

May 27, 2021

via email

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

**Re: Proposed Open Space Residential Development
15 Coleman Road, Newbury, MA
Peer Review Response to Comments**

Dear Ms. Taylor:

On behalf of the applicant, Zendko, LLC., Civil Design Group, LLC (CDG) is in receipt of the peer review comments dated 05/26/21. CDG's responses are provided in **bold** below the outstanding comments and supporting plans and documentation are enclosed herein:

Sheets 3.1-3.5, Key Map, Existing Conditions Survey

7. The 5 series test pits need to be reviewed. The plan shows two TH5-1 test pits. It appears that six 5 series test pits and 3 perc tests were conducted. Test pit 5-1 had refusal at 44", so that would not be used.

CDG Response: The two (2) test pit numbers will be corrected in the final plan set.

Serwatka Response: A revised plan was not included in the submittal, but the response states that it will be corrected. The plan should be submitted for review.

CDG Response: The test pit numbering has been corrected.

Serwatka Response: The response states that "the test pit numbering has been corrected, but sheet 3.2 still depicts two TH5-1 test pits.

CDG Response: The test pit numbering has been corrected on the survey sheet.

Sheet 7, Demolition & Erosion Control Plan

1. The plan calls for the contractor to "remove all trees within limit of work". It appears this will result in the site being clear cut. The board may want some existing trees, perhaps the larger ones, and along Coleman Road, to be depicted and saved.

CDG Response: See response to Sheet 2 Legend and Notes, #2.

Serwatka Response: A revised plan was not included in the submittal, and the response refers to previous response relative to existing trees.

CDG Response: No further response required.

Serwatka Response: The response states that no further response is required. The plan, however, now states “protect existing trees outside limit of work unless sightlines are obstructed”, for the trees along Coleman Road. The engineer has already analyzed sightlines on sheet 6, which depicts 290’ and 390’ sightlines along Coleman Road. The board, therefore, may want this note revised to require planning department approval prior to any tree removal along Coleman Road.

CDG Response: A note has been added to Sheet 7 indicating that Planning Department approval is required to remove any tree along Coleman Road.

Sheet 9, Grading & Drainage Plan

2. The details provided on sheet 18 are inadequate for the subsurface infiltration system. Soil removal (e.g. A & B layer) beneath the system should be depicted, and fill material should be shown along with specifications. A cleanout detail would need to be provided that would allow for the inspection and maintenance described in the report. An RCP to HDPE pipe connection detail should be provided.

CDG Response: The final plans will include notes/depiction to remove the A and B soil layers beneath the system and fill material will be specified. A cleanout detail will also be included.

Serwatka Response: The response states these issues will be addressed on the final plans.

CDG Response: No further response required.

Serwatka Response: The response states that no further response is required. Sheet 18 now calls for an “inspection manhole” at each corner of the system but note 3 calls them “riser pipes” with manhole covers. Additional detail should be provided as to riser pipe diameter so that inspections and maintenance may occur.

CDG Response: An inspection manhole detail has been provided on Sheet 18.

Sheet 13, Definitive Subdivision & Easement Plan

1. A note in the plans state that the information shown on the plan with respect to lotting, easements and monumentation shall be considered draft.

CDG Responses: Acknowledged. Final plans will include final lotting, easement and monumentation notations prepared by a professional land surveyor.

Serwatka Response: The response states that the final plans will include final lotting information, etc.

CDG Response: No further response required.

Serwatka Response: The plan appears to be revised, but it would appear that a professional land surveyor's stamp should appear on the plan. This was acknowledged by the engineer in his previous responses.

CDG Response: The final plan for endorsement will include a surveyor stamp.

Stormwater Management Report

1. The operation and maintenance plan appears to indicate that this will be a privately maintained project, likely with a homeowner's association. The board may want to make that a condition of any approvals.

CDG Response: The roadway is proposed to be a public right of way, therefore, the Operation and Maintenance plan incorrectly referenced the same and will be updated in the final submission.

Serwatka Response: The response states that the roadway is proposed to be a public right-of-way. The issues of utilities, stormwater BMPs, and septic system would have to be addressed.

CDG Response: The roadway jurisdiction is currently under review with the Planning Board and a final Operation and Maintenance Plan will be prepared based on the Planning Board's decision.

Serwatka Response: The response appears to indicate that these issues remain outstanding.

CDG Response: An appropriate Home Owners Association will be established prior to first occupancy permit and would accept a condition of approval related to the same.

CIVIL DESIGN GROUP, LLC

ENGINEERING. LAND USE. PLANNING. PERMITTING.

21 High Street, Suite 207
North Andover, MA 01845
Tel 978.794.5400
www.cdengineering.com

We trust the responses provided above sufficiently address the comments issued by the peer reviewer. Please feel free to contact our office if you have any questions or require further clarification.

Sincerely,

CIVIL DESIGN GROUP, LLC



Philip R. Henry, P.E.
Principal

cc. Mr. Thomas Zahoruiko, Owner
Enclosures