



August 30, 2021

Martha L. Taylor, Town Planner
Town of Newbury
12 Kent Way
Byfield, MA 01922

Re: 105 High Road OSRD
OSRD Detailed Plan Submission
Response to August 20, 2021 Peer Review Letter

115 GLASTONBURY BLVD
GLASTONBURY CT 06033
860.659.1416

120 MIDDLESEX AVENUE
SUITE 20
SOMERVILLE, MA 02145
617.776.3350

6 CHESTNUT ST
AMESBURY MA 01913
978.388.2157

197 LOUDON RD
SUITE 310
CONCORD NH 03301
603.856.7854

317 IRON HORSE WAY
SUITE 100
PROVIDENCE RI 02908
401.383.6530

Dear Ms. Taylor and Members of the Planning Board:

Design Consultants Inc. has received the review letter by Joseph J. Serwatka, P.E. dated August 20, 2021. The plans and stormwater calculations have been revised in response to the review comments with two copies delivered by hand on August 26, 2021. DCI is providing a written response to the review the remaining comments only below with peer review comment in normal font and *DCI response blue italic font*.

Title Sheet, G1.11

All comments addressed.

OSRD Site Plan, Sheets C1.11/12

3. The response states that each home will be custom built. It also recommends that individual plans be submitted to the Planning Department for review. The board may want to condition that each dwelling/lot submit a site plan for review/approval.

Each home will be custom built within the identified unit exclusive use areas. As is customary with residential construction in Newbury, the contractor will submit a plot plan to the Building and Planning Departments as part of the building permit process. The plot plans for Seagate will include detailed grading with patios and site appurtenances. The provided plot plan shall confirm that the grading within the footprint matches the required grades outside of the footprint. This will ensure that the home specific grading is consistent with the design of the roadway and the stormwater management system, as shown on the approved site plan and described in the stormwater management report and will support the proper functioning of the drainage system.

5. The plan has been revised to show the pool. It should be noted that a proposed dwelling now appears to be depicted over the existing dwelling on lot 10. The board may want the engineer to address the existing dwelling.

The exiting home on lot 10 is to remain with the garage to be remodeled moving the garage doors from the front or north side to the end or east side of the garage.

6. The lights have been revised to electric lamp posts, per the response, but no detail or photometric analysis is provided. The plan still does not provide illumination at the site entrance, as would be typical. The response refers to this as the “new normal” due to dark sky compliance. The board may want the engineer adequate illumination for the anticipated residents/owners of the project.

As consistent with the recently approved OSRD and Subdivision projects by the Planning Board there are no streetlights provided with this project. There is an existing streetlight approximately 30 feet to the north of the drive entry on High Road that provides sufficient lighting at the intersection of the new driveway and High Road.

OSRD Grading/Drainage Plan, Sheets C1.21/22

2. As noted previously, the response states that each home will be custom built. The response offers that individual plans be submitted for each dwelling/lot for review/approval by the town. The board may want to consider this option.

Each home will be custom built within the identified unit exclusive use areas. As is customary with residential construction in Newbury, the contractor will submit a plot plan to the Building and Planning Departments as part of the building permit process. The plot plans for Seagate will include detailed grading with patios and site appurtenances. The provided plot plan shall confirm that the grading within the footprint matches the required grades outside of the footprint. This will ensure that the home specific grading is consistent with the design of the roadway and the stormwater management system, as shown on the approved site plan and described in the stormwater management report and will support the proper functioning of the drainage system.

3. The plan has been revised to label “drainage swale”, and a detail has been provided, but a minimum depth should be specified. The proposed swale would appear to severely restrict the use of the backyards on lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 given the proximity to the dwelling and grading requirements. The board may want to require, and I would recommend, that the drainage swales shown on these plans be integrated into any future “site plans” for individual lots relative to location and grading. Otherwise, individual lot designers may be inclined to modify swale location/grading in such a way so that it no longer complies with the original design intent.

The swale depth of 8” has been added to the detail. It is important to note the site is a condominium and not individual lots with different designers, as such there is control of the entire site as each home is designed and constructed. All areas that provide stormwater management will be located outside of the exclusive use areas for a homeowner and therefore may not be altered. The building permit review process will ensure that each home is constructed within the identified building footprints, which represents the exclusive use area for the home. This will ensure that none of the stormwater

management features will be modified and that the stormwater management drainage system is properly maintained.

7. The response does not address roof infiltration systems that were mentioned in the OSRD narratives, even though they would greatly improve the drainage design, in my professional opinion. The response does state that the current grading plan directs runoff to the front and back of lots but, as previously mentioned, all the lots will be developed individually, so the current plan is conceptual only.

The drainage as designed fully complies with the stormwater standards without the need to incorporate roof infiltration chamber systems. By requiring chambers, the homes would require gutters and downspouts to be incorporated into the design. At this time, we do not know if gutters will be included on all the home designs. Dependent on the detailed home design there may be stone drip tranches or gutters, downspouts and chambers included with the house design. During the building permit review process the contractor will be required to demonstrate that the design of the home will conform with the stormwater management features as approved.

8. The engineer may want to review his response to this issue, as it does not appear to make sense. It reads "the driveways all are all set above the driveway grade with water running back to driveway drainage system either over pavement or over grass".

As noted previously, the driveways shown are conceptual at this point, as each lot will be developed individually.

The garages are all set above the road grade with driveways sloping down to the roadway drainage system. During the building permit review process the contractor will be required to demonstrate that the design of the home will conform with the stormwater management features as approved based on the provided plot plan.

9. Two new test pits, TP 21-12 and 21-13, are shown in the infiltration basin, but the soil logs have not been included in the stormwater report.

Test pit logs for TP 21-12 and 21-13 were included in Appendix C of the stormwater report. Please see the last page of Appendix C for this information.

OSRD Utility Plan, Sheets C1.31/32

All Comments Addressed

OSRD Drive Profile, Sheets C2.11/12

2. The response states that catchbasins 3 and 4 have been added to the profile page, but only CB-3 has been added. Also, the descriptions appear to reference sewer manholes (SMH) rather than drain manholes (DMH). This should be corrected.

The references have been corrected and both catch basin are now shown on the plan.

OSRD Erosion & Sediment Control Plan

All comments addressed

OSRD Misc. Details, Sheets C5.11/12/13

2. The response states that the wall is less than 4 feet in height.

The response also indicated a standard detail was provided. The detail is on Sheet C5.11.

Stormwater Management Report

All Comments Addressed

Landscape Plan, Sheet L1

1. The plan labels “existing trees to remain” abutting 107 High Road, and on the southerly property line, but proposed grading is shown in these locations. It is, therefore, unlikely that the trees can be saved.

The grading has been revised to save most of the trees in this area with the removed trees now called out on the plans.

2. A multitude of trees, shrubs and annuals/perennials are proposed but, as mentioned previously, much of the site development is “conceptual”. The board may want the engineer to address which portions of the landscape plan are not conceptual, and whether individual lot landscape plans will be submitted as custom homes are proposed.

The landscaping along the site drive and screening along the property lines is to be built per the approved site plan. The plantings shown within the exclusive use areas for the individual homes are intended to be comprehensive of the plantings for each home.

3. The board may want the landscape plan to address whether all areas will be sprinklered/irrigated to ensure adequate growth.

It is anticipated the development will be irrigated.

4. The board may want the landscape plan stamped and signed by a landscape architect, as would be typical.

Upon the approval of the site plan, the Petitioner will submit a final stamped and signed landscape plan by the landscape architect.

If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know. Our goal is to have the hearing closed at the next planning board meeting on September 8th, 2021.

Sincerely,

Stephen Sawyer

Stephen Sawyer, P.E.

Letter to J. Doe, 00/00/0000