

October 7, 2025

Town Hall
Planning Department
101 Main Street
Ashland, MA 01721

Attn: Jasmin Farinacci, Director of Planning and Community Development

**Re: GCG Site Plan and Drainage Peer Review
Proposed Team Hoyt YMCA & Early Learning Center, 30 Memorial Drive**

Dear Members of the Board,

Bohler Engineering MA, LLC is in receipt of a Peer Review comment letter from GCG Associates, Inc, dated August 4, 2025. On behalf of the applicant, MetroWest Young Man's Christian Associates, Inc. (MetroWest YMCA), Bohler offers the following responses. For clarity, the original comments are in *italics*, while our responses are directly below in **bold** type.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment *The project exceeded the 1-acre limit of work threshold and requires a NPDES Construction General Permit and associates SWPPP to be filed at least 14 days prior to start of construction.*

Response: **Comment acknowledged, and an EPA NPDES registration will be filed.**

Comment *This is a new development project. The site consists of 546,641+/- s.f. (12.55+/- acres), Assessors Map 13, Lot 178), in the Ashland Rail Transit District (RTD) Area C and Area D Zoning District. The site plan proposed a 3-story membership building for the Young Man's Christian Associates (YMCA) use and a separate single-story building for the early learning center (ELC) use. (Chapter 282 Section 8.4.4) - The YMCA building consists of Rail Transit Use (g), Indoor Commercial Recreation use; use (j), Parking in compliance with section 5.1 to service a use permitted; and use (l), Outdoor Commercial Recreation other than campground. The ELC building consists of use (n), Day Care Facility, and (d) Educational uses, or by a nonprofit educational group. Kitchen facility is proposed in the YMCA and ELC buildings as shown on the Architectural floor plan, Level 01, sheet A1.2. Which under use (o) Accessory uses, (ii) Food preparation and eating facilities. All these proposed uses are permitted in the RTD areas C and D Zone as By Right.*

Response: **No response necessary.**

Comment *The northern portion of the proposed soccer field is inside the Environmental Restriction and Easement Area A-2. The applicant should clarify how the proposed use complies with the easement restrictions.*

Response: **There appear to be restrictions on the use of groundwater in Easement Area A-2, but there are no restrictions on the placement of fill or use of the area within Area A-2.**

SITE PLAN SET

C-101 – Cover Sheet

Comment 1. No comment.

C-102 – General Notes & Legend

Comment 2. GCG recommends adding the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System), CGP (Construction General Permit), and the associated SWWWP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan) requirements as part of the Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Notes.

Response: Note number 29 has been added to the Massachusetts Erosion and Sediment Control Notes indicating that a construction general permit and SWPPP are required because the site disturbance exceeds one acre.

C-103 – Jurisdictional Notes

Comment 3. No comment.

C-201 – Existing Conditions/Demolition Plan

Comment 4. GCG recommends field locating the existing bike trail pavement, handicap ramp, steel guardrails, crosswalk, rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) sign, and large boulders in front of the southwesterly site corner frontage. Where the proposed site walkway will be connected. (See C-302 comments below).

Response: The requested existing features have been added to the plan.

C-301 – Overall Site Layout Plan

Comment 5. The Zoning Table should include the RTD C – Rail Transit District C zoning district, which is located at the western portion of the site.

Response: The zoning table has been updated to indicate the additional zoning district.

Comment 6. 282-8.4.6.11 - The applicant is requesting maximum building height relief through the special permit approval, maximum permitted height 30' by right and 50' by special permit. A 46'-5" building height is proposed. GCG recommends providing mean building height calculations for the Building Department to review. (The Architectural plan shows YMCA building with three levels and partial 2 levels in the north elevation (54.5' height) and two levels in the south elevation (40' height), a mean building height calculation should be provided.)

Response: A mean building height calculation has been provided by the Architects.

Comment 7. The proposed 72.7' building separation shown on the Zoning Table should be clarified. However, the building separation dimensions shown on C-302 were 71.8' without building expansion and 30.4' with the building expansion.

Response: The design table has been updated to indicate the dimensions shown on the detailed site plan.

Comment 8. 282-8.4.7 – The applicant has requested a relief to reduce the rear/side landscape screen from 50' to 20.6'.

Response: No response necessary.

Comment 9. The proposed 262 parking spaces should be verified, GCG counted 263 spaces (the 27 spaces in front of the YMCA building appeared to be 28 spaces).

Response: The overall parking count has been updated to 289 spaces to include 28 spaces in front of the YMCA building and to show striped spaces in snow storage areas, per the Town of Ashland's request

Comment 10. Parking space calculations should be provided. The ELC use should be calculated based on Section 5.1.2 - Day care & nursery schools use parking area requirements; the YMCA use is under Section 5.1.2 - Others use and require Building Inspector advisory.

Response: Parking quantities are based on actual programming in the building and are modeled using YMCA data from the Framingham location, as well as YMCAs throughout the country.

Comment 11. The proposed 9.0' x 18.0' parking stall dimensions do not meet standard 9' x 20' requirements (Ch. 282, Section 10, Definitions - Parking space).

Response: The Ashland ZBA granted a variance for the 9' x 18' parking stall dimensions on September 9, 2025.

Comment 12. Chapter 164-2 – Handicap accessible spaces calculations should be provided. Section 164-2 requires additional handicap accessible spaces than the ADA/AAB requirements.

Response: The Federal ADA standards require seven (7) ADA parking stalls. Section 164-2 of the Ashland Bylaws requires six (6) ADA parking stalls. Eight (8) ADA stalls are provided. The Federal and Town requirements have been added to the zoning table.

C-302 – Site Plan A

Comment 13. The proposed 9' x 18' parking stall dimensions do not meet the standard 9' x 20' requirements (Section 10, Definitions), the (27) parking spaces label in front of the YMCA building should be 28 spaces.

Response: The Ashland ZBA granted a variance for the 9' x 18' parking stall dimensions on September 9, 2025.

Comment 14. There should not be any bollards proposed in front of the handicap spaces access aisle. The plan should show all wheelchair ramp locations with warning panel requirements. Curbing in front of the access aisle should be flush with the parking pavement and wheelchair ramp landing. (Grading plan should be adjusted accordingly).

Response: Bollards have been relocated to provide minimum required clearances at the ADA parking space access aisles.

Comment 15. The proposed westerly pavement area is being designated/hatched as snow storage area. This area could provide addition 26 parking spaces during the non-winter periods. The proposed 263 parking spaces and the 26 non-winter spaces provide 289 parking spaces combined which is required to meet the peak parking demand (268 vehicles on Saturday per MDM Transportation Impact Assessments (TIA) report, page 22). Since the ELC uses parking demands are not seasonal. GCG recommends laying out the pavement area as parking spaces with the required parking striping and landscape requirements and seeks additional snow storage areas on-site. Furthermore, snow storage on top of the two sets of double catch basins should be avoided to prevent blocking and creating icy hazardous conditions. Furthermore, snow storage area should be provided for the main southern parking lot.

Response: The westerly parking area has been striped with 26 spaces as requested, resulting in a total of 289 parking spaces within the site. Snow storage areas have been added for the south parking lot.

Comment 16. The westerly parking lot is intended to serve ELC building use, this area may have frequent drop-off parking with heavy parent and toddler pedestrian traffic. GCG recommends providing additional walkways within the parking areas.

Response: A five foot wide crosswalk has been added in the westerly parking area toward the south immediately opposite the ADA access aisle. This area is expected to have the most parking and pedestrian traffic as it is near the front entrance to the ELC.

Comment 17. All ADA/AAB accessible parking areas should be equipped with striped (no-parking) access aisles with level landing and warning panels. Curbing should be eliminated or set to flush between pavement and wheelchair ramp landing. Transitional curbs should be utilized for the ramps. No bollard or sign should be placed within the access path. Wheelchair ramps should be called out/and shown on the layout plan.

Response: The ADA parking areas have been revised as suggested.

Comment 18. Sections 5.2.1. and 5.2.6. Loading area should be provided.

Response: Deliveries to the site will be made by box trucks. A delivery area is provided in front of the YMCA. Deliveries to the ELC will be made at the northwest door of the ELC building and a truck can temporarily park in front of the maintenance shed or in front of the ELC door, as deliveries are expected to be made during off-peak hours.

Comment 19. Section 5.3 - No freestanding sign proposed.

Response: A monument site sign has been added at the southeast property corner at Memorial Drive.

Comment 20. The 1,040 s.f. maintenance shed referred to architectural plans. But Architectural shed plans were not provided.

Response: Shed plans will be provided on future building permit plans.

Comment 21. The plan shows a "Do Not Enter" sign at the western driveway access which conflicts with the two-way driveway arrows and "Stop" sign shown on the plan. There appears to be driveway intersection safety sight distance issues due to the grading. If the intention is for a one-way ingress only driveway this should be shown on the plans.

Response: The "Do Not Enter" sign has been removed.

Comment 22. There is no sidewalk along the northern side of Memorial Drive, a paved multipurpose (sidewalk and bike path) path exists along the southern side of the road. There is an existing paved bike path in front of the southwesterly site frontage with RRFB sign, wheelchair ramp, guardrail, and crosswalk crossing Memorial Drive. The proposed sidewalk along the proposed western driveway (see additional grading comments below) should connect to the bike path crosswalk landing and utilize the existing crosswalk. Relocation of the guardrail or builders/ledge should be addressed. (Existing bike path details were requested under the Existing Conditions/Demolition Plan, C-201 comments).

Response: A connection from the western driveway sidewalk to the existing bike path has been added.

Comment 23. The project proposes a 5' wide walkway connecting the center of YMCA building to the existing multipurpose path with a crosswalk crossing Memorial Drive. GCG recommends having MDM Transportation Consultants' Inc. (Project Traffic Consultant) evaluate the proposed midblock crosswalk between the existing bike path crosswalk and another existing crosswalk at the Memorial Drive West Union Street intersection. This new midblock crosswalk is being proposed approximately 420'+/- east of the existing bike path midblock crosswalk. The proximity of two midblock crosswalks in a roadway with 85% percentile vehicle travel speed at 37 to 38 mph should be reviewed by the traffic engineer.

Response: **Response by MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc.:** Initially the project team reviewed the feasibility of providing a sidewalk between the central portion of the site and then extending the sidewalk along the eastern side of Memorial Drive to provide a connection to/from Route 135. Upon review there are existing constraints that include but are not limited to the location of a utility pole and guy wire, traffic signal equipment, MBTA signage, and right-of-way restrictions that would likely make this connection infeasible without right-of-way out of the control of the Applicant. Therefore, the midblock crossing was determined to be the best solution.

As outlined in the May 23, 2025 Traffic Impact Assessment, MDM reviewed the location of the potential midblock crossing along Memorial Drive which would provide an ADA compliant pedestrian connection with crosswalk and rectangular rapid flashing pedestrian beacon (RRFB) along the central portion of the Site to provide a connection to the existing multi-use path along the western side of Memorial Drive which would accommodate pedestrian and bicycle activity to/from south. A review of the sight lines (TIA Exhibit TIA Attachments) for the potential crosswalk location along Memorial Drive indicates that adequate stopping sight distance (SSD) will be available. The crosswalk location will also be enhanced with RRFB's to enhance visibility and awareness of a pedestrian crossing.

Bohler Addition to Response: Due to the ROW issues noted above and based on discussions with the Town, the Applicant's understanding is that the Town may consider constructing a sidewalk at the Dunkin' Donuts property, in which case the Applicant would consider providing a connection from the site to the new sidewalk, at that time.

Comment 24. Label gravel trail and width on the plan.

Response: Labels for the gravel trail and width have been added to the plan.

C-303 – Site Plan B

Comment 25. The project proposes tree clearing and constructing a portion of the soccer field within the Grant Environmental Restriction & Easement Area (A-2), The applicant should clarify how the proposed work meets the restriction in the easement.

Response: There are restrictions on the use of groundwater in Easement Area A-2, but there are no known restrictions on the placement of fill or use of the ground surface area within Area A-2.

Comment 26. Label gravel trail and width on the plan.

Response: Labels for the gravel trail and width have been added to the plan.

C-401 – Overall Grading and Drainage Plan (See C-402 and C-403 Comments Below)

C-402 – Grading and Drainage Plan A

Comment 27. Section 5.6. – Corner Clearance, the proposed eastern driveway has a cut along the western shoulder area and blocking the safety sight line, both driveways consist of steep slope at the Memorial Road intersection. GCG recommends providing a leveling grading transition at each driveway.

Response: **Thirty-foot long leveling areas of 2% to 3.5% slopes have been provided on the exit / westerly sides of the driveways.**

Comment 28. Section 5.7.3.1 – The proposed grading at these locations, the west side of the eastern driveway, the steep slope at the eastern end of YMCA building, (east of the southeasterly building corner between stairway and walkway grass strip, and the opening area behind northeastern side of YMCA building) where the three horizontal to one vertical (3H:1V) slope is exceeded should be addressed.

Response: **The three areas noted have been revised to 3:1 slopes by proposing that boulders that will be excavated during construction are used as retaining walls.**

Comment 29. The proposed western driveway consists of 6%+/- longitudinal slope and the abutting sidewalk along the western driveway shoulder would not meet the maximum 5% ADA/AAB slope requirements. GCG recommends providing a grass strip between the driveway and sidewalk to reduce the walkway slope to meet the ADA/AAB requirements.

Response: **There is no feasible way to provide a slope-compliant path at the west driveway without providing either an extremely winding path or providing ramp switchbacks. Our understanding is that ADA guidelines require only one accessible route from the street to the site, and the center sidewalk route provides the ADA accessible path.**

Comment 30. There is an unlabeled contour between the handicap parking spaces and the YMCA building. There is a contour 253 shown in the parking lot and the building doors are at elevation 254. There should not be any contour between contour 253 and the building finish floor at 254. In addition, there should be wheelchair ramp landing(s) installed in front of the handicap spaces with warning panels. The sidewalk in front of the handicap accessible spaces could be graded flush with the parking pavement, with warning panels installed along the walkway parking space transition, accessible spaces sign on bollard could be utilized in front of each space, but no bollard should be installed in front of the access aisles. The proposed accessible route in front of the handicap spaces should not exceed the 2% maximum slope to meet the landing requirements. (5% maximum slope was specified.)

Response: **The recommended grading changes have been made.**

Comment 31. Handicap ramp and spot grades should be provided in front of the handicap accessible spaces near the ELC building.

Response: **Spot grades have been added to the ADA spaces near the ELC building.**

Comment 32. Leveling landing is required at the sidewalk/walkway and Memorial Road connection, and all driveway, parking lot, internal crosswalk connections, add wheelchair ramps, as necessary.

Response: **Level landings have been added where required. Please note that some of these level landings are within the paved areas, as allowed by ADA guidelines.**

Comment 33. There appeared to be incomplete contours at the west side of the concrete dumpster pad lawn area. The proposed contours should be labeled. There appeared to be an extra contour 250 shown, a high point (approximately 252) should be shown behind the dumpster pad between the two 252-contours and adjust the 251 contours to direct the runoff flow northward and southward.

Response: The contours have been revised as recommended.

Comment 34. The proposed retaining wall is approximately 11.5' in height at the highest point with proposed 4-foot high chain link fence. The wall exceeds 4 feet in height, which requires a building permit, final wall design and chain link fence should be approved by the Building Department.

Response: Comment acknowledged.

Comment 35. Soil test pit locations should be shown in the plan set.

Response: Soil test pit locations have been added to the plans.

Comment 36. Proposed underground infiltration Basin 3 – (160 Retain-It concrete units), with proposed bottom of system stone elevation at 241.50, which is approximately 15.5 feet below the high surface contour 257. GCG recommends additional test pits to be performed at the location. The nearest TP-4 soil test pit was 242.25, at the limit of the excavator's reach. 12 test pits, all indicated silt sand materials in the 'C' soil horizon/layer. Based on the nearby development (Cirrus Apartments and Arbella at Ashland) projects experience, the soil materials in the area are either sandy or with very high silt contents, poorly drained soil, GCG recommend performing soil sieve analysis to evaluate the on-site materials.

Response: Additional storm water testing was performed at the site on August 28th and 29th in the area of the proposed storm water basins. Bedrock or boulders were encountered at a maximum elevation of 242.50 within the footprint area of Basin #3 (renumbered to Basin #2). Basin #2 has been changed from Retain-It concrete units to Stormtech underground chambers in order to be able to raise the basin to provide two feet of separation from the possible bedrock. Sieve analyses were also performed on the soils, and the results and impacts on the drainage calculations are described below in Drainage Report comment #10.

Comment 37. The proposed underground (chambers) infiltration basins 1, 2, and 4 utilize the Stormtech Isolator Row Plus and deep-sump hooded catch basin for stormwater runoff pre-treatments. GCG concurs with the treatment requirements. However, the Isolator row plus chambers is intended to provide pretreatment storage volume, typically based on the required 1-inch water quality volume (WQV), with a woven textile (impermeable) fabric bottom liner to retain the first flush runoff for sediment. Therefore, the isolator row plus chambers volume should be excluded from the stormwater HydroCAD model calculations. In addition, basins 3's bottom of stone and chamber invert elevations do not match with the HydroCAD calculations. The infiltration basin 4 shows 12 MC-3500 Stormtech chambers embedded in stone bed. However, the calculations were based on 15 chamber units.

(GEO-TP-1B). Additional test pits at the exact system location should be performed, with soil material sieve analysis to evaluate the silt content.

Response: The plans have been modified to provide isolator rows in addition to the infiltration units needed for runoff attenuation. The isolator rows are not included in the hydrologic model, and as a result, the plans show one additional row of units than are listed in the HydroCAD model. The number of rows and units in Basin #4 (renumbered to Basin #3) have been revised and the plans and

HydroCAD model have been revised to match. An infiltration rate matching the sieve analysis results has been applied to Basin #3.

Comment 39. The plan shows a proposed roof drain #4 directed northward to the soccer field, this is not part of the drainage calculations and should be removed.

Response: The drainage calculations have been revised to include a 4,000 square foot roof area draining to the pipe. The roof is part of the area that drains to Basin #4.

Comment 40. The proposed driveway at the northern side of the buildings is proposed with curbing at the northern edge and directs runoff to the soccer field, the open field is utilized as vegetated filter strip pre-treatment. Therefore, concentrated runoff flow should be avoided, GCG recommends modifying the contours to create a level spreader for sheet flow over the open field.

Response: A catch basin has been added just before the end of the curb in this area in order to reduce the amount of flow discharging directly to the open field. This will also help reduce the chance of runoff washing out the gravel walkway in this area. The catch basin will be piped to a stone outlet point with swale routing the discharge to basin #4.

Comment 41. The 18" drainpipe between OCS A-30 and DMH A-10 with 4.04% slope should be reduced to lower the flow velocity to below 10 feet per second, as shown on the Storm Sewers calculations line 23, during the 25-year return events.

Response: The pipe slope between OCS-30 and DMH-10 has been reduced to 2%, resulting in a pipe velocity of less than 10 fps.

Comment 42. A30 outlet pipe sized was shown 18" on the plan, calculations were based on a 12" pipe.

Response: Plans and report have been revised to show a 15" outlet pipe.

Comment 43. B30 outlet pipe sized was shown 15" on the plan, calculations were based on a 12" pipe.

Response: Plans have been revised to show a 12 inch pipe to match the calculations.

Comment 44. Drainpipe from B-50 to B-40 should be labeled, with 18' – 15" diameter at 0.5% slope.

Response: Drainpipe from B-50 to B-40 has been labeled with a 15" diameter at 0.5% slope.

Comment 45. Structure C20's proposed rim grade at 243.00 is below the nearby proposed contour 245 and should be raised to the finish grade.

Response: Structure C20's and the accompanying infiltration basin have been removed from the plans.

Comment 46. Underground infiltration systems dimensions should be shown on the plan.

Response: Plans have been revised to show infiltration systems dimensions.

Comment 47. Underground infiltration system should be equipped with cleanout/inspection ports suitable for cleaning and maintenance. The isolator row plus chambers would require an inlet and a suction port at the two ends. Basins 1 and 4 need suction ports.

Response: Inspection ports have been added to underground infiltration basins. Manholes with 24-inch diameter pipes are shown at the ends of the isolator rows for access and cleaning purposes, so suction ports are not needed.

C-403 – Grading and Drainage Plan B

Comment 48. Infiltration basin #5's top of berm contour 233.50 should be shown on the plan, the proposed earth berm is constructed in fill and approximately 6 feet wide at the top. GCG recommends widening the top of berm to a minimum of 10 feet wide, (which also serve as an access maintenance path), the earth berm should be constructed with low permeable core and keyed at least two feet below the existing grade. The infiltration basin should be sized with 1 foot freeboard during the 100-year storm event. An emergency spillway should be provided and sized with brimful conditions without impinging upon the structural integrity of the basin, per SMH Vol.2, Ch. 2, Pg. 91. (i.e., no overtopping earth berm). Spillway should be sized with erosion armor protection.

Response: The basin (now Basin #4) has been revised to provide a 10 foot wide berm. A detail has been added showing a low permeability core keyed at least two feet below existing grade. An emergency overflow spillway has been added with crest elevation just above the 100 year brimful elevation and the top of the berm elevation provides one foot of freeboard.

Comment 49. The western soccer field is part of the vegetated filter strip pretreatment BMP and should be maintained accordingly. Both soccer fields should be constructed with natural turf, no synthetic turf should be used without drainage mitigation. The northern soccer field is partially in the Environmental Restriction and Easement Area A-2. The plan should specify that no groundwater should be utilized for irrigation or any other use restricted under record document - Book 62400 Page 377.

Response: The playing field surfaces will be natural grass. Please note that sediment generation behind the building is expected to be minimal as the rear access drive will be used infrequently by vehicles, and the main use behind the building will be by pedestrians. A note has been added to plan sheet L-101 prohibiting the use of groundwater for irrigation in the area of Environmental Restriction and Easement Area A-2.

C-501 – Utility Plan

Comment 50. Verify sewer pipe slope between SMH 30 to SMH 20, it calculated to be 0.76%.

Response: The sewer pipe slope between SMH 30 and SMH 20 has been revised to read 0.76%.

Comment 51. Proposed grease trap for the ELC building should have a standard internal drop of 3-inch per 1,500 Gallon Precast Concrete Grease Trap detail (C-902). Hence, the inlet invert elevation should be 249.20, and the 6" PVC sewer service pipe slope to the building should be 2.29% slope.

Response: The invert at the grease trap and sewer pipe slope have been revised.

Comment 52. The applicant should clarify that there is no natural gas service connection to the ELC building.

Response: Correct, there is no natural gas service connection to the ELC building.

Comment 53. Water pressure and flow tests should be performed to verify fire flow capacity.

Response: A water flow test was performed by Impact Fire on June 5, 2025 and found a static pressure of 105 psi, residual pressure of 87 psi, and flow rate of 919 GPM at 30 psi.

Comment 54. Estimated site sewage flow should be provided and approved by DPW Sewer Division.

Response: Sewer flows will be provided to the DPW for review.

C-801 – Overall Erosion and Sediment Control Plan

Comment 55. Install erosion control silt sack at the Memorial Drive downstream catch basins

Response: An inlet protection silt sack has been added to the downstream catch basin to the west on Memorial Drive.

C-802 – Erosion and Sediment Control Notes and Details

Comment 56. Massachusetts Erosion and Sediment Control Note #6's 2:1 slope does not agree with Chapter 282, Section 5.7.3.1 – which require minimum slope of a 3H:1V except under special permit from Planning Board.

Response: Note #6 has been revised to say that slopes shall not be steeper than three to one and the areas of proposed grading within the site that previously exceeded a three to one slope have been revised to be a three to one slope.

C-901 – Construction Details

Comment 57. Pavement Section details, the plan should specify the 'Light Duty' and 'Heavy Duty' bituminous concrete course locations. Pavement thickness within Memorial Drive roadway should be 1-1/2" bituminous concrete/hot mix asphalt (HMA) top course over 3" HMA binder (intermediate) course, with 4" dense grade gravel base over 12" gravel borrow base on top of the compacted subgrade; Pavement thickness within Memorial Drive's Multi-Use Path should be 1-1/2" HMA top course over 1-1/2" HMA intermediate course, with 4" select gravel base over 8" gravel borrow base on top of compacted subgrade.

Response: Pavement throughout the site will consist of "light duty" pavement, and the detail has been revised to eliminate the "heavy duty" notation. Separate details for the pavement sections within Memorial Drive and the multi-use path have been added to sheet C-901.

C-902 – Construction Details

Comment 58. Final 'Reinforced Segmental Block Retaining Wall' details shall be certified by a Massachusetts Registered Professional Structural Engineer and submitted for Building Permit approval.

Response: Comment acknowledged, and stamped wall plans will be provided to the building department for approval prior to construction.

C-903 – Construction Details

Comment 59. Outlet control structures A-30 (Basin 1) and B30 (Basin 2) rectangular weir width dimensions should be provided. (2' wide per HydroCAD calculations), outlet pipe diameters should match with the drainage plan and calculations. (Both pipes were based on 12" diameter in the calculations but shown 18" diameter on the drainage plan.)

Response: Basin #2 has been deleted from the design and details for Basin #1 have been updated to reflect the correct outlet pipe diameter. HydroCAD calculations have been updated with a 4' wide weir.

Comment 60. There were some discrepancies with the outlet control structures A-20 (Basin 4) and C20 (Basin 3), with the plan and calculations. The details drawings should be adjusted accordingly. (See additional Drainage Report comments below).

Response: OCS configurations have been revised and the details have been adjusted accordingly.

Comment 61. Specify 3/8" gravel surfacing topcoat thickness on the Gravel Trail Surface Detail.

Response: A one inch (minimum) 3/8" gravel surface top coat thickness has been indicated on the gravel trail surface detail.

C-904 – Construction Details

Comment 62. Underground infiltration (MC-4500 Chambers) system's overall dimensions should be provided.

Response: The dimensions of the underground infiltration basins have been added to the basin details.

C-905 – Construction Details

Comment 63. Underground infiltration (MC-3500 chambers) system(s) overall dimensions should be provided.

Response: The dimensions of the underground infiltration basins have been added to the basin details.

906 – Construction Details

Comment 64. Retain-It Underground Infiltration Basin Details' Typical Infiltration, (Elevation and Plan View) details did not match with the structures number, layout, under drain, invert elevations, and finish grade shown on plan sheet C-402 and C-403, which should be revised to apply to this project.

Response: The Retain-it basin detail has been removed and replaced with a Stormtech infiltration basin detail.

Comment 65. Access/inspection ports and clean-out ports should be provided.

Response: Inspection ports have been added to the Stormtech infiltration basin details.

C-907 – Construction Details

Comment 66. Generic sewer ejection pump details, to be reviewed by the DPW Sewer Division.

Response: Comment acknowledged, sewer pump details will be provided to the DPW when available.

L-101 – Overall Landscape Plan (See L-102 and L-103 Comments Below)

L-102 & L-103 – Landscape Plans A and B

Comment 67. The proposed westerly paved snow storage area is intended to be parking area during the non-winter periods and should be designed as parking lot, based on the pavement dimensions, it will fit 26 parking spaces. GCG recommends providing the required interior landscaping in parking areas features per Section 5.4.4. (1 tree per eight spaces required.)

Response: The westerly parking area has been changed to striped parking as recommended. The large snow storage area has been removed and redistributed throughout the site as shown on the site plans.

Comment 68. Section 5.6 Corner Clearance – the proposed driveways consist of steep cut at the Memorial Drive intersection, GCG recommends creating a leveling area at the driveway entrance/exit and evaluate the safety sight line at the intersections with the proposed steep driveway shoulder grade and landscape features.

Response: A leveling area has been provided at both driveways as requested. From the project traffic engineer, MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc.: As outlined in the May 23, 2025, TIA, the available sight lines looking north and south from the site driveway onto Memorial Drive will exceed the recommended minimum and ideal sight line criteria from AASHTO. The Applicant commits to clearing and grading the sight lines along Memorial Drive in such a manner that sight distance requirements cited in the TIA for the proposed driveways are achieved. Any new plantings (shrubs, bushes) or physical landscape features to be located within driveway sight lines should also be maintained at a height of 2 feet or less above the adjacent existing roadway grade to ensure unobstructed lines of sight.

Comment 69. The applicant is seeking relief with Section 8.4.7, which requires a distance of fifty (50) feet, minimum, of side and rear yard boundaries, in place landscape greenery or other screening method(s) existing at the time of development shall remain undisturbed or shall be landscaped in accordance with a plan approved by the Planning Board.

Response: No response necessary.

L-201 – Overall Lighting Plan

Comment 72. The applicant should verify the Luminaire Schedule's lighting fixtures quantities. The schedule Label P4M appeared to be P4 label shown on the plan; Label P-4M-D appeared to be P4-D shown on the plan; D-BEGA label appeared to be D1 shown on the plan. The schedule calls for eight (8) - P4M-D lighting units and nineteen (19) - D-BEGA units. However, GCG counted 7 - P4-D units and 22 - D1 units on the plan.

Response: The Luminaire Schedule's lighting fixture quantities have been verified and updated accordingly.

Comment 73. The mounting height for the P4M, P3-S, P2-S, and P4M-D fixtures are 25'-0" above finish grade. And the D-BEGA lighting fixtures mounting height are proposed at 20'-0". The applicant should clarify the D-BEGA lighting fixtures mounting height, is it 20'-0" or 20". There are no specific requirements for light fixture mounting height in the RTD zoning district, the photometric plan shows minor luminance (1.4 foot-candle) overspilled onto the Memorial Drive right-of-way. However, there are existing streetlights on the multi-use path across street from the project site. The light fixture mounting heights and fixture styles require Board approval.

Response: The mounting height of the D-BEGA fixture has been clarified on the lighting plan table to be 20'-0".

Comment 74. Hours of operation should be provided on the plan.

Response: The anticipated hours of operation of Monday-Friday: 5AM to 10 PM and Saturday and Sunday: 7 AM to 7 PM have been added to the plan.

L-202 – Lighting Plan A (see L-201 Comments Above)

L-203 – Lighting Plan B

Comment 75. No lighting was proposed in the two soccer field areas.

Response: Lighting of the outdoor playing fields is not proposed.

L-204 – Lighting Details

Comment 76. Parking lot lighting fixtures are similar to the existing streetlight installed along the Memorial Drive multi-use path. The B84404 light fixtures mounting height should be specified.

Response: The mounting heights of all proposed lighting fixtures are listed in the Luminaire Schedule on plan sheet L-201.

EX-101 – Fire Truck Turning Plan

Comment 77. Fire truck maneuvering path seems reasonable. The turn around area in the back of YMCA building is tight with the site lightings and should be reviewed by the Fire Department.

Response: The fire department requested a 76-foot diameter truck turning area at the rear of the building, which has been added to the plans. Site lights have been moved out of the area.

V-101 – Existing Conditions

Comment 78. GCG has requested adding the existing bike path, wheelchair ramp, and crosswalk information, and soil test pit locations on the plan set.

Response: All of the requested information has been added to the plans.

Architectural Plan – 9 Sheets

Comment 79. The Architectural Plan did not include the future 3,888 s.f. YMCA building expansion. Future site plan modification would be required.

Response: Comment acknowledged, and the Applicant defers to the Planning Board on future permitting, if needed, for the future building expansion.

Drainage Report

Comment 1. Chapter 343.7.6.16.c).9) – Data on the increase in rate and volume of runoff for the specified design storms should be provided. Drainage report - Table 1.1 - shows increased runoff peak rates during the 10-year, 25-year, and 100-year storm events. Runoff volume comparison data was not provided. However, based on the pre- and post-development HydroCAD reports, there are runoff volume increases during the 10-, 25-, and 100-year storm events. The 100-year storm event HydroCAD calculations showed increase in runoff volume from 0.461 acre-feet (pre-) to 0.947 acre-feet (post-), which is approximately 158,363 gallons of increased runoff volume flow to the abutting properties, which should be mitigated. Post development peak runoff and volume should be controlled to meet the pre-development conditions for all study events.

Response: The hydrologic calculations have been revised based on the additional soil testing described in the response to comment #10 below. As a result, the hydrologic soil type has been changed from type A to type B, resulting in higher pre development runoff rates and volumes. The proposed stormwater system will result in post development peak rates that are less than pre development rates. Due to slow soil infiltration rates within the site, a reduction in runoff volume cannot feasibly be obtained. This will be discussed further with the Planning Board.

Comment 2. Post-development HydroCAD sub-catchment P1.3 does not match the grading plan ridge line at the top of the proposed western driveway, Portion of the P1.3 sub-catchment surface (south of the proposed ridge line) should be transferred to sub-catchments P1.4 and P1.5 per proposed grading.

Response: The drainage area map has been revised to clarify the boundaries of subcatchment P1.3.

Comment 3. Sub-catchment P1.7 should model the infiltration basin ponding surface as water surface with CN 98.

Response: Subcatchment area P1 .7 has been revised to include a surface water area with CN 98.

Comment 4. HydroCAD Model Pond B1:UG Basin SE Parking's outlet pipe was based on a 12" culvert, but plan called for 18" diameter drain.

Response: The plans have been revised to show a 12" diameter pipe matching the HydroCAD model.

Comment 5. HydroCAD Model Pond B2:UG Basin ELC Parking's outlet pipe was based on a 12" culvert, but plan called for 15" diameter drainpipe; Basin length 79.92'L should be verified, and system dimensions should be specified on the plan. Based on the 79.92'L, the end stone requires approximately 14.15" at the two ends.

Response: The HydroCAD model has been revised to show a 12" culvert matching the plans. The basin dimensions have been revised and confirmed, and the dimensions are shown on the basin detail.

Comment 6. HydroCAD Model Pond B3:UG Basin West Driveway with inflow from sub-catchment P1.9 (eastern driveway area), should this basin be Basin 4 – East Driveway? Pond B3 consists of 15 MC-3500 chambers, but plan shown 12 chambers, and system inverts do not match with the drainage plan.

Response: Correct, subcatchment P1.9 drains to basin #4 (now basin #3) at the east driveway. The number of chambers has been revised, and the plans match the HydroCAD model.

Comment 7. HydroCAD Model Pond B4:UG Basin East Driveway with inflow from sub-catchment P1.4 (western driveway area), should this basin be Basin 3 – West Driveway? Pond B4 consists of 15 MC-3500 chambers, which matches the drainage layout. However, the system inverts do not match the drainage plan. B4 outlet pipe is connected to a catch basin, please clarify the intent.

Response: This basin has been removed from the design.

Comment 8. HydroCAD Model Pond B5: Bioretention A. Please clarify the intent of the bioretention title. The plan labeled the BMP as infiltration basin without the engineered soil mix media, and there is no bioretention planting shown on the landscape plan. This BMP should be an infiltration basin and titled as such. The top of berm 233.00 contour should be shown on the grading plan to match the 10,930+/- s.f. surface area, a 1' freeboard should be provided during the 100-year storm event. An emergency spillway should be provided and sized to handle the inflow with brimful conditions without overtopping the earth berm, (MSH Vol.2, Ch.2, Pg. 91). Spillway should be equipped with erosion armor.

Response: The title of basin #5 (now basin #4) has been renamed to "infiltration basin" in the HydroCAD model. The recommended berm and spillway modifications have been made.

Comment 9. As presented, the HydroCAD drainage calculations were inconclusive with the above discrepancies. However, peak runoff and volume should be controlled to below the pre-development conditions for the study storms.

Response: Please see the response to #10 below for a detailed description of changes made to the drainage calculations based on additional soil testing. The post development flow rates are proposed to be less than the predevelopment rates. Due to slow infiltration rates within the site soils, it is not feasible to reduce the post development volumes to below pre development rates, and the Applicant will discuss this issue with the Planning Board and request relief if necessary.

Comment 10. Additional soil test pits should be performed to determine the soil drainage classes and estimated seasonal high ground water (ESHGW), (soil logs provided were based on the surface elevation to the closest even foot) and restricted layer refusal elevations. Basin 2 is proposed below the nearby TP-1 and TP-1B refusal elevation at 244.75+/- . The proposed Retain-It infiltration system Basin 1 is proposed below the nearby TP-4's bottom of excavation. This bottom of the basin 1 system stone is approximately 15.5' below the existing surface contour 257. There is no test pit nearby basins 1, 4, and 5. All test pits show silt sand materials in the 'C' horizon, based on the nearby developments along Memorial Drive, the silt content could be high and not suitable for infiltration BMPs. GCG recommends performing sieve analysis to determine the silt contents to determine the Rawls (exfiltration) rates used in the calculations.

Response: Additional soil testing was performed at all of the proposed infiltration basins on August 28 and 29, 2025. The soil testing confirmed that soils are silty sand. One in-situ infiltration test was done at Basin #5, and sieve analyses were performed on the soils recovered from borings at the other four basins. The infiltration testing and sieve analyses confirmed that infiltration rates are relatively slow, but they also match the infiltration rates used in the design of the two large infiltration basins proposed under the parking lot. Infiltration rates for the other three basins were reduced in the design calculations to match the soil testing rates, with minimal impact on the design of those basins.

NRCS soil mapping shows the site soils as hydrologic Type A. However, as noted in the comment above, and as confirmed by the soil testing results, site soils are not hydrologic Type A and are more consistent with a Type B, less well drained soil. As a result of the soil testing, the soil type used in the hydrologic design calculations has been changed from Type A to Type B. This resulted in higher pre and post development runoff rates in volumes, but the revised drainage design now provides a decrease in post-development peak runoff rates. As noted previously, the slow infiltration rates do not allow for significant infiltration or a reduction in runoff volume.

Soil testing also confirmed that there is no groundwater in the vicinity of the proposed infiltration basins. The soil testing encountered possible bedrock, but more likely boulders, within the previous infiltration basins. The elevations of those basins have been revised to provide a minimum two foot separation to any potential bedrock. In addition, the type of chamber for the two main infiltration basins under the parking lot has been changed to a lower profile chamber to accommodate the higher basin elevations.

Comment 11. Storm Sewers calculations table: Drain Line numbers 1, 4, 5, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 34, and 36 did not match the drain data shown on the plan; line 23 should be A30-A10; line 35's rim elevation is below finish grade surface; line A10-HDWL analysis is missing. Flow rate (Q) should be provided for each drain line, for example, A42-A41's flow Q should consist of inflows from CB A-43 and Roof Drain 3. Drain lines 21, 23, and 28 have flow velocities exceeding 10 feet per second, which should be controlled to below 10 feet per second, Lines 22 and 23 were shown 18" pipe size, but HydroCAD calculations were based on 12" diameter pipes. Line 23's velocity showed flow velocity at 13.79 feet per second with 18" pipe diameter, the calculated

velocity with 12" diameter should result with even higher velocity, which should be addressed.

Response: The storm sewer calculations have been revised to match the information shown on the plans. Flow rates have been added for each drain line, and pipe slopes have been revised so that flow velocities are less than 10 feet per second.

Comment 12. TSS removal worksheets – infiltration basin's 80% TSS removal credit requires pre-treatment BMPs. No additional credit should be claimed through the pre-treatment BMPs. GCG recommends utilizing the EPA Region-1 BMPs performance work sheets or performance curve to address the 343-7.1.6 (a through d)'s TSS and Nutrient (TP and TN) removal requirements.

Response: The TSS removal worksheet indicates 45% TSS pretreatment removal from the >50' long grass filter strip that is the playing field. The 80% TSS removal rate for the infiltration basin can be applied because of the pretreatment.

Additional calculations are provided demonstrating that there is zero outflow from the infiltration basins for the 1-inch first flush runoff depth.

Comment 13. Long Term Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Plan – roof leader, gutter/roof drain inlet should be included in the O&M plan, inspected and cleaned at least twice per year. The eastern soccer field was utilized as a vegetated filter strip pre-treatment for the infiltration basin #5. and should be included in the O&M plan and maintained as such. GCG recommends creating a level spreader at the rear driveway's end of curb to provide a sheet flow across the soccer field to receive vegetated filter strip pre-treatment.

Response: The long term operation and maintenance plan has been revised as recommended. Please see the response to Site Plan comment number #40 regarding the addition of a catch basin at the driveway end of curb.

Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA)

Comment 1. The applicant should verify the proposed parking spaces provided onsite. GCG counted 263 proposed spaces and the westerly paved area that is to be reserved for snow storage can only fit 26 spaces. Which brings the total parking supply to 289 spaces.

Response: The plans have been revised to indicate 289 total parking spaces.

Comment 2. The Development-Related Growth should include the "Arbella at Ashland," 180 residential age restricted units (Chapter 40B) development off Memorial Drive, (next to Cirrus Apartments). should be included in the No-Build traffic volumes.

Response: A separate traffic peer review is being performed and responses to those comments will be provided in a separate response letter. Comments specific to the TIA will be addressed only in the other response letter to avoid possible contradictions between comments in this letter and the other peer review letter.

Comment 3. The proposed driveways were scaled with an approaching slope of 8% to 9%, GCG recommends providing a 3% maximum slope leveling transition area at the driveway intersections.

Response: Driveway slopes at the exit lane have been reduced to 2.5% at the curblines of the easterly driveway and 3.5% at the westerly driveway to provide an approximately 30 foot long leveling transition area at both driveways.

Comment 4. Stopping sight distance analysis – GCG recommends analyzing the proposed steep grading at the two driveways' shoulder area, which appears blocking the driveways' safety sight line and address the Chapter 282, Section 5.6 - Corner Clearance requirements.

Response: Please refer to responses to be made in a future separate response letter to the other traffic peer review comment letter.

Comment 5. The existing Bike Path crosswalk and proposed new crosswalk in front of the YMCA building walkway are approximately 430 feet apart in a section of roadway with 85th percentile travel speed of 37 and 38 mph. The traffic consultant should evaluate the proximity of these two mid-block crosswalks.

Response: Please refer to Site Plan Set response #23 above, and responses to be made in a future separate response letter to the other traffic peer review comment letter.

Comment 6. The traffic consultant should assess the pedestrian access adequacy within the ELC building parking lot, the use would demand frequent short term (drop off) parking and heavy foot traffic for parents with small children. However, there is only a single sidewalk in front of the ELC building with no walkway within the parking lot.

Response: A painted walkway area has been added to the ELC parking area to provide better accessibility from the west side of the parking lot to the ELC building entrance.

Comment 7. In general, the development should not create any major adverse impacts to the traffic network. However, the safety sight line with the steep grading along the proposed driveway should be addressed.

Response: Refer to site plan set comment response #23.

Conservation Commission NOI

Comment 1. Section 280-4 – No work is proposed within the twenty-five (25) foot No Disturb Zone.

Response: No response necessary.

Comment 2. Site stormwater management and drainage mitigation should be addressed as stated in the Planning Board review comments above.

Response: Please refer to responses above.

We trust the above as well as the attached information are sufficient for your continued review of the project. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (508) 480-9900.

Sincerely,

Bohler Engineering MA, LLC



Andrew Platt



Lucien DiStefano

Cc: Becca Solomon, Conservation Agent