



October 7, 2019

Ms. Susan E. Affleck-Childs
Medway Planning and Economic Development Coordinator
Medway Town Hall
155 Village Street
Medway, MA 02053

**Re: Evergreen Village
Multi-Family Special Permit Site Plan Review
22 Evergreen Street
Medway, Massachusetts**

Dear Ms. Affleck-Childs:

Tetra Tech (TT) has performed a review of the proposed Site Plan for the above-mentioned Project at the request of the Town of Medway Planning and Economic Development Board (PEDB). The proposed Project is located at 22 Evergreen Street in Medway, MA. The Project includes construction of seven units within two townhouse structures with parking garages and associated driveways. A site roadway will be constructed with appurtenant stormwater infrastructure and utilities

TT is in receipt of the following materials:

- A plan (Plans) set titled "Evergreen Village, 22 Evergreen Street, Medway, MA", dated September 5, 2019, prepared by Ronald Tiberi, P.E. (RT).
- An Application for Major Site Plan Approval dated September 4, 2019, prepared by RT.
- A Multifamily Housing Special Permit Application dated September 4, 2019, prepared by RT.
- A Medway Scenic Road Work Permit Application – Part 1 dated September 2019, prepared by RT.

The Plans and accompanying materials were reviewed for conformance with Chapter 200 of the Town of Medway PEDB Rules and Regulations (Regulations) and good engineering practice. Review of the project for zoning, stormwater and wetland related issues was not completed as these reviews are conducted by separate consultants/town agencies.

Site Plan Review

1. The Applicant has not supplied a written Project Description. (Ch. 200 §204-3.A.6)
2. The Applicant has not supplied a written Development Impact Statement with appurtenant traffic, environmental, community and parking impacts. (Ch. 200 §204-3.A.7)
3. A list of waivers has not been submitted. However, several waivers have been included on the coversheet of the Plans. (Ch. 200 §204-3.A.8)
4. The Plans have been drawn at a scale of 1"=20' which does not comply with the Regulations. However, the scale of the Plans as presented is sufficient to adequately present the Project. (Ch. 200 §204-4.B)
5. The Applicant has supplied a benchmark with reference to a "town datum" we are unaware of any town datum and the Regulation require the Plans to be on NAVD 88. (Ch. 200 §204-4.D)
6. The lot lines presented do not have metes and bounds shown. (Ch. 200 §204-5.B.3)

7. The wetland buffer located to the south has not been labeled. (Ch. 200 §204-5.C.2)
8. The Applicant has supplied location of existing trees but no descriptions to determine sizes of the trees. (Ch. 200 §204-5.C.3)
9. Dimensioning of proposed buildings has not been provided. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.1)
10. Dimensioning of proposed parking has not been provided. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.2)
11. Proposed contour lines have been provided but have not been labeled. Furthermore, existing grades have not been shown on the Grading Plan. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.4)
12. The Applicant has not supplied a Proposed Site Utilities Plan. The plan should include proposed utilities as well as existing utilities and how existing services into the site will be discontinued. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.6)
13. Dimensions of the units have not been supplied on the Architectural Plans. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.8)
14. The Applicant has supplied renderings of the proposed units but not the overall project with the required views. Furthermore, the renderings are presented in grayscale and shall be provided in color for context. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.9)
15. A lighting plan has not been submitted. Details or proposed lighting have not been presented in the Plans. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.13)
16. Sight distances should be provided which reflect the proposed work at the entrance to the site. It appears the site distance triangle intercepts proposed fence and landscaping provided on the Landscape Plan Sheet L-1. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.14)
17. Fire Hydrants have not been proposed for the Project. The Applicant should provide confirmation from Medway Fire Department that the Project has been reviewed by the Department and all requests have been proposed. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.16)
18. The proposed driveway does not appear to intersect Evergreen Street at a 90° angle. (Ch. 200 §205-3.B.3)
19. The Applicant has not labeled proposed curb type on the Plans. (Ch. 200 §205-3.B.6)
20. Sidewalks have not been proposed as part of the Project. (Ch. 200 §205-3.D.1)
21. As stated in Comment 12, the Applicant has not supplied a Site utilities Plan. All utilities shall be located underground. (Ch. 200 §205-5)
22. The Applicant has not supplied a roadway cross-section to confirm proposed pavement thickness. (Ch. 200 §205-6)
23. The Proposed Vehicle Emergency Access Plan provided does not address the turning movements which may be required for emergency vehicles to turn around within the development. We anticipate emergency vehicles would have to reverse the vehicle which may not be a desired egress from the site by the Fire Department. (Ch. 200 §205-6.E)
24. The Applicant has proposed a 22-foot development roadway which does not meet the minimum 24-foot wide standard. (Ch. 200 §205-6.I)
25. We do not anticipate the snow removal area provided will be sufficient to accommodate the development. The density of the development may limit normal snow removal operations and require off-site mitigation of snow from the site. (Ch. 200 §205-7)

26. Proposed trees are not included on the approved list located in the Regulations. (Ch. 200 §205-9.B.1)
27. The applicant has not supplied a landscape inventory which includes sizes of trees to be removed from the site as a result of the Development. The Applicant shall provide a tree replacement calculation to ensure new replacement trees are provided at the correct rate. (Ch. 200 §205-9.F)

General Comments

28. The Plans are difficult to follow and require some level of revision to ensure all linework is included and proposed at proper hierarchies to ensure reviewers can differentiate between existing and proposed information.
29. We recommend the Applicant propose a stop sign and stop line markings at the proposed intersection with Evergreen Street. Street name signage should also be proposed. We recommend the Applicant coordinate with the town safety officer to confirm signage requirements.
30. Proposed construction entrance is located above one of the rooftop infiltration units. We do not recommend this as these structures should not be driven over unless proper care has been taken to properly backfill and ensure loading requirements have been met. Furthermore, a construction entrance detail has not been provided.
31. We recommend the Applicant provide a roadway profile with utilities shown.
32. There is no proposal for how existing curb cuts will be mitigated. The Applicant shall provide Plans that convey all work to be completed as part of the Project.
33. The Applicant has shown the proposed scale in word form on each sheet, however we recommend the Applicant place a bar scale on each sheet.
34. Site location on locus map is not lining up with the property line.
35. There is a random block showing up on multiple sheets which we believe does not belong, please QC all plans to ensure they are clean and legible.

These comments are offered as guides for use during the Town's review and additional comments may be generated during the course of review. The Applicant shall be advised that any absence of comment shall not relieve him/her of the responsibility to comply with all applicable local, state and federal regulations for the Project. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact us at (508) 786-2200.

Very truly yours,



Steven M. Bouley, P.E.
Senior Project Engineer



Bradley M. Picard, E.I.T.
Civil Engineer

P:\21583\143-21583-20001 (PEDB EVERGREEN VILLAGE)\DOCS\EVERGREEN VILLAGE-PEDBREV(2019-10-07).DOCX