



Guerriere & Halnon, Inc.

ENGINEERING & LAND SURVEYING

www.gandhengineering.com

Est. 1972

Milford Office
333 West Street, P. O. Box 235
Milford, MA 01757-0235
(508) 473-6630/Fax (508) 473-8243

Franklin Office
55 West Central Street
Franklin, MA 02038-2101
(508) 528-3221/Fax (508) 528-7921

Whitinsville Office
1029 Providence Road
Whitinsville, MA 01588-2121
(508) 234-6834/Fax (508) 234-6723

F4683

April 17, 2025

Franklin Planning Board
355 East Central Street
Franklin, MA 02038
Attn: Amy Love, Town Planner

RE: ***Comments from Beta Group 151 Grove Street, Self Storage Facility Site Plan***

Dear Members of the Board:

On behalf of our client, Mark Yadisernia, Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. has prepared the following information to address comments contained in the letter to the Planning Board from BETA Group.

BETA's findings, comments and recommendations are shown in *italics* followed by our response in **bold**.

PARKING, LOADING AND DRIVEWAY REQUIREMENTS (§185-21)

As noted in the application, the applicant is asking the Board for a determination that the parking spaces required for the proposed warehouse use be waived in their entirety. As shown, a 6-space parking lot at the front right corner of the building is proposed to satisfy the parking requirements for the proposed office use. Since the proposed facility is a self-storage unit with no proposed outside storage, and gated vehicular access into the building, BETA has no issues with the request.

Z1. *Identify sight distances at the proposed entrance (§185-21.C.(7)(c) and demonstrate compliance with MASSDOT 2006 Design Guide requirements.*

G.H. Response: The entrance has been adjusted to line up with Kenwood Circle. Site distances will be provided by Vanasse and Associates.

EARTH REMOVAL (§185-23)

The project is primarily a fill situation. The perimeter roadway along the south side of the building will require approximately 7' of fill to meet the proposed grade.

Z2. *Identify the proposed slab elevation for the structure*

G.H. Response: The proposed slab elevation has been added to the plan.

- Z3. Summarize the net cuts and fill on site.

G.H. Response: A cut/fill analysis was performed for the site: 5,011 C.Y. of cut and 9,811 C.Y. of fill results in a net fill of 4,800 C.Y. for the site. A table reflecting this information has been added to sheet 5.

SITE PLAN AND DESIGN REVIEW (§185-31)

The project has been submitted for Site Plan Review and is required to conform to the requirements of this section. The submission is in compliance with this section except as noted below:

- Z4. Provide data quantifying on-site generation of noise and odors (§185-31.C.(3).(r)).

G.H. Response: No significant noise or odors will be generated by this site. As a self-storage facility there will not be much activity on a daily basis, just a few customers coming to access their storage units or potential customers to access the office. As such, we are submitting a waiver for this requirement.

- Z5. Provide a photometric plan (§185-31.C.(3).(k)).

G.H. Response: A photometric plan has been added to the plan set, see sheet 7.

GENERAL TRAFFIC COMMENTS

- T1. The Trip Generation Assessment was conducted in accordance with industry standards and practices, and MassDOT policies. The use of Land Use Code (LUC) 151 (Mini-Warehouse) is appropriate for the estimation of new trips.

G.H. Response: Acknowledged.

PARKING AND LOADING

The project proposes 6 total parking spaces. Two (2) of the parking spaces are designed to be accessible, and each will be van accessible, in accordance with 521 CMR 23.2.1. The applicant has requested a parking determination from the Board to waive the requirement to install any of the required spaces for the proposed warehouse use.

All maneuvering aisles are at least 24 feet wide. Parking spaces are 9 feet wide and 19 feet long.

- T2. Clarify why the office component of the proposed development was not incorporated into the parking assessment. Furthermore, six (6) parking spaces results in a ratio of 0.10 parking spaces per 1,000 sf based on the square feet of the proposed self-storage facility.

G.H. Response: The office component of the proposed self-storage facility was incorporated into the parking assessment. Roughly 7-10 customers per month are expected to need use of these parking spaces. Customers accessing storage will park alongside the building. A 30' wide one-way drive aisle around the building will provide ample room for the minimal number of daily trips expected. A waiver for non-office parking is being requested.

- T3. *The proposed driveway is located opposite Kenwood Circle and the centerline is offset approximately 9' to the north of the roadway. Recommend shifting the driveway to the south to provide a better alignment that is consistent with a conventional four-legged intersection.*

G.H. Response: The entrance has been adjusted to line up with Kenwood Circle.

- T4. *Vertical Granite Curbing is proposed at the entrance from Grove Street and the remainder of the site will utilize a modified Cape Cod berm. BETA will defer to the Board regarding the requirements of §185-29.*

G.H. Response: Based on discussions at the Planning Board meeting, a waiver is requested to utilize a cape cod berm in the areas within the gates.

- T5. *Provide vehicle turning diagrams to illustrate that the proposed driveway and site circulation can accommodate the largest vehicle expected to access the site.*

G.H. Response: An additional sheet has been added to the plan set to include vehicle showing the Town of Franklin's Fire Truck(s) are able to fully navigate about the site within the limits of pavement.

- T6. *Provide the accessibility parking space marking for the two parking spaces designated as HC should. Also, show the location of the proposed signage associated with these spaces on the plan.*

G.H. Response: Revised as requested.

- T7. *Clarify the color of the proposed parking space pavement markings*

G.H. Response: The color of the proposed parking space pavement markings is to be white, a note has been added to sheet 4.

SIGNAGE AND LIGHTING

The project proposes a "business sign" at the site entrance as well as a stop sign to control egress from the Site. Accessible parking signs are proposed at applicable parking spaces.

- SL1. *Provide details and dimensions for proposed "business" sign (§185-31.C.(3)(j))*

G.H. Response: Details and dimensions have been provided as an addendum.

A photometric plan has not been provided nor are there any proposed lights indicated on the site plans.

- SL2. *Provide a photometric plan for the site which documents the intensities required for the site (§185-31.C.(3)(l)).*

G.H. Response: A photometric plan has been added to the plan set (sheet 7A).

UTILITIES

Proposed utilities depicted on the plans include domestic water, fire service, and sanitary sewer. Domestic water and fire service are proposed via new 1.5" and 8" services, respectively, connecting to the existing main at Grove Street. Sanitary sewer service is proposed via a new 6" PVC service which will connect to an existing sewer service in Grove Street just north of an existing sewer manhole which accepts flows from

force mains both from Grove Street and Kenwood Circle. In addition to the new services, the existing fire hydrant at the front of the site will be relocated to the northerly property line along Grove Street.

- U1. *The hatch lines for the existing foundation are shown on sheet 6 of 10 just below the drain line from DMH 8 to FES 3 and should be removed for clarity.*

G.H. Response: Hatch lines have been removed from sheet 6.

- U2. *Coordinate with the DPW to determine if the existing fire hydrant should be relocated or replaced with new.*

G.H. Response: Per the DPW Director and Town Engineer, the existing fire hydrant is to be replaced with a new fire hydrant while utilizing the existing hydrant tee connection. A note has also been included on sheet 6 stating that the final location of the hydrant must have DPW confirmation prior to installation.

- U3. *Clarify if vehicles will be able to enter the drive-up units and evaluate if floor drains and a gas trap are required.*

G.H. Response: Vehicles will not be allowed to enter the drive-up units. A sign detail regarding this has been included on sheet 7.

LANDSCAPE TREATMENT & GRADING

- LA1. *Indicate proposed seed mix and loam depth (§185-31.C.(3)(j)) for landscaped areas; use of native seeding is encouraged especially in areas which are not required to be a fine lawn.*

G.H. Response: Notes including the proposed seed mixes and loam depths have been included on sheet 7.

- LA2. *Recommend providing a construction detail for the proposed swale to be shaped around the perimeter of the parcel.*

G.H. Response: A detail for the proposed swale has been included on sheet 9.

- LA3. *The proposed trees along the southerly property line will be located within the proposed swale in this area. BETA recommends that these trees be relocated to another area on the site.*

G.H. Response: The proposed trees along the southerly property line have been relocated to the northern property line. The trees have been kept away from the western property line in order to avoid the same swale to the south.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

- SW1. *Clarify the size of the culvert from the wetlands in Grove Street. It is labeled as both 15" RCP and 18" RCP on the site plans*

G.H. Response: Labels have been revised to be consistent; the culvert size is 15".

- SW2. *Most of the site development area is identified by NRCS-WSS as Charlton-Hollis-Rock Complex, 3-8% slope. Unfortunately, the soils map does not classify the layer. Rather it classifies each of the underlying soil types. Charlton is HSG A and Hollis is HSG C/D. For this site, the test pits conducted on site all indicated that the underlying mineral soil is SAND. In addition, only 3 of the 24 test pits encountered any redoximorphic features. Based upon these soil conditions, BETA does not consider the soils on site as HSG D (clay), rather they should be considered as HSG A which is the classification of the Charlton Soil Class. Accordingly, the analysis should be revised to reflect this*

soil classification.

G.H. Response: Upon discussion with BETA, it has been agreed that a HSG B classification is appropriate.

SW3. *On the watershed plans, correct the HSG Rating for the Merrimac Soil group. It should be HSG A not D.*

G.H. Response: The HSG rating has been corrected as requested.

SW4. *The HydroCAD results for existing conditions is not included in the report.*

G.H. Response: The HydroCAD results for existing conditions has now been included in our latest submission.

SW5. *The detail on sheet 9 of 10 shows a 30 Mil PVC liner to be placed at the bottom of the sediment forebay. The liner is not needed, nor can it be protected from damage during maintenance. BETA recommends that it Be removed.*

G.H. Response: The liner has been removed from the detail.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS (CHAPTER 153)

SW6. *Provide a description of construction and stockpile and/or excess materials removed from the Site expected to be stored on-site, including description of controls to reduce pollutants from these materials and other wastes (§153-12.L).*

G.H. Response: The stockpiling location is shown on Sheet 3, and additional descriptions of stockpile protection, erosion control, and stabilization has been provided in the revised standard 8 section of the stormwater report.

SW7. *The proposed roof drain connection with the infiltration basin is a proposed HDPE culvert. BETA will defer to the Board if this should be RCP in accordance with the regulations. (§300-11.B(2.a)).*

G.H. Response: Acknowledged.

BEST DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES GUIDEBOOK

The project is required to comply with the requirements of the Town of Franklin 2021 Best Development Practices Guidebook (BDPG).

SW8. *Indicate if proposed seed mix and plantings will reflect native vegetation, particularly outside the proposed perimeter fencing (BDPG Page 7).*

G.H. Response: Notes including the proposed seed mixes and loam depths have been included on the sheet 7.

LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT (LID) TECHNIQUES

Proposed LID measures include

- *No disturbance to any wetland resource area*
- *Minimizing disturbance to existing trees and shrubs*
- *Use of Country Drainage*
- *Grass channel*

SW9. *Applicant should clarify why “minimizing disturbance to existing trees and shrubs, and use of country drainage are LID measures applicable to the Site.*

G.H. Response: Country Drainage was considered, but ultimately is not compatible with this site. Disturbance to existing trees and shrubs has been limited to the maximum extent possible. All areas that do not require grading or other inherently necessary features will not have any disturbance to the trees or shrubs.

Post-Development Peak Discharge Rates (Standard Number 2): Stormwater management systems must be designed so that post-development peak discharge rates do not exceed pre-development peak discharge rates.

SW10. *Correct the HSG Rating for both existing and proposed hydro-cad analysis. (See SW2&3 above)*

G.H. Response: Corrected as requested.

RECHARGE TO GROUNDWATER (STANDARD NUMBER 3): Loss of annual recharge to groundwater should be minimized through the use of infiltration measures to maximum extent practicable.

SW11. *The required recharge volume should be revised to reflect the correct HSG rating. However, the Water Quality volume will control the static storage volume required in the basins. Thus, the change in soil rating will not impact the overall results.*

G.H. Response: Revised as requested.

SW12. *In accordance with the standards, the infiltration basin must be setback a minimum of 50’ from the waters of the commonwealth. In accordance with the interpretation of DEP, this setback measurement should be measured from the downstream slope level with the bottom of the basin. Based upon this requirement, the infiltration basin should be moved approximately 8’ north to achieve this setback*

G.H. Response: The basin now meets the setback as interpreted by DEP.

TOTAL SUSPENDED SOLIDS (STANDARD NUMBER 4): For new development, stormwater management systems must be designed to remove 80% of the annual load of Total Suspended Solids (TSS).

A Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan is included in the O&M Plan.

SW13. *The isolator row meets the pretreatment requirements for the subsurface system; therefore, the deep sump catch basin should not be listed in the pretreatment analysis for the subsurface system.*

G.H. Response: Deep sump catch basins have been removed from the pretreatment analysis, as requested.

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROLS (STANDARD NUMBER 8): Erosion and sediment controls must be implemented to prevent impacts during construction or land disturbance activities.

SW14. *The use of the proposed infiltration basin as a temporary sediment basin is not allowed in accordance with the standards. As noted earlier, a significant portion of the westerly portion of the site will be exposed and blasted ledge with very little erosion potential. BETA recommends that the applicant use a second layer of 12" silt sock between the basin and the building area once the basin is shaped to protect the basin from any potential sediment from the development upgradient around the building.*

G.H. Response: An additional layer of erosion control has been added upgradient of the basin, running between the basin and the building/driveway areas.

SW15. *Provide measures to protect open excavations for the subsurface infiltration structure during construction.*

G.H. Response: Additional layers of erosion control have been proposed encapsulating each subsurface basin.

OPERATIONS/MAINTENANCE PLAN (STANDARD NUMBER 9): A Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Plan shall be developed and implemented to ensure that stormwater management systems function as designed

SW16. *O & M plan should be developed as a stand-alone document which can accompany the deed and signed by the Owner.*

G.H. Response: The O & M plan has been developed as a stand-alone document, as requested.

SW17. *Incorporate maintenance manual for cultec system and Contech separators into the manual.*

G.H. Response: The maintenance manuals for Cultec system and Contech separators have been incorporated into the O & M plan, as requested.

SW18. *Provide map, drawn to scale, that shows the location of all stormwater BMPs in each treatment train and snow storage areas.*

G.H. Response: A plan has been included showing all the locations of stormwater BMPs in each treatment train and snow storage areas, as requested.

SW19. *Provide a budget and inspection form.*

G.H. Response: A budget and inspection form has been provided.

SW20. *Include provision requiring a documentation submittal to the DPW confirming when maintenance has been satisfactorily completed (§153-18.B(6)).*

G.H. Response: The provision requiring documentation submittal to the DPW confirming maintenance has been satisfactorily completed has been included, as requested, and can be found under Standard 9 under sections A and B.

We believe these responses have addressed the concerns expressed by BETA Group from their review letter. Should you have any further questions or concerns, please contact our office.

Sincerely,

Guerriere & Halnon, Inc.



Brian Hassett

Project Engineer