown as underground duct banks. Should utility providers require an alternative service, such as overhead wires, the applicant will advise the Board. |
| PSC 49 | RRSPA §4.02 List of All Items Submitted: This section requires the Submission to include a separate titled "List of Items Submitted which shall number and identify each document, plan, drawing or other item that is submitted by the Applicant". The Applicant needs to submit this list and be sure that "any item that is added to the Submission during the course of the site plan approval process shall be added to the List..." In a prior response, Tetra Tech has indicated intent to submit this list, but PSC is not aware of it being submitted to the Board. | Tetra Tech | The list of items submitted will be provided prior the Comprehensive Permit being issued. |
| PSC 50 | RRSPA §4.07 Site Improvements requires: "Proposed parking structures must contain the above information as well as: dimensions of the structures; means of ingress and egress; internal traffic circulation; lighting and access to the principal structure." Information has been provided for external parking, and internal garage parking spaces including means of ingress and egress to adjacent floors, internal traffic circulation, pedestrian areas, and proposed access points to the residential structures. However, the Applicant needs to submit information on proposed lighting inside the garage. | Tetra Tech | The interior design elements of the parking garage are typically detailed as part of the Building Permit process. Providing the Board with a copy of the Building Permit plans could be a condition of approval. |
| PSC 51 | The Applicant still needs to submit the following: (a) the weight, turning radius length and height of the largest truck expected to use the site, and (b) a turning movement plan to demonstrate that the Weston Fire Department vehicles and their proposed firefighting apparatus (per consultation with the Fire Chief) can maneuver freely to, from and within the Site. Also, see Comment 13.a above. | Tetra Tech | Turning movements for Weston's fire truck, a typical garbage truck, a single unit moving truck and a delivery vehicle (Amazon, FedEx, etc.) were submitted previously and reviewed by MDM and the Weston Fire Department. Turning movements were determined to be satisfactory. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|---|
| PSC 52 | RRSPA §4.09 Waste Disposal requires: "The location of the area which is capable of supporting on-site sewage disposal from the proposed project shall be shown. Design, operating and maintenance details of the proposed disposal facility shall be explained." The Applicant has clearly noted the areas of proposed wastewater treatment and effluent disposal. However, the Applicant still needs to submit design, operating and maintenance details for these facilities. See Comment 40 above. [Although MADEP will be the review and approving authority for the Wastewater Treatment Facility, pursuant to RRSPA §4.09, the Board is still entitled to receive from the Applicant an explanation of the design, operating and maintenance details for the proposed wastewater treatment facility that will serve the Site.] | Tetra Tech | MA DEP is the review and approval granting authority for the Wastewater Treatment Plant and Subsurface Disposal System as well as its ongoing Operation and Maintenance. The Applicant can provide the Town a copy of all approved design plans and the Operations and Maintenance plan, as a condition of approval. |
| PSC 53 | RRSPA §4.10 Earth Removal/Fill requires: "Indicate areas where earth removal, blasting, or filling is proposed and the approximate volume in cubic yards, along with the rationale for proposed removal of vegetation, trees, soil and for any grade change." The Applicant has stated that site grading will result in a net export of soils; and that their preliminary calculations indicate exports will amount to approximately 6,000 cubic yards; and that blasting for rock removal is not currently anticipated. However, those prior estimates on cut and fill were based on the prior design; and the latest design calls for a substantial rise in grade at and around the proposed buildings. Therefore, the Applicant still needs to provide a cut & fill plan as required by RRSPA §4.10 to illustrate for the Board's understanding the proposed areas of cut and fill, and include proposed volumes of earth (or rock) involved from each area of cut and fill that will add up to the Applicant's total revised estimate of net soil import or export. | Tetra Tech | A Cut/Fill Plan was provided with the November submission. Ledge is not expected. Site grading remains consistent with the November submission, therefore a revision is not required. |
| PSC 54 | RRSPA §4.10 Earth Removal/Fill requires: "Precise calculations for determining the total amount of earth removal or fill will only be required when the development will require earth materials to be obtained or removed off site. If the amount is over 30 cubic yards, a removal/fill schedule will be required which shows size of trucks, gross vehicle weight, estimated number of trips per day for each vehicle, travel routes to be taken, and hours of operation, and certification that fill is free of hazardous materials." As a supplement to their response to Comment 53 above, the Applicant should provide their proposed estimated schedule of truck trips including all details as requested in RRSPA §4.10. | Tetra Tech | The Cut/Fill Plan noted above was generated with earthworks calculations from AutoCAD's Civil3D. A description of trucks used for obtaining fill materials and trips per day can be provided once a Site Contractor has been chosen and the source(s) of fill determined. This can be provided to the Board as a Condition of Approval. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|--|-------------|--|
| PSC 55 | <p>RRSPA §4.14 Traffic Study: A traffic study is required encompassing all roads and intersections within 500 ft. of the site as well as all roads and intersections impacted by site generated traffic. The Planning Board (in this instance the Zoning Board of Appeals acting in lieu of the Planning Board) is authorized to define requirements for the traffic study. The Town has engaged MDM Transportation Consultants to conduct a peer review of the Traffic Impact and Access Study (TIAS) prepared by Vanasse & Associates, Inc. (July 2019). In order to avoid duplication, we will not perform a detailed analysis of the submitted TIAS. However, it should be noted that the submitted TIAS does not comply with the requirement of Section 4.14 to identify and evaluate construction phase traffic impacts. The TIAS should address construction equipment and heavy truck trips, particularly those generated by earthwork, foundation, and building structure tasks. The TIAS should also identify total construction phase trips based upon the overall project schedule. The TIAS should identify truck routes and traffic management measures coordinated with Police Department requirements. A draft Construction Management Plan should be provided to minimize overall construction trips particularly single occupant vehicle trips. PSC is unaware of receipt by the Board of a Construction Management Plan, and receipt of a revised TIAS that fully complies with the requirements of RRSPA §4.14 including the construction phase traffic impacts noted in Comment 56 below.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>A Construction Management Plan was submitted to and presented to the Board on October 13, 2021. Details on specific construction equipment, deliveries, trips, etc. will require input from various trade contractors. Additional details and schedules can be provided to the Board as a Condition of Approval.</p> |
| PSC 56 | <p>RSPA §4.15 Impact and Mitigation requires: "Analysis shall be provided of impacts during construction including days and hours of operation; provisions for employee and equipment parking; traffic, noise, dust vibration; impacts on wildlife habitats; demand for and effects on character of the community. Any proposed mitigation of negative impacts shall be provided and shall be consistent with the Standards and Criteria set forth in Section XI, Subsection H. of the Weston Zoning By-Law." The Applicant needs to provide this required analysis including a proposed construction schedule. Also see Comment 55 above.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>As noted above, the Construction Management Plan was presented to the Board on October 13, 2021 which addressed items raised in this comment.</p> |
| PSC 57 | <p>PBRR §5.08 Paving of Sidewalks requires the following: "Sidewalks shall be brought to subgrade by the necessary excavation and filling and shall receive a coat of selected gravel at least 8 inches in thickness, free of all stone over 1 inch in diameter and free from loam, clay, and other foreign matter. Thereafter, each sidewalk shall receive a two- course bituminous paving at least 2 1/2 inches in total thickness after compaction." The Applicant should confirm with the Town's DPW that the sidewalk detail shown on Details Sheet C-13 will satisfy their requirement and the requirements of PBRR §5.08 Paving of Sidewalks.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>The sidewalk detail as shown calls for 8 inches of compacted gravel (MassDOT Standard Specification M1.03.0b) with 4 inches of concrete. If the Town prefers a bituminous concrete sidewalk along South Avenue, the Applicant is agreeable. The material used in the sidewalk construction can be specified as a Condition of Approval.</p> |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|--|-------------|--|
| PSC 58 | The Applicant's Site plans call for a 5-foot-wide concrete sidewalk within the Site, and also along the south side of South Avenue heading east from a point about 100- feet west of the Project entrance until reaching Wellesley Street. MassDOT requires a minimum sidewalk width of 5 ft. exclusive of curb and clear from obstructions such as hydrants, signs, and utility poles. A minimum width of 5-ft. including curb with spot widening if obstructions are to be installed in the sidewalk is mandatory along South Avenue (Route 30) and is recommended throughout the site to ensure that the accessible route is maintained. Massachusetts Highway Department, Project Development and Design Guide 2006 §5.2.1. In addition, the Applicant needs to correct the detail shown on Sheet C-13 to call for a 534-foot sidewalk (not 4-foot as detailed). | Tetra Tech | The sidewalk along South Avenue is laid out as 5 feet in width, exclusive of the curb. A detailed design of the offsite sidewalk will be provided to the Town prior to construction. It is our understanding that street furnishings such as signs, hydrants or utility poles are allowed provided that there is a minimum accessible path that is 30 inches wide (36 inches preferred). Submission of a design detailing compliance with MassDOT's accessibility requirements can be a condition of approval. Onsite sidewalks will be reviewed by the Applicant's Accessibility Consultant prior to construction. A copy of the their final report can be provided as a Condition of Approval. |
| PSC 59 | PBRR §5.13 Cleaning Up requires the following: "Upon completion of the work, the Subdivider shall clean up any debris thereon caused by street construction, installation of utilities, and other operations of the subdivider. All areas within a right of way or foot path destroyed, damaged, or altered in construction operations shall be restored to vegetation or other finish satisfactory to the Board. Any areas which are used for the disposition of excess fill, stumps, rock, and similar materials which may have accumulated during the prosecution of the work shall, as soon as practicable (and no later than the time of completion of the work), be excavated and then recovered, graded, and landscaped by the Subdivider. The Subdivider shall leave the subdivision area in a neat and orderly condition." | Tetra Tech | Although there is not a subdivision proposed, the clean up requirements could be included as a Condition of Approval. |
| PSC 60 | The Applicant should add a note to the Site plans that will require the Project construction to comply with the intent of PBRR §5.13 Cleaning Up. | Tetra Tech | Please see above. |
| PSC 61 | The walk at the head of perpendicular parking spaces should be increased to 7 ft. in width to maintain 5 ft. clear exclusive of bumper overhang. | Tetra Tech | The 5-foot sidewalk is adequate to provide a 36-inch accessible path, should a vehicle overhand the curb and sidewalk. |
| PSC 62 | Improvements to encourage access for alternative modes should be provided: | | |
| PSC 62.a | A bicycle path should be added between the building and South St. | Tetra Tech | Bicycles will access South Avenue via the driveway and/or sidewalk. A dedicated bicycle lane is not proposed for the site driveway. |
| PSC 62.b | Bicycle racks should be added at the main building entrance | Tetra Tech | Bicycle storage is provided within the parking garage. |
| PSC 62.c | Secure bicycle storage should be added in the garage or other appropriate location for residents. | Tetra Tech | Approximately XXX bicycles can be accommodated within the parking garage. |
| PSC 63 | Add EV charging stations at the front entrance and in the parking garage. | Tetra Tech | EV charging stations are proposed within the garage for residents. Currently X charging stations are proposed (each charging station can service two vehicles) with infrastructure plan to allow and expansion to Y stations. |
| PSC 64 | Provide for proper on-site access and circulation: | | |
| PSC 64.a | Provide a stop line at the stop sign at the principal site entrance. | Tetra Tech | A stop line will be added to the principal site exit. |
| PSC 64.b | Sign the on-site access drives for "No Parking" (MUTCD R7-1). | Tetra Tech | The onsite property management will be responsible to enforce no parking in the site driveway. The Applicant does not typically provide "No Parking" signage. |
| PSC 64.c | Provide stop control for the eastbound and westbound approaches to the drop off and turnaround at the main entrance. | Tetra Tech | Stop control is provided for the Westbound approach. Stop control can be provided for the eastbound approach if required by the Board. |
| PSC 64.d | Provide speed limit signs. | Tetra Tech | Speed limit signs can be provided if required by the Board. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|--|
| PSC 64.e | Confirm that school busses will not enter the site. Provide a pullout lane at the main entrance to accommodate parents waiting for school bus pickup or drop-off. | Tetra Tech | It was the Applicant's initial understanding that buses would pick up and drop off from South Avenue. However the Applicant will allow buses to pull into the site and circulate around the building as suggested by MDM Associates at the February 15, 2022 Public Hearing. |
| PSC 65 | Revise the stormwater management O&M plan to show proposed snow storage zones (see Comment 33 above); and include calculations (based on a stated snowstorm accumulation) that justify the areas that have been selected for snow storage after plowing, and identify the storage volume provided at each specific area on the plan. And, because snow amounts that exceed available storage shall require disposal offsite, add a note to the O&M Plan to this effect. | Tetra Tech | The snow storage areas are indicated on the Landscape Plan. The Landscape Plans the indicate four locations for snow storage. Snow storage area 1 is located adjacent to the driveway for the WWTF. Snow storage area 2 is located across the site drive from area 1. Snow storage area 3 is located northwest of the front building corner. Snow storage area 4 is located near the southwest rear building corner. Assuming the snow will be cleared with a loader and piled up to 8 feet in height, the available snow storage is estimated as follows: Area 1 - 1,720 sf x 8 ft = 13,760 cf; Area 2 - 820 sf x 8 ft = 6,560 cf; Area 3 - 570 sf x 8 ft = 4,560 cf; and Area 4 - 2,790 sf x 8 ft = 22,320 cf. The total volume of snow storage is estimated to be 47,200 cf. Given that there is approximately 62,000 SF of driveway area to be cleared, approximately 9-inches of snow can be managed onsite, prior to hauling off site. |
| PSC 66 | The proposed retaining walls need to be designed by a Massachusetts registered Structural Engineer. Calculations for factor of safety against overturning, sliding and bearing capacity are required for any section over 4-feet in height, and the proximity of wetlands and conditions of high groundwater and groundwater mounding should be factored into the design. If the structural plans are provided by a wall manufacturer, then the Board should require that the plans be based on site specific geotechnical information and they should not accept plans that are qualified by requiring further determination of geotechnical conditions after issuance of the signed and sealed structural drawings. | Tetra Tech | This can be included as a condition of approval. |
| PSC 67 | Provide a detail showing guardrail installation for retaining walls capable of resisting horizontal impact loads. | Tetra Tech | These are details that will be developed as part of the retaining wall design and will be submitted with the Building Permit for the retaining walls. However for reference, we have attached typical details from Stone Strong that fence and guard rail installation with the retaining walls. We have also included a detail for a 42 inch base block that can be used in gravity retaining walls up to 7.5 feet in height. These blocks would be used along the west property line. |
| PSC 68 | The Zoning Board of Appeals will have to determine the acceptability of these retaining walls from an aesthetic and zoning aspect, especially considering the walls as structures are not compliant with yard setbacks. | Tetra Tech | Relief from local zoning setbacks has been requested. |
| PSC 69 | Submit a report from an air quality consultant detailing measures required to ensure that the surrounding residential structures do not experience concentrations of carbon monoxide or other pollutants from vehicle emissions exceeding air quality standards. | Tetra Tech | The ventilation system of the parking garage will be designed in accordance with the Massachusetts Building Code. Compliance with the Building Code presumes that air quality requirements for users of the garage and adjacent uses are met. |
| PSC 70 | Submit a statement from a mechanical engineer generally outlining the mechanical ventilation system required to control vehicle exhaust including carbon monoxide. The mechanical engineer's statement should specifically address the location of the system exhaust. | Tetra Tech | See response above. |
| PSC 71 | The mechanical engineer's statement should also address whether a generator is required to operate the garage ventilation system during power outages. | Tetra Tech | The parking garage is designed to be "open air", meaning mechanical ventilation will not be required. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|---|--|-------------|---|
| PSC 72 | Review the design requirements for the garage fire suppression system with the Fire Department: | Tetra Tech | The fire suppression system for the parking garage will be developed with the Building Permit plans. |
| PSC 72.a | The design of the fire suppression system will be highly specialized given that fire apparatus cannot enter the garage due to vertical clearance and the position of the residential buildings preclude Fire Department access to the exterior walls of the garage. Accordingly, we recommend as a Condition of Approval, that the Applicant compensate the Town for the cost of review of the fire protection requirements for the parking garage. | Tetra Tech | This comment will be addressed as part of the building permit submission. |
| PSC 72.b | The design of the fire suppression system must accommodate exposure to freeze/thaw conditions. | Tetra Tech | This comment will be addressed as part of the building permit submission. |
| PSC 72.c | Document agreement with the Fire Department on the type and on the performance standards for the fire suppression system. | Tetra Tech | This comment will be addressed as part of the building permit submission. |
| PSC 73 | Submit a parking management plan for the garage setting forth regulations that include controlling the number of vehicles the residents can park on-site, visitor parking, and service vehicle parking. | | |
| Patrick C. Garner Company, Inc. Comment Letter dated January 14, 2020 | | | |
| | Massachusetts 40B regulations do not waive the MassDEP WPA regulations. The ConCom (not the Zoning Board) retains permitting authority under the WPA regulations. | Tetra Tech | The project is designed to meet MADEP regulations. |
| | <u>Protected Resource Areas</u> The Hanover-Weston project site contains the following state-protected wetland resources: ·Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW); ·A stream within the BVW (the stream is a tributary to Bogle Brook. Bogle Brook itself lies approximately a half mile (> 3,000 feet) to the south and on the other side of the Mass Turnpike. Bogle Brook runs into Nonesuch Pond, some two miles from the site); ·Bank, associated with the stream; and ·Land Under a Waterbody, also associated with the stream. | Tetra Tech | Please note that the stream onsite has been determined to be Intermittent by the Weston Conservation Commission and MADEP. |
| | <u>Buffer Zone</u> The project, as it applies to ConCom jurisdiction, is for work in the 100-foot buffer zone beside BVW. Note that under the regulations the buffer zone is not a no-build zone, but rather an area that triggers a filing with the ConCom when work is proposed therein. Further, any stormwater system outside of the 100-foot buffer that drains or terminates within that 100-foot buffer is under the ConCom's jurisdiction (which is the case for this project). The Weston ConCom encourages applicants to avoid all work within 25-feet of a resource area; this is a policy only, and not a town bylaw or state regulation. Under the current Plan, work would occur in the 25-foot buffer to BVW, and extensive site alterations are proposed 25 to 100-feet from the BVW edge. | Tetra Tech | A new Notice of Intent will be filed with the Weston Conservation Commission at the conclusion of the Comprehensive Permit process. |
| | <u>Stormwater Regulations</u> As noted, MassDEP Stormwater Regulations are also administered by the ConCom. The Hanover-Weston project is not exempt from these and must comply with state stormwater provisions. | Tetra Tech | The Stormwater Management System has been designed to comply with the MADEP Stormwater Policy. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|--|-------------|--|
| | <p><u>FEMA Floodplain</u> The project is not within a FEMA-designated floodplain.</p> | Tetra Tech | We concur. |
| | <p><u>Endangered Species</u> Endangered species have not been identified on or near the site.</p> | Tetra Tech | We concur. |
| | <p><u>Stormwater</u> The stormwater design has changed significantly since the project was filed in mid-2020. The current Plan makes significant revisions to almost all design components. Revisions include extensive fill throughout much of the site (averaging three-feet), reduction in units to 180, extensive use of retaining walls, expansion of porous pavement, redesign of stormwater infiltration and relocation of the septic effluent leaching area.</p> | Tetra Tech | Revisions have been made to the Stormwater Management System in coordination with the onsite Wastewater Disposal System in accordance with MADEP requirements. |
| | <p><u>Mounding</u> Mounding calculations are required to determine if groundwater elevations will rise, potentially impacting abutting properties and resource areas. At this date, the accuracy of the revised mounding calculations is questionable. For instance, the calculations do not account for the impact of retaining walls and building foundations. Regardless, the Applicant's current submission indicates that groundwater levels will rise on abutting properties. Further, levels will unacceptably rise at the wetland boundary and within the wetlands. Groundwater elevations are projected to rise at the wetland boundary by two-feet or more. Until the accuracy of the mounding calculations is resolved, precise impacts to resources cannot be quantified.</p> | | |
| | <p><u>Alteration: Wetland, Stream and Associated Water Resources Impacts</u> The project wastewater treatment system would discharge over 33,000 gallons per day (gpd) of effluent. This quantity is at least 53 times greater than the volume generated by a typical single family home in Weston. Further, combined wastewater and stormwater discharge is 45,350 gpd. Unlike stormwater discharges, wastewater represents additional volume on site; the underlying groundwater becomes the receptor of this new volume. Mounding calculations indicate higher groundwater elevations will occur in both upland and wetland areas on site.</p> | | |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|---|
| | <p>The WPA and Title 5 prohibit alteration of protected resources. Regulations in 310 CMR 10.04 (the WPA), define alter as follows (emphasis is mine): Alter means to change the condition of any Area Subject to Protection under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. Examples of alterations include, but are not limited to, the following: (a)the changing of pre-existing drainage characteristics, flushing characteristics, salinity distribution, sedimentation patterns, flow patterns and flood retention areas; (b)the lowering of the water level or water table; (c)the destruction of vegetation; (d)the changing of water temperature, biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), and other physical, biological or chemical characteristics of the receiving water. Based on the current Plan, pre-existing drainage patterns and flushing characteristics may be altered by increased wastewater volume [310 CMR 10.04 subsection (a)]. Further, mounding from both stormwater and effluent volume may alter wetlands by substantially raising groundwater at the wetland boundary and within the wetlands, which MassDEP does not allow. In addition, "physical, biological or chemical characteristics of receiving water" [subsection (d)] are likely to be changed by the introduction of wastewater.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>The Wastewater Disposal System will be designed in accordance with MADEP requirements for siting, groundwater mounding and effluent discharge levels. A system that is designed to meet these requirements is presumed to protect the interests noted by Mr. Garner.</p> |
| | <p><u>Potential Wetland Impacts</u> An on-going issue with the project design has been whether changes to groundwater levels within the wetland may change the diversity and type of vegetation within the wetland, constituting an alteration. Mounding calculations indicate such an alteration is likely. Further, effluent discharge may change the chemical characteristics of groundwater. Stream water quality changes may affect amphibians, reptiles and other animals within the wetlands. Last, due to the added volume of effluent discharge, the stream itself is likely to flow for longer periods, constituting a further alteration.</p> | | |
| | <p><u>Scott Horsley memo</u> Horsley focuses on project compliance with MassDEP stormwater regulations, concluding that Standard 3 is violated, given that base flow and groundwater discharge are substantially altered. He further notes that although peak flow is mitigated, the amount of stormwater volume will more than double due to increased impermeable areas on site.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>Standard 3 sets a minimum recharge volume that a project must meet, not a maximum as Mr. Horsley incorrectly suggests.</p> |
| | <p>Horsley observes that mounding will increase groundwater levels. His analysis indicates that groundwater elevations at the wetland edge will rise by 2.4 to 2.8 feet, and that this rise will result in groundwater breakout both above and within the wetlands, which he states is in violation of the WPA and the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook. Horsley concludes that the stream is a headwater tributary to Bogle Brook, Nonesuch Pond and other downgradient resources. He notes that the proposed wastewater system may discharge effluent in violation of MassDEP and EPA drinking water standards. My opinion is that the Horsley comments are substantive and persuasive. The Applicant should address the issues Horsley raises point-by-point.</p> | | |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|--|
| | The revised plans still violate required setback distances with the infiltration areas 35-40 feet from the soil absorption system for effluent disposal, and the effluent disposal area remains 50 feet, not the required 100 feet from the wetlands. Issues with mounding impacts are being reviewed by others, but that analysis cannot be completed accurately if the infrastructure shown on the revised plans is situated in the wrong location. | Tetra Tech | The recommended setback between a Soil Absorption System and an infiltration system is 25 feet per the Guidelines for the Design, Construction, Operation, Maintenance of Small Wastewater Treatment Facilities with Land Disposal. The setback from wetlands and a Soil Absorption System is 50 feet. |
| | This area continues to be ignored as a confined low point despite the obvious closed contours in the area indicating a low area that would trap runoff. Correcting this error will reduce overall runoff to the low point on # 526 South Avenue in the existing case. | Tetra Tech | Tetra Tech visited the site during a heavy rainfall in November 2020 and no ponding was observed. |
| | The revised calculations use a "Weighted-Q" feature in HydroCAD. This calculates runoff from each different cover type and sums the values. Although this could be more accurate in some cases, it ignores the fact that, in smaller storms in particular, runoff from a paved surface or roof would be absorbed by pervious surfaces. Common observations of rainfall events demonstrate that not every drop of runoff from a splash pad at a roof downspout flows across a yard to a wetland area, in particular in cases where the soils are highly permeable and/or have a layer of leaf litter and organic materials such as a woodland. This feature may be appropriate where impervious surfaces are piped to a wetland or other control point but are not appropriate for the existing conditions model. Again the analysis has been modified to over-estimate existing runoff. | Tetra Tech | The "Weighted-Q" feature is recommended for use in watersheds with wide ranging curve numbers, which is the case for this site. Curve numbers for wooded and landscaped areas are in the 30's, while gravel surfaces, sidewalks and driveways have curve numbers in the 90's. |
| | The prior revision of the model included infiltration as a component of discharge in the low point on # 526 South Avenue. This has been eliminated in the current model but likely there would be some infiltration, in particular in smaller storms. Again this aspect over-estimates existing runoff. The effect of overestimating existing runoff would be to overstate the amount of runoff allowed post-development, which should be corrected in the design. | Tetra Tech | Significant portions of the low point at 526 South Avenue consists of bituminous and gravel surfaces, which limits infiltration ability. Therefore infiltration has not been considered in this area for both the pre-development and post-development analysis. |
| | This issues is not addressed in the revised plans. Although porous pavement has been eliminated next to the wetlands at the emergency access roadway, this issue would still apply for the porous pavement along the southern part of the site. The DEP Specifications do not include an impervious barrier as proposed in the revised plans. | Tetra Tech | The MADEP Stormwater Handbook provides design and planning considerations for the various best management practices (BMP's) contained within the Handbook. These considerations are not specifications. |
| | Porous pavement provides peak rate control for small storms. This is for a 2 year or lower rainfall based on the DEP Handbook. The design assumes all storms including the 100 year storm would be controlled by the porous pavement and does not comply with the Regulations. Not addressed. | Tetra Tech | The stone reservoir course under the porous pavement has been designed to store and infiltrate the volume of runoff from storm events up to and including the 100 year event. Please note that it is the stone reservoir course, not the porous pavement, that is sized to manage larger storm events. |
| | Not addressed, the porous pavement is now within 5 feet of the proposed soil absorption system reserve area and still does not meet the required setbacks. | Tetra Tech | The groundwater mounding analysis takes into account the porous pavement in the locations shown on the site plans. |
| | The southeastern section of the porous pavement access loop is within 100 feet of the wetlands in violation of the setback required by the regulations. | Tetra Tech | The setback is considered a planning consideration. |
| | The access along # 526 is no longer porous pavement but the southerly porous pavement access is still within 10 feet of the property line in violation of the required setback. | Tetra Tech | The setback is considered a planning consideration. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|--|-------------|---|
| | This issue has not been fully addressed as there are still some areas that would drain into the porous pavement from adjacent surfaces. | Tetra Tech | Design guidance from the University of New Hampshire's Stormwater Center indicates that porous pavement can accept run-on from an surface areas equal to approximately 50% of the porous pavement surface area. |
| | The revised design raises a new issue because it includes the high volume section of roadway at the entrance to the site as porous pavement. This is not consistent with the DEP Regulations. Page 119 of Volume 2 Chapter 2 of the Handbook, previously provided, specifies that this BMP is restricted to specific areas "Most appropriate for pedestrian only areas, low volume, low speed areas such as overflow parking areas, residential driveways, alleys and parking stalls. In this case the porous pavement is for the main access with a reported trip generation of 980 vehicles per day. This is clearly not an appropriate application of this BMP. In addition, it is unlikely that much runoff would flow into the small gaps in the paver section based on the Architectural rendition of the access drive. | Tetra Tech | The project is not considered a land use with higher potential pollutant loads. Porous pavement is proposed only along relatively straight portions for the site drive, which will only be subject to low speed, residential traffic. Porous pavement is an appropriate use. |
| | It is clear that clogging of the pores in the porous pavement reduces efficiency and effectiveness of porous pavement. The plans have a low area approximately 30 feet from the property line at South Avenue in the porous pavement. Anyone with a paved driveway understands that sand from winter roadway operations will be tracked onto a driveway just from normal vehicle operations. This site fronts on a state numbered route with heavy traffic, this combined with the high vehicle usage proposed will quickly render this area ineffective due to clogging. As a low point there would then be ponding right at the entrance which would create a safety issue. The use of porous pavement in this location is inappropriate and inconsistent with DEP Regulations for use of this BMP. | Tetra Tech | Routine maintenance of the porous pavement includes monthly pavement cleaning with a high efficiency vacuum sweeper. Furthermore, has been recommended that a professional stormwater maintenance contractor such as Stormwater Compliance be retained to conduct routine inspections and maintenance. Stormwater Compliance has extensive experience in maintaining porous pavement. |
| | The project design continues to ignore the Regulations and present a design that is not compliant with the requirements. | Tetra Tech | We respectfully disagree. Mr. Chessia cites guidance documents as regulations, which is incorrect. |
| | The revised submission includes a new, ill conceived, design element in the center of the proposed emergency access drive. There are two sections of proposed grass swales potentially considered "bio-swales" that would discharge to a "raingarden" all are in the center of the roadway. The proposed design is not safe or practical as an emergency vehicle will have to straddle the center strip. The grass swales and raingarden are 5 feet wide +/- and six inches deep with unspecified side slopes. If a vehicle tracks into these areas it could get stuck as a rain garden is loose compost fill. I note that the width between the tires of a typical Fire Truck is 6 feet. That leaves just six inches of space on either side of the swale to the inside edge of the tire, which offers minimal room for error. There is no detail of the grass swale sections and the detail provided for the raingarden section is lacking in sufficient dimensional data. | Tetra Tech | The Weston Fire Department has reviewed the revised emergency access drive and has provided their approval in writing. |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------|---|
| | <p>Raingardens and bio-retention areas are not listed as rate control BMP's as modeled in the Report. Raingardens are also not to be used without pretreatment. In this case there is no specific pretreatment BMP's proposed and the system would have a limited service life. How would the roadway be plowed without damage to this system? The system would flood and overflow in storms greater than the 2 year storm according to the calculations. The overflow would be down a 2:1 slope just seven feet from the wetlands.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>The Stormwater Handbook provides general guidelines and considerations for designs. In the case of the emergency access drive the design of the bioswale has been adapted to its use, which is an emergency access drive that will only receive traffic from first responders. Therefore there will not be the pollutants that might typically be associated with a roadway or driveway. Also, similar to the porous pavement, the stone reservoir course beneath the bioswale is design to store and infiltrate stormwater. The bioswale has been designed overflow only it's eastern edge. Maximum flow depths of one-eighth of an inch are anticipated.</p> |
| | <p>The calculations assume that the stone is higher than the bottom of the open area in the raingarden and double count the volume. In addition, the growing media depth is not specified and would have less void space than stone. A raingarden should have at least 30 inches of growing media, which has not been provided.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>Six inches of growing media is specified on Detail Sheet C-18. The detail has been adapted for the intended use of the driveway, which is an emergency only drive, only used by first responders. The emergency drive will not be subject to pollutant loading that the main site driveway would.</p> |
| | <p>The overflow outlet for the subsurface recharge systems has been moved to within 5 feet of the southerly property line and would discharge onto the abutting property. It is generally not allowed to create a new discharge point to an abutter without suitable easements, in particular where there is currently no concentrated flow. The Board should require this outlet be relocated to further within the site.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>The level spreader has been located to minimize work within 25 feet of the wetland. The level spreader will only receive flow for storm events in excess of the 25 year storm. The level spreader is design to evenly dissipate stormwater flow so that it is not concentrated and to reduce velocity. The flow velocity for the 100 year storm event is calculated to be 0.05 feet/second, well below erosive velocity.</p> |
| | <p>The revised plans reduce the design flow by 5,000 GPD (13%), but locate the reserve directly adjacent to the primary area on the east side of the site.</p> | Tetra Tech | <p>No response required.</p> |
| | <p>The Site Plans do not comply with setback requirements set forth in DEP's WWTF Guidelines included with this letter. Since wastewater disposal is a health and safety issue, full compliance with the WWTF Guidelines should be required. The Applicant has continually stated that DEP approved the location of the system based on what has been demonstrated is a flawed model. Further, the revised design would further impact the model that has been submitted to DEP. A revised groundwater model as discussed in the PSC letter should be required and it should also be a requirement of the Board that DEP fully review the revised model. We request that the Board require that the Applicant comply with the minimum setbacks listed in the WWT Guidelines of 100 feet. The submittal continues to ignore this setback issue.</p> | | |

| Comment # | Comment | Response By | Response |
|-----------|---|-------------------|---|
| | <p>The plans include extensive retaining walls essentially surrounding the site. The few details provided are generic and based on a review the retaining walls would interfere with other proposed features depending on the location and height of the walls. The Applicant expressed at the public hearing on December 14, 2021 that they have extensive experience with construction of retaining walls. The design engineer also indicated that he is familiar with the design parameters of these walls. The Board should require the Applicant to supply actual cross sections at specific areas where parameters such as height, proximity to porous pavement, fill or cut section, etc. around the entire site. There were inconsistencies in the presentation by the Applicant relative to the types of walls proposed in various locations versus the labels on the plans. It is unclear where an impervious barrier is proposed and it is my understanding that this was not a consideration in the groundwater mounding analysis although it was represented at the hearing that there would be a barrier along the wall near the wastewater effluent leaching area. The Board should require that this aspect be completely designed and detailed with the actual dimensions of the proposed walls determined to understand if they are even feasible as proposed. Additional details are also required to model the effect of the retaining walls on groundwater mounding.</p> | <p>Tetra Tech</p> | <p>These are details that will be developed as part of the retaining wall design and will be submitted with the Building Permit for the retaining walls. However for reference, we have attached typical details from Stone Strong that fence and guard rail installation with the retaining walls. We have also included a detail for a 42 inch base block that can be used in gravity retaining walls up to 7.5 feet in height. These blocks would be used along the west property line. Mounding effects associated with the retaining walls are addressed in responses to MMA's and Mr. Davis's comments.</p> |