



65 Glenn Street | 169 Ocean Blvd.
Lawrence, MA 01843 | Unit 101, PO Box 249
Hampton, NH 03842
T: 978.794.1792 T: 603.601.8154
TheEngineeringCorp.com

Mr. Nathaniel N. Strosberg, Town Planner
Planning Department
101 Main Street, 2nd Floor
Ashland, MA 01721

December 14, 2015

TEC Ref. T0608.00

Re: Village of the America's, Phase VII - Peer Review
Ashland, MA

Dear Mr. Strosberg:

On behalf of the Town of Ashland, TEC, Inc. reviewed documents as part of the civil engineering peer review for the proposed Phase VII subdivision, buildings 70-82 on America Boulevard. Ashland Chestnut Realty Trust ("Applicant") submitted the following documents, which TEC reviewed for conformance with the Town of Ashland Zoning Bylaws and Chapters 247 and 343, Stormwater Management of the Code of the Town of Ashland:

- Response to Peer Review comments, prepared by Guerriere & Halnon, Inc., dated December 2, 2015.
- "Village of the Americas" Phase VII Site Plan, Buildings 70 through 82, in Ashland, Massachusetts, Site Plans, prepared by Guerriere & Halnon, Inc., dated September 11, 2015, revised November 2, 2015, and revised December 2, 2015.
- "Village of the Americas", Phase VII, Revised Pipe Analysis Calculations

Upon review of the latest submission, TEC compiled the following list of comments. For consistency, the outstanding original comment numbers have been retained from the most recent TEC review letter dated September 8, 2015. The Applicants response to comments is shown as **bold**; TEC responses are shown as *italic*.

TEC has compiled the following comments for the Town of Ashland Planning Board's consideration:

7. Comment Ongoing: Several driveways remain with a width of 18'. The Town of Ashland Fire Department should confirm if the width is adequate.

Applicant response: No response in comment letter.

TEC: Comment Ongoing.

8. Comment Ongoing. It appears that the Applicant is still awaiting final comments from the Fire Department.

Applicant response: No response in comment letter.

TEC: Comment Ongoing.

11. The Applicant has revised the drainage calculations to include this area. However, the drainage structures added to the plan include a drain pipe directly through a sewer manhole (SMH 4). The Plans should be revised to show adequate spacing between the drain pipe and SMH 4.

Applicant Response: The conflict between the proposed drain line and proposed SMH-4 has been corrected.

TEC: Comment Addressed.

15. Perimeter erosion control should be placed along the westerly limits of work to prevent sediment from leaving the construction area.

Applicant Response: The limits of the proposed erosion control have been extended to the limits of the proposed grading.

TEC: Comment Addressed.

16. The Applicant indicated at the public hearing on October 22, 2015 that they would look into modifying the existing fence at this corner. It is TEC's recommendation that this may be considered as a condition of approval.

Applicant Response: No response in comment letter.

TEC: Comment Ongoing.

17. The Applicant has added the stockade fence to the plans. The Applicant should clarify if this is a permanent or temporary fence for the duration of construction.

Applicant Response: As discussed at the last planning board meeting, the proposed fence will be temporary chain link with wind barrier.

TEC: Comment Addressed.

20. The sewer service from Building 73 is shown directly through proposed CB#10. The Plans should be revised to eliminate this conflict.

Applicant Response: The conflict with the building sewer for unit 73 and the proposed CB-10 has been corrected.

TEC: Comment Addressed.

21. The proposed drain pipe in Queen Isabella Way which ties into exist DMH#27 is shown directly thru an existing SMH. The Plans should be revised to eliminate this conflict.



Applicant Response: The conflict with the drain to DMH-27 and the existing SMH has been corrected. The location of DMH-4 has been revised and the pipe lengths, slopes, and inverts have been adjusted. A revised pipe analysis is provided.

TEC: Comment Addressed.

22. The Phase VII development appears to be consistent with past Stormwater Management Reports and drainage calculations in regards to total impervious area flowing to the existing forebay and detention basin. However, as the final phases of the project are permitted, these calculations will need to be reviewed for consistency to ensure that the total impervious area is consistent with the initial design intent and forebay and basin sizing.

Applicant Response: No response in comment letter.

23. The existing stormwater management system has been in operation since the early phases of the development. The Order of Conditions for the project indicates that there are operations and maintenance forms that are to be maintained and submitted to the Town. To ensure the proper function of the stormwater management system, this documentation should be provided by the Applicant. If maintenance has not recently been performed, TEC recommends that the forebay and detention basin be cleaned/maintained according to the approved plan, as well as upstream catch basins.

Applicant Response: No response in comment letter.

24. To achieve Total Suspended Solids (TSS) removal, the Applicant indicates that Street Sweeping is included for a pretreatment Best Management Practice. The MassDEP Stormwater Management Handbook indicates that to obtain 10% TSS removal by way of Street Sweeping, the paved areas should be swept on a monthly average with a high efficiency vacuum sweeper or a weekly average with a rotary broom sweeper.

Applicant Response: No response in comment letter.

If you have any questions regarding the peer review, please do not hesitate to contact me at (978) 794-1792. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
TEC, Inc.
"TheEngineeringCorp.com"



Eric K. Gerade, PE, LEED AP
Senior Civil Engineer

