



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

F4719

October 6, 2025

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

RE: *Comments from Beta Group Adin Estates Definitive Subdivision*

Dear Members of the Board:

On behalf of our client, Calarese Properties, 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**.

I. PLAN SUBMISSION:

The Definitive Plan is 11 sheets, which include a cover sheet, lotting plan, existing conditions plan, erosion control plan, site layout, utility plan, grading plan, roadway plan & profile, and construction details. BETA has the following comments regarding the contents of the plans.

- 1.1. *In accordance with A.(1)(c), at the same scale as the definitive plan, a development plan of the premises plus adjoining land within 300 feet of the property line." The development plan should include the adjoining land to the limits as identified. As a minimum, BETA recommends that the structures, driveways, and topography (USGS 2022 LIDAR contours are acceptable) for the dwellings at S11, 513, 517 & 547 Union Street be shown.*

G.H. Response: Topography, building locations, and driveway locations have been added to Pre and Post Development Sheets

- 1.2. *In accordance with A.(1)(i), Zoning District Boundaries should be indicated on the Locus Plan, Sheet 1.*

G.H. Response: Revised as requested

- 1.3 *In accordance with A.(2)(a) and B(2), 3 ties into the Massachusetts Coordinate System should be identified.*

G.H. Response: coordinates shown on Sheet 2

- 1.4 *In accordance with A.(2)(g), sight distances at the entrance should be identified in compliance with §300-10B(6).*

G.H. Response: Sight Distance is depicted on Sheet 5 of 11 and the Exhibit Plan.

1.5. In accordance with B.(2)(d)&(h), add the width of the right of way and the tangent length of all curves to Sheet 2.

G.H. Response: All data requested is depicted on Sheet 2, Lotting Plan.

1.6. In accordance with B.(2)(j) location, names, and width of the adjacent streets should be identified.

G.H. Response: Union Street is a Public Way, Variable Width with a pavement width of 26.5 +/- as shown on Sheet 2.

1.7. In accordance with B(2)C Street Plan and profile contents, the following items should be added to Sheet 8:

- Bearings and distances on the exterior lines of the way (§300-8C.(1))*
- Road centerline stationing (§300-8C.(S))*
- Proposed streetlights (§300-8C.(8))*

G.H. Response: the data has been added to Sheet 8, Plan and Profile.

1.8. In accordance with §300-8D., an Environmental analysis is required.

G.H. Response: Acknowledged

II. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS'

In accordance with Article IV, BETA has the following comments.

- 11.1. The centerline offset with Delta Drive is less than 200' (§300-10,B.(5)(b)). BETA recommends that the offset with Delta Drive be identified. Ideally, the offset should be zero otherwise a waiver is required.*

G.H. Response: Town Engineer Mike Maglio recommended the alignment remain unchanged at the 9/22/25 meeting.

- 11.2. In accordance with §300-10, E.(3) Approval of dead-end streets may be contingent upon provision of easements and necessary facilities to allow continuity of utility and drainage systems. BETA will defer this issue to the DPW whether a utility easement should be provided from the end of the cul-de-sac to the westerly property line. BETA notes that there is an existing sewer easement along the westerly property line on the abutting parcels.*

G.H. Response: Acknowledged.

- 11.3. Revise the roadway cross section on Sheet 9 to indicate that the curbing will be vertical granite, consistent with Sheet 5 and the vertical granite curb detail. BETA notes that historically, the Board has required the use of vertical granite curbing throughout subdivisions where sidewalk is only provided on one side of the roadway.*

G.H. Response: Revised to show vertical granite curbing.

- 11.4. In accordance with §300-11B.(2)(a) the minimum cover for drainage piping is 42". None of the piping from the catch basins meet this criterion; however, Class V piping is proposed, which has historically been acceptable to the Planning Board as part of a waiver request. BETA recommends for the waiver to be added to the request on the cover sheet and defers this issue to the Board.*

G.H. Response: Acknowledged, a waiver will be added to the request on the cover sheet.

- 11.5. *In accordance with §300-11B.(3)(a) catch basins are required at all low points in the roadway. Catch basins are not provided at the low point at STA 0+94.19.*
- G.H. Response: Roadway profile has been revised to allow for catch basins at all low points.**
- 11.6. *BETA recommends that the catch basin sumps on the profile be corrected graphically to show the 48" sump.*
- G.H. Response: Revised, all catch basin sumps are now shown.**
- 11.7. *In accordance with §300-12A.(2)(c) water mains shall be set on a 12" bed of sand. The detail on Sheet 9 shows a 4" bed and should be corrected. In addition, the designer should review the Franklin Department of Public Works Standard Document for Water Materials and resolve the detail to comply with each, including a note referencing the above.*
- G.H. Response: Acknowledged, the detail on sheet 9 will be corrected to show a 12" bed of sand.**
- 11.8. *In accordance with §300-12A.(2)(e) hydrant spacing shall not exceed 500'. Only 1 hydrant is proposed, and it is 560'1 from the intersection with Union Street.*
- G.H. Response: The subdivision is now proposed for 5 lots with individual wells**
- 11.9. *The sewer manhole in the cul de sac is 15'+ deep. BETA recommends that the designer review the sewer design to reduce this depth.*
- G.H. Response: The sewer manhole depth has been set to allow for the sewerage of the slabs of the proposed houses, the manhole depth has not been revised.**
- 11.10. *In accordance with §300-12B.(2)(a) sewer piping shall be set on a 6" bed of " screened gravel stone. The detail on Sheet 9 shows a 4" bed and should be corrected. As noted above, the designer should review the Franklin Department of Public Works requirements to ensure that the installation will satisfy the requirements.*
- G.H. Response: Acknowledged, the detail on sheet 9 will be corrected to show a 12" bed of sand.**
- 11.11. *Underground electric layout is shown but connections to the 2 proposed streetlights should also be shown.*
- G.H. Response: Site plan revised**
- 11.12. *In accordance with §300-13C.(1) the slope of the grass strip outside the sidewalk should have a maximum slope of 3 horizontal to 1 vertical. The typical roadway cross section on Sheet 9 should be corrected to reflect this slope.*
- G.H. Response: Detail has been revised**
- 11.13. *In accordance with §300-13E.(2)(a), 3 street trees are required on each lot. An additional street tree is required on Lot 2. In addition, BETA recommends that the tree locations be coordinated with the final stormwater design to ensure that they do not overlap.*

G.H. Response: Trees have been adjusted

- II.14. *There are stormwater features proposed on all residential lots, No easements associated with these improvements are shown, yet they are critical to the continued ability of the proposed infiltration basin to protect against flooding on or near the proposed intersection. In accordance with §300-14B.(2), for a water storage facility the Board may require a stormwater easement. BETA will defer this issue to the Board and Department of Public Works but strongly recommends that easements or deed restrictions be provided around each of these features.*

G.H. Response: The stormwater design has been revised to exclude these features.

III. STORMWATER DESIGN STANDARDS:

GENERAL COMMENTS

- G1. *In accordance with §300 11A.(4), Stormwater management components must be located on a separate lot. As noted above, stormwater components are proposed on all the lots.*

G.H. Response: Stormwater design has been revised.

- G2. *There is an existing localized depression at the westerly edge of the parcel that accepts and infiltrates runoff from a portion of the existing parcel and the abutting residential lots to the west of the site. A small portion of this depression will remain, separated, on Lot Nos. 3, 4, & 5 and stormwater design depends upon the retained depressions. BETA defines these depressions as stormwater management components, and they are subject to §300-11A.(4) like the proposed subsurface systems on the lots. Based on the proposed grade changes associated with the lot development, BETA recommends that this runoff be directed towards the roadway system or set in a separate lot in accordance with the rules and regulations.*

G.H. Response: Revised to direct this runoff towards the roadway system.

- G3. *In accordance with §300-11,B.(2) "(c) At each outfall of a drain line, a Type B winged headwall of reinforced concrete shall be constructed". A flared end is proposed at the discharge from DMH2. BETA recommends that the applicant's designer either request the waiver or modify the design to comply with the regulations.*

G.H. Response: Acknowledged, a waiver will be added to the request on the cover sheet.

- G4 *In accordance with the stormwater standards, test pit data is required at all infiltration structures. No test pit data has been developed for any of the proposed infiltration structures outside of the basin.*

G.H. Response: Stormwater design has been revised to exclude these structures.

- G5. *BETA recommends that the designer review the delineation of the existing watershed area EX-3. Based on the contours, the rear westerly corner of the parcel should be delineated within this area.*

G.H. Response: Revised.

- G6. *The proposed outlet control structure from the infiltration basin is a 12" dia. PVC standpipe. BETA recommends that a multi-stage concrete structure be designed and utilized but will defer the decision to the Board and the DPW.*

G.H. Response: Revised to include a concrete outlet control structure.

G7. *in accordance with Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the standards, a low-level outlet, accessible during flood events, that will drain the basin completely is required.*

G.H. Response: A 6" low-level outlet has been shown as a part of the outlet control structure.

G8. *In the existing conditions analysis, BETA recommends that the designer use actual impervious surface areas in the analysis of EX-4 rather than a generic CN value for half acre lots.*

G.H. Response: Without on-ground topography, we do not feel comfortable making the required assumptions for these lots. We have revised off-site lots that we feel we can adequately define from satellite imagery and aerial photos.

G9. *A trench drain does not qualify as a deep sump catch basin and should be eliminated from the TSS Removal calculation sheet for the lot chamber systems. If the Board accepts this design concept, the Isolator row will fulfill the pretreatment requirements for the subsurface system.*

G.H. Response: Trench drains have been removed from the design.

G10. *A small portion of the proposed roadway will flow untreated towards the MS4 system in Union Street. The calculations assume that this runoff will flow into the swale along the north side of the right of way however, there is no feature provided which will ensure that this runoff is directed into the swale. Adjust the calculations accordingly and demonstrate compliance with the standards.*

G.H. Response: The design has been revised to include catch basins instead of a superelevated roadway with a curb cut.

G11. *The velocity in the culvert from DMH1-DMH2 as shown in the calculations is only 2.02 feet/second at the peak of the 25-year storm. BETA recommends that the slope of this culvert be increased to bring the actual velocity up to the minimum 2.5 ft/sec.*

G.H. Response: Revised.

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.



Michael Hassett
Project Engineer