



October 26, 2016

Travis Snell, Chair
Carlisle Board of Appeals
Town Offices
66 Westford Street
Carlisle, MA 01741

Re: "The Birches", 100 Long Ridge Road
Response 1 Nitsch Engineering Review of October 18, 2016

Dear Mr. Snell:

In response to the Nitsch review of the civil engineering aspects of the above referenced project please find our comments below in the numerical order provided by Nitsch.

Site and Project Descriptions

1. Statement only, no response required.
2. Statement only, but the peer reviewer's stated roadway width is in error. The proposed roadway (defined in Carlisle as a 'private driveway') is 24' to and through the cul-de-sac. See verification on this in item 12.

Permitting

3. Statement only, MEPA review is not required.
4. Statement only, US Army Corps of Engineer review is not required.
5. Statement only, Conservation Commission or the MassDEP (if appealed) will permit the wetland crossing.
6. Statement only, no open space provided.
7. Statement only, no response required.
8. Statement only, no response required.
9. Statement only, no response required.
10. Statement only, proposed condition is not acceptable. The Board of Appeals has no jurisdiction over the US EPA and the 30 day recommendation is not needed for anything other than to delay.
11. Statement only, any update is the responsibility of the ZBA in seeking advice.

Project Layout and Site Features

12. Statement only, no response required.

13. The fire chief has received a copy of the proposed plans and was provided with a fire truck turning template plan and has not provided any objections to the truck maneuverability. All required parking is within the garages.
14. See response to comment 13.
15. These items are final design elements and are not required per MGL Ch. 40 B rules and regulations in 760 CMR 56.05(2). For the most part they will conform to the previously submitted final design plans to be updated prior to construction to reflect any changes. This issue can certainly be addressed in a condition to provide this prior to construction.
16. See response to item 15 above. In general, the construction details remain the same as was previously submitted. The curbing is cape cod berm, the shoulder is shown on the plans and is grass, and there is no sidewalk. The gravel access road will be per the MassDEP standards for public water supply well access.
17. No easements. The association will maintain.
18. No new trails. The Carlisle Trail Committee did not recommend new trails on this property.
19. Referrals to the departments are the responsibility of the ZBA per the rules and regulations of MGL Ch. 40B. The police chief did provide comments on the previous plan.
20. The first phase will be constructed first, then when nearing completion the second phase will commence including the demolition of the barn and farm improvements. The phasing is to allow time for the farm animals to find other accommodations since the actual start date is extremely undetermined.
21. Sign is the same.
22. Statement only, no response required.
23. No ledge is anticipated. No ledge in areas of construction is evident or previously encountered, including during test pits.
24. See item 15. The landscaping plan is generally intended to be the same as the previous plan submittal to be updated prior to construction to reflect any changes.
25. No street lighting is proposed. This is a new comment that was not brought up previously.
26. Statement, the earthwork quantity is not a regulated requirement. The earthwork will be very similar to the previously submitted volumes.
27. See item 15. These are elevation details that will be provided in the construction plans.
28. See item 15. These are piping details that will be provided in the construction plans.
29. See item 15. These are water supply details that will be provided in the permit application to MassDEP for the public water supply.

Drainage/Stormwater Management

30. Statement only, no response required.
31. Statement, the test pit logs were previously submitted. The locations are shown on the provided plans.
32. The recommendation is outside the jurisdiction of the ZBA, is not required anywhere in the Massachusetts Stormwater Manual, and any infiltration provided is not included in the stormwater calculations. Providing roof infiltration is meant to be a positive item as part of a LID design but is not required anywhere.
33. The gravel access roads will be per MassDEP requirements. This area is a distinct drainage subcatchment area and is de minimus in that any runoff will be directed to the natural ground immediately adjacent to the very narrow gravel access road.
34. Statement only, Nitsch indicates concurrence with the design being conservative.
35. There is more than 200% capacity in the water quality calculation and recharge computations and therefore either the 0.5 inch or 1.0 inch requirements are met.
36. No, volume reduction is not required anywhere; not in the Massachusetts Stormwater Manual nor the Town's regulations.
37. Curbing is provided.
38. See item 15, this is a detailed construction item but the HydroCAD reports do show the pipe sizing criteria.
39. See item 35. The stormwater calculations showed that the 0.5 inch requirement was provided. There is over 200% additional capacity so the 1 inch requirement can be met without any changes. Standard 2 is provided. There is no increase in the peak flow rate for all required storm frequencies. The peer review is wrong on this.

MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards

MassDEP Stormwater Handbook standards are not the jurisdiction of the Board of Appeals. Even so, it is the applicant's position that they are all met and will be met in the final design. I take exception to the statements made on Standards 1, 2, and 3. In Standard 1, items 32, 33, 35, and 39 have nothing to do with meeting this standard in the design as there is NO direct discharge to the wetlands. In Standard 2 and 3, test pits have been provided near the bio-retention area. The extended detention basin is not to use infiltration so soil testing in this area would be useless. In any case, a condition that the project meet the relevant stormwater standards is acceptable.

Zoning By-Law:

1. The separation of units and the reasons for the change have been submitted in writing in previous correspondence and discussed briefly in the last hearing in response to a question from Member Galligan.

Travis Snell, Chair
Carlisle Board of Appeals
Re: "The Birches", Nitsch review
October 26, 2016
Page 4 of 4

2. See item 24.
3. See item 24.
4. See item 15. The profile will be generally the same. As previously stated, no waiver of any local regulation on the roadway grade will be requested.

Summary

No additional submittals are intended by the applicant. The information required pursuant to the MGL Ch. 40B including the regulations found in 760 CMR 56.05(2) especially those listed in part (a) have been provided and thus the Board of Appeals has enough information to rule on the project and to condition any approval on final design items.

Sincerely
MEISNER BREM CORPORATION

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Jeffrey A. Brem". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J" and "B".

Jeffrey A. Brem
Principal Engineer

Cc: Mark Bobrowski, Esq.