



January 14, 2021
(revised February 18, 2021)

Mr. Richard S. Novak, Chairman
Sherborn Zoning Board of Appeals
Town Hall
19 Washington Street
Sherborn, MA 01770

**Re: Coolidge Crossing
Comprehensive Permit Peer Review
84-86 Coolidge Street
Sherborn, Massachusetts**

Dear Mr. Novak:

Tetra Tech (TT) has reviewed specific submittal materials for the above-referenced Project to assist the Sherborn Zoning Board of Appeals (Board) in its Comprehensive Permit review of the proposed Coolidge Crossing residential development. The following letter provides comments generated during our initial review of Applicant submittals which appear to be highly conceptual. The review generally focuses on substantive concerns that speak to issues whose eventual resolution may substantially impact Project design or could otherwise result in potentially unsafe conditions or unanticipated impacts. These initial comments are likely to inform design changes.

Our review is based on materials received from the Board comprising the following pertinent documents:

- A Comprehensive Permit Application titled "Coolidge Crossing, Comprehensive Permit Application", dated October, 2020, prepared by Baystone Development (Baystone).
- A plan (Plans) set titled "Coolidge Crossing, 84 Coolidge Street, Sherborn, Massachusetts", dated March 26, 2020, revised July 13, 2020, prepared by Civil Design Group, LLC (CDG).
- An Landscape plan set titled "Coolidge Crossing, 84 & 86 Coolidge Street, Sherborn, Massachusetts" dated September 25, 2020, prepared by Hawk Design, Inc (HDI).
- A Traffic Impact and Access Study (TIAS) titled "Traffic Impact and Access Study, Proposed Villages at Sherborn 40B Development, 84-86 Coolidge Street, Sherborn, Massachusetts" dated September 2020, prepared by MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc. (MDM).

The Plans and accompanying materials were reviewed for good engineering practice, overall site plan efficiency, stormwater, erosion and sedimentation control, utilities, traffic and public safety. In general, the plans and supporting materials were well prepared and we appreciate the clarity and completeness of documents provided. Our initial comments are provided below.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update

The Applicant has supplied TT with a revised submission addressing comments provided in our previous letter. Additionally, the revised Plans and supporting documentation expand on the conceptual Plans previously submitted which provide a much clearer scope to help determine the feasibility of the Project as currently proposed.

The Applicant has provided the following documents for review:

- A plan (Plans) set titled "Site Plan for Coolidge Crossing, Residential Apartment Community, 84 & 86 Coolidge Street, Sherborn, Massachusetts", latest revised January 22, 2021, prepared by CDG.

- A stormwater management report (Stormwater Report) titled "Stormwater Management Report for Coolidge Crossing", dated January 22, 2021, prepared by CDG.
- A Response to Transportation Comments letter dated January 27, 2021, prepared by MDM.
- A Response to Site/Civil Comments letter dated January 28, 2021, prepared by CDG.

The revised Plans and supporting documentation were reviewed against our previous comment letter (January 14, 2021) and comments have been tracked accordingly. Text shown in gray represents information contained in previous correspondence while new information is shown in black text. Our updates are provided below each of our original comments. Comments that are resolved during this review will be removed from future letters to consolidate the documentation as much as possible during this process. Additional comments have been included at the end of the document to address new concerns related to the revised submission.

SITE DESIGN

The Site Plans provide a good introduction to the Project and its various components and shows the Project is placed in what appears to be an appropriate location but notably occupies nearly all available upland area. Our principal concern is that we found no test pit or similar information indicating underlying soils and groundwater depths. Additionally, the plans do not appear to provide adequate accommodation for the true extent of stormwater mitigation that will be required to meet Massachusetts Stormwater Management Standards, particularly design requirements for separation from groundwater. As such, we expect the program shown may need to change substantially to meet stormwater management performance criteria. Setting that concern aside we reviewed the submittal materials and offer the following specific comments identifying areas where additional information is required, or changes are requested to address questions or support further review.

Site Plan

1. Emergency access to the rear of the buildings has not been proposed. We recommend the Applicant confirm access is acceptable to the Sherborn Fire Department.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant stated they spoke with the Fire Chief who found the design to be acceptable for emergency access. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide written confirmation from the Fire Chief regarding emergency access to the rear of the buildings. Comment resolved.

2. Secondary emergency access at the rear of the site is predicated on a connection to a proposed road that is part of another development and is not within the control of the Project. We recommend that Project Plans show construction of the emergency access to the public right-of-way unless other documentation can be provided that ensures the off-site work will be complete prior to any request for building permits.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant stated they spoke with the Fire Chief who found the design to be acceptable for emergency access. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide written confirmation from the Fire Chief regarding secondary emergency access to the site. Additionally, as noted in our original comment, the proposed emergency access is reliant on the access driveway to the Meadowbrook Commons development which is not under control of this Project. We recommend the Board include an additional Condition in the Comprehensive Permit that limits building permits until the proposed emergency access can be adequately provided. Comment resolved.

3. Parking and dumpster storage are proposed within the electric easement on the southern side of the site. Please provide confirmation that this is consistent with easement terms.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant stated the proposed plans are consistent with the language in the easement documentation and they are currently in the process of coordinating with the Utility to determine if any design changes are required. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide written confirmation from the Utility related to proposed work within the easement. **Comment resolved.**

4. The plans show 200 parking spaces for 120 units (1.67 spaces/unit which exceeds the 1.5 spaces/unit required for Multidwelling Projects). However, some of these spaces are shown within the electric utility easement and we request confirmation that parking is allowed within the easement.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #3 above.

5. The parking stalls are proposed at 20-foot length which is 2 feet longer than standard parking spaces. We understand the additional length provides mitigation for bumper overhang on the adjacent sidewalk. However, reduction in parking space length would decrease overall impervious coverage, locate the development further away from the wetland resource areas and would allow for additional pervious surface to remain at the site.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: This item was discussed in the hearing on January 28, 2021 and it appeared the town was amenable to decreasing the stall length to help reduce the overall impact of the project on the adjacent resource areas. We suggest all parking stalls adjacent to sidewalks remain at 20 feet to compensate for bumper overhang, all other spaces could be reduced to 18 feet. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant explore alternative parking space sizing to reduce impervious coverage for the Project. **Comment resolved.**

6. We recommend a sidewalk connection from the Coolidge Crossing development to the abutting Pulte development if sidewalk is proposed on that Project.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Although the trail connection appears to be an alternative solution for most residents, we believe a sidewalk connection may be better suited to serve all residents of the development including those that may have disabilities where using a natural path may be difficult. This will drastically increase the walkability between the two projects as there are no sidewalks on Coolidge Street for pedestrians to use. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant explore a sidewalk connection to the Meadowbrook Commons site prior to preparation of Final Plans. **Comment resolved.**

Utility Plan

7. The plans should show specific connection locations for water and sewer services.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The connection locations have been shown on the Plans. **Comment resolved.**

8. The plans do not provide invert information to confirm adequate cover and check for potential conflicts with other utilities. We recommend future plans include a simple roadway/utility profile.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Invert information has been provided on the Plans. **Comment resolved.**

9. We recommend the plans show proposed stormwater infrastructure (screened) on the Utility Plan to coordinate all subsurface installations to ensure there are no conflicts.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Detailed stormwater mitigation has been shown on the Plans. **Comment resolved.**

10. The Plans should show electrical connections to proposed garages if power will be provided in those units.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Electrical connections to the garages has been provided on the Plans. **Comment resolved.**

Stormwater Plan

11. The proposed Stormwater Plan is lacking detail typically provided to confirm viability of the proposed layout. We request additional engineering design detail be provided demonstrating how the project will meet applicable stormwater performance standards.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Detailed stormwater mitigation has been shown on the Plans. **Comment resolved.**

Site Planting Plan (L1.0)

12. There is no irrigation well proposed for the site. The applicant shall confirm how proposed landscaping will be irrigated as we anticipate limits on using domestic water for irrigation at the site.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant confirm their decision on a proposed well during preparation of the Final Plans and also provide written confirmation from the authorities supplying water to the site regarding use of the water supply for irrigation. **Comment resolved.**

13. Screening of the project is minimal along the eastern property line and the limit of clearing is not defined. We recommend the Applicant coordinate screening along this property line with the abutting project and show all proposed landscaping that will be constructed as part of this Project on the plans.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant stated they are actively working with the adjacent Meadowbrook Commons developer to maintain an existing wooded buffer to help screen the two projects. Additionally, we agree with the Applicant that proposed planting on this Site would not achieve the necessary screening due to the grade differential between the two sites on the Meadowbrook Commons site would achieve more effective screening due to the grade differential between the two projects (Coolidge Crossing is lower in grade). **Comment resolved.**

Site Lighting Plan (L1.1)

14. The Plan appears to depict light trespass on the multiple properties abutting the project. Additionally, photometrics should be provided to determine light values at the property limits and to confirm proposed lighting will not spill over onto adjacent property.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: An updated lighting plan was not submitted for review. However, we do not anticipate lighting will be an issue on this Project. We recommend the Board include this item as a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide an updated lighting and photometric plan in the Final Plan submission. **Comment resolved.**

15. No proposed lighting is shown on the buildings, particularly the rear of each building where we anticipate lighting may be placed at access/egress points. The Plan should be comprehensive and include all proposed lighting for the site.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #3 above.

Amenity Area Layout and Materials Plan (L2.0)

16. Proposed trees are shown in areas that may conflict with subsurface stormwater management features. Landscaping should be placed only in areas where root intrusion will not cause issues with the proposed stormwater systems.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant has supplied an updated landscape plan with areas of stormwater mitigation shown on the Plan, plantings do not conflict with proposed stormwater mitigation. **Comment resolved.**

Typical Building Planting Plan (L3.0)

17. Proposed landscaping is only provided on the front facing portion of the buildings. Additional landscaping may be required at the rear of buildings to mitigate view impacts.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We agree with the assessment that landscaping at the rear of the buildings would not provide additional benefit. **Comment resolved.**

STORMWATER

The Site Plans depict nearly all the available upland area of the site will be rendered impervious by the proposed Project. Additionally, wetland resource areas encompass the eastern and western sides of the proposed development and soil maps show ledge outcrops on portions of the site. Please provide a Stormwater Management Report demonstrating how the Project intends to comply with applicable performance standards. The current layout and grading information provided does not appear to meet applicable performance standards. The following comments were generated from information provided and we expect additional comments when requested documentation is provided per guidance included in the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection's (MA DEP) Stormwater Standards (Standards) and Stormwater Handbook (Handbook).

The Applicant has submitted a comprehensive stormwater design for the project. Five surface basins, four subsurface basins and appurtenant infrastructure have been proposed to mitigate stormwater at the site. We believe the stormwater proposed is feasible and will function to ensure the site meets the Stormwater Standards. We have provided updates to our initial comments below and provided additional comments at the end of this document to address new concerns.

18. The Applicant is proposing five subsurface stormwater basins for stormwater mitigation. The basins may not be viable options for mitigation due to expected height of groundwater at the site and possible presence of ledge. Test pit information has not been provided to confirm viability of these structures.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Test pit logs have been provided but do not contain ground surface elevations which will be required to accurately correspond the information provided to the proposed basin elevations to determine their compliance with the Standards. We contacted the Engineer who has since sent a table of these elevations. However, this information should be included in the test pit logs in the Final Stormwater Report. Additionally, Basin CC-3 requires mounding analysis since the basin bottom is within four feet of the groundwater table. We recommend the Board include this item as a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide existing ground elevations on the test pit logs and provide groundwater mounding analysis for Basin CC-3 in the Final Stormwater Report.

Comment resolved.

19. It appears a significant amount of off-site area is flowing to the Project site from the east. These areas should be included in the stormwater analysis for the project, particularly if these areas will flow to the proposed basins.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant has included areas of run-on from the adjacent properties in the pre-development analysis for the Project. The post-development watershed plan excludes portions of off-site area from the analysis which appear to be mitigated by a proposed swale which straddles the property line between the two sites as shown on Sheet 6 – Grading & Drainage Plan. The Applicant stated they have an agreement with the Meadowbrook Commons developer for proposed minor grading work shown on the abutting property. **Comment resolved.**

20. Several of the subsurface stormwater basins are located within 50 feet of a wetland resource area. The Handbook recommends infiltration basins be located outside of the 50-foot buffer to limit impacts to the resource area as well as ensure proper functionality of the proposed basins.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We believe the proposed design is consistent with the general setback requirements of the Handbook given the Applicant's design criteria provided for the impacted basins. **Comment resolved.**

21. A subsurface stormwater basin is proposed within the electric easement. Please confirm this is consistent with easement terms.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #3 above.

22. It does not appear there will be adequate snow storage at the site and we anticipate the need for snow to be removed and disposed of off-site. Snow removal and disposal should be documented in the site Operation and Maintenance Plan (O&M Plan) required under the Standards and Handbook.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The Applicant has included provisions in the O&M Plan for snow removal and transport off-site to approved disposal locations if required. **Comment resolved.**

EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL

The Applicant has not supplied any Plans related to managing the site during construction. We expect, given the proximity of the development to the surrounding wetland resource areas, that construction impacts may be extensive if not conducted properly. The following comments are offered specific to the Project and its potential for off-site erosion during construction.

23. The Project will disturb more than an acre of area and likely require coverage under the United States Environmental protection Agency (US EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges from Construction Activities (CGP). We recommend a copy of the permit be provided prior to the start of any construction on site.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide proof of coverage under the NPDES CGP prior to construction. **Comment resolved.**

24. The Project will also require an Order of Conditions from the Sherborn Conservation Commission or MA DEP for work within areas subject to jurisdiction under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act. We recommend a copy of the Order of Conditions be provided prior to the start of any construction.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: It is our understanding that a Notice of Intent has been filed with the Sherborn Conservation Commission. **Comment resolved.**

WATER

As discussed in the Comprehensive Permit Application, the Applicant is in discussions with the City of Framingham to provide water service for the Project. The following comments are offered specific to the Project water system and related analysis or lack thereof.

25. Please provide a “will serve” letter or similar documentation proving potable water will be provided in the quantity and pressure needed to serve the development’s potable and fire protection demands. Without the proposed connection we do not anticipate this project will be viable.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant secure adequate water supply prior to receiving any building permits for the Project. **Comment resolved.**

26. Any offsite water system infrastructure improvements needed to supply the site should be shown on the plans and documentation provided showing rights of access over lands not under the Project’s control.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #25 above.

SEWER

As discussed in the Comprehensive Permit Application, the Applicant is in discussions with the Town of Natick to provide sanitary sewer service for the Project. If the sewer service is allowed, the Project will discharge to the system via a proposed sanitary sewer force main from a pump station located on-site. The following comments are offered specific to the Project sewer system and related analysis or lack thereof.

27. Please provide a “will serve” letter or similar documentation proving adequate sewer service will be provided to the site. Without the proposed connection to public sewer we do not anticipate this project will be viable.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant secure adequate sewer service prior to receiving any building permits for the Project. **Comment resolved.**

28. Please provide pump station and force main design and sizing information and confirm that all pumping equipment is served by emergency power systems.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant provide detailed pump station and force main design during Final Plan review. **Comment resolved.**

29. Any offsite sewer system infrastructure improvements needed to serve the site should be shown on the plans and documentation provided showing rights of access over lands not under the Project’s control.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved in update at #27 above.

TRAFFIC

TT has conducted a review of the September 2020 TIAS prepared by MDM for the proposed development. The TIAS evaluates the potential traffic impacts associated with the currently proposed project which includes 120 multifamily units. One of the two existing single-family homes on-site will be removed to support the proposed development, while the other single-family home at 86 Coolidge Street will remain.

Access to the site will be provided by a full-access driveway along Coolidge Street located just to the south of the existing driveway for the residence at 86 Coolidge Street. A separate gated, emergency access only driveway will be provided to the adjacent development driveway at 104 Coolidge Street, at the northern end of the site. On-site parking will include 170 surface parking spaces and 30 garage parking spaces.

The September 2020 TIAS generally conforms with standard professional practices in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the preparation of traffic impact studies for projects of the size and nature of the proposed residential development. However, TT recommends that the Applicant provide additional information identified below to provide a comprehensive review of the project’s traffic-related impacts.

30. The TIAS presents Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) for both the posted speed limit (35 mph) and the observed 85th percentile speed (44 mph); however, Intersection Sight Distance (ISD) is only noted for the posted speed limit. Since the observed 85th percentile travel speeds are higher than the posted speed limit, TT recommends the Applicant include a discussion of the available ISD compared to the desired ISD using the observed travel speed. TT also recommends the Applicant confirm the SSD is listed in the appropriate directions in Table 4, as the available SSD eastbound and westbound appear to be reversed.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant revise the proposed grading prior to Final Plan review to ensure proper sight distance is achieved and accurately documented in the Plans. **Comment resolved.**

31. As currently shown on the Plan View in Figure 4, the Ideal ISD line is drawn through a wooded area on the site (looking left from the site driveway). There appears to be a number of large trees within that wooded area that may hinder the line of sight. The TIAS notes that the recommended sight lines will be satisfied “with selective clearing and grading as part of the installation of the Site driveway.” If any of the trees within the wooded area are to be removed, they should be noted on the plan. The sight triangles and area of clearing for the 44-mph observed speed should be shown on the plan.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant inventory trees which may impede sight lines and include those as well as sight triangles to the Final Plans. **Comment resolved.**

32. The crash analysis has generally been prepared in accordance with industry standards and includes an evaluation of data from the MassDOT crash database for the study intersections for the five-year period between 2015 and 2019. However, the volumes included on the crash rate worksheets are inconsistent with the volumes presented in Figure 3. The results of the crash rate calculation with the volumes presented in Figure 3 do not change significantly, however, so no further action is required.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved.

33. Vehicle trip generation estimates for the project were developed based on trip rates published in ITE's Trip Generation for Land Use Code (LUC) 221 – Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) applied to 120 units. The site program evaluated in the TIAS is expected to generate approximately 652 daily trips on a weekday (43 vph during the morning peak hour and 53 vph during the evening peak hour). TT agrees with the trip generation and trip distributed methodology used in the TIAS.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: Comment resolved.

34. The TIAS utilized Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 6th edition methodology for the unsignalized intersections using Synchro software. TT generally agrees with the methodology used in the TIAS but notes some discrepancies with some of the data inputs used in the analysis (i.e., lane use assumption for the Coolidge Street approach to North Main Street is inconsistent with the text). The TIAS notes that the Coolidge Street eastbound approach is a single lane, while the capacity analysis shows separate left- and right-turn lanes on the approach. If analyzed with a single approach lane, the Coolidge Street eastbound approach is likely to exceed capacity and operate at LOS F during both peak hours under baseline conditions and will worsen under future conditions with and without the proposed project. While the delay for the approach will be higher than reported in the TIAS, the end result is still the same for the eastbound approach (LOS F) under Build conditions. The project is expected to add no more than 24 peak hour trips to the intersection.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: This item was discussed during the Hearing on January 28, 2021. We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant coordinate with Sherborn DPW to provide off-site striping improvements to the intersection to delineate the two lanes prior to development of the Final Plans. Comment resolved.

35. The Applicant shows a proposed bus shelter and pull-out just south of the site driveway. The shelter is to be located outside of the sight triangle. Since the ideal sight distance shown on Figure 4 was based on the posted speed limit and not the observed 85th percentile speed, this bus shelter may need to be relocated further back from the edge of the roadway to provide an adequate line of sight looking left from the site driveway. Additionally, the need for a bus pull-out is unclear at this location. There was no discussion of any transit in the TIAS. A school bus would be safer stopping directly in the roadway as the bus stops traffic in both directions with the use of the flashing red lights and STOP sign. TT recommends the Applicant clarify the need for this bus pull-out and the relocation of the bus shelter to be outside of the ideal ISD line based on the 85th percentile speed.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: We recommend the Board include a Condition in the Comprehensive Permit to require the Applicant coordinate with MWRTA regarding bus service and associated turnaround and bus shelter prior to development of the Final Plans. Comment resolved.

36. The Applicant shows an entry sign on the Site Planting Plan. It should be confirmed that this entry sign will not interfere with the line of sight looking left from the site driveway or the sign should be relocated.

Feb. 18, 2021 Update: The entry sign has been relocated and sight line triangles will be added to the Final Plans. **Comment resolved.**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (2/18/21)

37. The Project is reliant on fill to be able to develop the property and meet applicable stormwater standards. We recommend the Applicant include cut-fill analysis on the Plans to confirm magnitude of filling operation and potential issues during construction with truck traffic on Coolidge Street and the studied intersections. A Construction Management Plan should be developed to outline the impacts and associated mitigation to ensure the surrounding community is not negatively impacted by construction of the Project.
38. Approximately 150 feet of the entrance driveway, the clubhouse rooftop and Forebay CC-1 (and its catchment area) are proposed to discharge to the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). The Applicant shall coordinate with Sherborn DPW to determine if the connection is allowed or if other means to maintain stormwater on the site are required.
39. All basins are proposed in fill which is not recommended in the Handbook. However, the Applicant is proposing to remove unsuitable soils beneath the proposed basins and backfill with sand which should provide adequate conditions for groundwater recharge and overall functionality. The basins should function as analyzed given the procedures outlined in the details on the Plans.
40. Basins CC-1 and CC-2 do not contain the necessary one-foot of freeboard from the 100-year event. Additionally, monitoring wells are required at all basin locations to monitor groundwater elevations beneath the basins.
41. We recommend the Applicant consider use of pervious pavers or other pervious surface for development of the proposed outdoor area hardscapes adjacent to the clubhouse. Reduction in impervious surfaces on a densely developed site such as this will help reduce impact of the site on the adjacent resource areas and their buffers.

Coolidge Crossing
Comprehensive Permit Peer Review
February 18, 2021 Review Letter

42. Foundation drains have not been included on the Plans. We expect drains may be required if buildings have basements that are in or near the water table. Foundation drains should not discharge to proposed stormwater infrastructure.
43. Maintenance of the dog park has not been included in the Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan (LTPPP). Animal waste can be a source of impairment to the adjacent resource area and proper inspection and maintenance procedures are warranted to reduce impact.

These comments are offered as guides for use during the Town's review and additional comments are likely to 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,



Sean P. Reardon, P.E.
Vice President



Steven M. Bouley, P.E.
Project Manager

P:\323009\143-323009-21001 (COOLIDGE CROSSING)\DOCS\COOLIDGECROSSING-ZBAREV(2021-02-18).DOCX