

HANCOCK ASSOCIATES

Surveyors | Engineers | Scientists

#26696

July 24, 2023

Town of Rowley
Planning Board
Town Hall Annex - 39 Central Street
Rowley, MA 01969

RE: 70 Forest Ridge Drive Permit Site Plan
Assessor's Parcel ID 7-10-5-1, 7-10-5-8, 7-10-8, 7-14
Gateway II Trust of 1997

Dear Planning Board Members:

On behalf of Gateway II Trust of 1997, Hancock Associates is pleased to respond to comments by H.L. Graham, P.E. review dated July 11, 2023, for the above referenced project.

The following comments are offered in response to H.L. Graham's letter.

Peer review comment:

1. *All plans and documents should clarify the name of the Applicant and Owner, if different, i.e. Gateway II Trust of 1997, Gateway II Realty Trust of 1997, other and Forest Ridge Condominium, others.*

Hancock's response:
Corrected on all plans and documents.

Peer review comment:

2. *The Forest Ridge Definitive Subdivision Amendment Plan must be approved before or concurrently with an approval of this application and as well recorded first in time.*

Hancock's response:
So noted.

Peer review comment:

3. *The property lines leading southwesterly off the cul-de-sac are labelled "proposed." They are "existing" correct? (Sheet 2 of 5-EC).*

Hancock's response:
This has been clarified on the plans.

Peer review comment:

4. *On Sheets C-1, C-2 and C-3 of the plan set we have the following recommendations:*
 - a. *Label the existing contours more frequently.*

Hancock's response:
Contour labeling added as requested.

Peer review comment:

- b. *The proposed building is 300 feet in length as are the proposed parking aisles on both sides of the building. There are no provisions proposed to turnaround large vehicles particularly emergency vehicles (fire trucks). We recommend the access drive be continued around the northwesterly end of the proposed building connecting the parking access aisles. We do recognize that this through connection would require additional and significant grading and would result in a steep driveway grade. However, we believe the safety benefits and convenient benefits of a "through" drive are warranted. The Fire Department may agree with and support this recommendation?*

185 Centre Street | Danvers, MA 01923 | V: 978-777-3050 | F: 978-774-7816 | HancockAssociates.com

Boston, Brockton, Chelmsford, Danvers, Marlborough, Newburyport, Palmer and Princeton, MA | Concord, NH

Hancock's response:

We met with Fire Chief, Mark Emery, on July 17 and reviewed the Plans. He took no exception to the layout as proposed and will not require an access road around the building.

Peer review comment:

- c. *The plans depict a single dumpster pad approximately 18'x18' in size. This pad might support 3 to 6 large dumpsters in an awkward arrangement. We have several concerns. First for a 36,000 S.F. building will enough dumpster volume be accommodated on this single pad. Secondly, access to the lower- level single dumpster pad from the upper level of the building might be challenging? Lastly how might a packer truck access the proposed and/or additional dumpster pads.*

Hancock's response:

We reviewed this with the applicant, and we have enlarged and added dumpster pads at the rear of the building. This is similar to the dumpster layout he has elsewhere at Forest Ridge, and he is confident that this will work for him.

Peer review comment:

- d. *The plans note that a 5' concrete sidewalk is proposed along the easterly side of the building with monolithic concrete curb. The detail on Sheet C-4 shows a vertical (concrete?) curb?*

Hancock's response:

This has been adjusted on the Site Plan.

Peer review comment:

- f. *The majority of the Forest Ridge development is constructed with Cape Cod berm. The detail in the Forest Ridge Definitive Subdivision Amendment Plan set depicts Cape Cod Berm. Th subject plan detail (on Sheet C-4) depicts a different berm section? The plan (C-1) does not clarify the type?*

Hancock's response:

The detail has been adjusted to be a Cape Cod Berm.

Peer review comment:

- g. *The Legend on Sheets C-1, C-2 and C-3 does not show a symbol for the 25' No-Disturb Zone shown on the plans. The Legend on these sheets shows symbols for the 30-Foot and 50-Foot Wetland Buffer Zones?*

Hancock's response:

This has been adjusted on the Site Plans.

Peer review comment:

- h. *Where is snow storage proposed? With the proposed curb, proposed guardrail (westerly side), and rising grade (easterly side), snow storage appears to be challenging?*

Hancock's response:

Reviewed this with the applicant. He is confident he can store snow utilizing a front-end loader both on the 3:1 slopes and on the far side of the guard rails. He is doing this on the other lots at Forest Ridge.

Peer review comment:

- i. *The plans indicated a 3' planted landscape strip of foundation plantings along the easterly side of the proposed building. A wider landscaped stirp along the westerly side of the building is depicted but not called out?*

Hancock's response:

The Site Plans have been adjusted to clarify this.

Peer review comment:

- j. *The building will of course be sprinkled, and we note one proposed fire service connection on the*

easterly (upper level) side of the building. We see no proposed fire hydrants?

Hancock's response:

As noted above, we met with the Fire Chief and have added fire hydrants where he recommended.

Peer review comment:

- k. *The plans propose to provide gas, electric and water off the existing mains in the abandoned portion of Forest Ridge Drive. The water main appears to be as close as 10' to the proposed two-story building wall. It would appear too that the lower floor level of the building might be as much as 10' below the watermain. Is it recognized and planned that a good length of both the existing water and gas mains along the easterly side of the building will need to be relocated?*

Hancock's response:

Notes have been added to the plan to account for the fact the water and gas lines will need to be adjusted.

Peer review comment:

- l. *CB-1 proposed as well as the invert rim elevations look like they are one-foot high.*

Hancock's response:

This has been adjusted on the Site Plans.

Peer review comment:

- m. *Positioning of another catch basin in the easterly parking area approximately 95 feet southerly of CB-1 should be considered.*

Hancock's response:

This is at the high point of the parking, so we have not added this CB. We are confident this will work as designed.

Peer review comment:

- n. *All drainage structures and piping should be removed, not abandoned and the plan notation revised accordingly.*

Hancock's response:

This has been noted on the Site Plans.

Peer review comment:

- o. *Please provide more information with report to the proposed sewer connection "... at existing pumphouse"?*

Hancock's response:

Additional information has been added to the Plans. We will provide the Planning Board with the Septic Design when it is completed.

Peer review comment:

- p. *Plans show a drain line leading southeasterly out of the drain manhole in Forest Ridge Drive easterly of the cul-de-sac. We do not believe there to be a drain line in that location?*

Hancock's response:

This has been adjusted on the Site Plans.

Peer review comment:

- q. *Please check the cover on the drainpipe from DMH-6 to the next existing drain manhole southwesterly thereof. Cover from 40'± to 60'± out of DMH-6 appears to be of concern.*

Hancock's response:

This has been reviewed and adjustments to the Site Plans have been made.

Peer review comment:

- r. *Two trees shown on Sheet C-3 have the same symbol and are noted "typical". (Kousa Dogwood*

and Columnar Oak?)

Hancock's response:

This has been adjusted on the Site Plans.

Peer review comment:

5. On Sheet C-4 of the plan set we have the following recommendations:

- a. The proposed Steel-Beam Guardrail detailed is preferable to the existing all wood guardrail throughout the site which is showing its age and is not structurally capable of stopping a vehicle.

Hancock's response:

The steel guard rail has been added to the Plans as recommended.

Peer review comment:

- b. Is the Fire Hydrant Assembly detail that approved by the Rowley Fire and Water Departments? It is noted as a "Danvers Standard."

Hancock's response:

The fire hydrant assembly has been revised to meet Rowley Fire Department requirements.

Peer review comment:

- c. See other previously mentioned comments with respect to the Bituminous Berm and Cement Concrete Walk details.

Hancock's response:

So noted and adjusted on the Site Plans.

Peer review comment:

6. The Stormwater Report on Pages 1 and 2 addresses compliance with the Massachusetts Stormwater Management Standards Nos. 2., 3. and 4. Unfortunately, we do not have the necessary information to verify the figures used in those three sections which shows that Pond 3 has the volume and recharge capacity to accommodate the proposed building and parking improvements. Assuming verification of the figures used there will be no need to provide additional stormwater mitigation.

Hancock's response:

The Stormwater Report has been revised and adjustments address this issue.

On a separate issue, the Conservation Commission has requested we incorporate some form of infiltration below the parking area directly abutting the wetlands. They have concerns that the project could reduce the amount of groundwater flowing to these wetlands. To address this, we have proposed to make the drainage pipe along the back of the building a perforated pipe. This design will promote infiltration in this area.

An issue with the Planning Board has also come up. Section 6.1.3.2.2 states:

The MSA measured from street lines shall be calculated as follows:

- (a) for buildings which do not exceed one hundred and fifty (150) feet in length on the side facing the street. The MSA shall be fifty (50) feet from the street line;
- (b) for buildings which exceed one hundred and fifty (150) feet in length on the side facing the street, the MSA shall be equal to the length of the building on the side facing the street divided by three (3); and,
- (c) for buildings that are stepped back from the street one or more times, separate MSAs shall be calculated, using the criteria stated above, for the length of the building closest to the street, and for each length of the building stepped back from the street.

This building falls under the definition of "stepped back." Under Section C, where the building is three hundred feet long (which under Section B would require a 100' setback) the building steps away from the street. Only seventy feet of the building façade falls within the one hundred feet so the setback requirement is fifty feet.

We look forward to discussing these issues at the next Planning Board hearing.

Sincerely,

HANCOCK ASSOCIATES on behalf of Gateway II Trust of 1997

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "C. E. Wear, III". The signature is stylized with a large initial "C" and "W".

Charles E. Wear, III, P.E.
Engineering Manager/Senior Project Manager

cc: H.L. Graham, P.E.
Conservation Commission
Fire Chief, Mark Emery

U:\s2_vol1\Civil 3D Projects\26696-Gateway-Rowley\Eng\Documents\Peer Review\22696 - 70 Forest Ridge - HSA Response.docx