



November 30, 2021

Alan Fryer, Chair
Zoning Board of Appeals
Dover Town House
P.O. Box 250
Dover, MA 02030

Re: Tetra Tech Peer Review Letter 2
Red Robin Pastures
Dover, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The Applicant has provided revised submission materials addressing comments in our September 29, 2021 letter. This letter provides an update to those comments based on review of the Applicant's response and collateral materials submitted on November 9, 2021 and supplemental materials received by email on November 24, 2021.

Applicant's November 9, 2021 submittal included:

- Cover Page dated September 15, 2021 prepared by PG Construction Management, Inc. summarizing recent changes.
- Set of drawings "Red Robin Pastures" dated June 14, 2021 (Latest Revision - No. 3 - September 21, 2021) under cover page of Signature Designs Architecture (SDA). Set includes civil plans and details, architectural plans and elevations and a landscape plan.
- Storm Water Report for "Red Robin Pastures" dated April 5, 2021 (Latest Revision – September 13, 2021) prepared by Ronald Tiberi, P.E.
- Letter from Vanasse & Associates, Inc. dated September 14, 2021 updating Sight Distance measurements and findings to reflect revised driveway location.

Applicant's November 18, 2021 submittal included:

- Revised Response to Comments document to replace similar version issued with November 9, 2021 that lacked indication of authorship by the Applicant.

Applicant's November 24, 2021 submittal included:

- Landscape Plan Sheet L1 on SDA Title Block with original issue date December 18, 2020 (Latest Revision - No. 4 – October 14, 2021).
- Lighting Plan Sheet L2 on SDA Title Block with original issue date December 14, 2020 (Latest Revision - No. 3 – October 14, 2021).

The Revised Plans and supporting information represent a significant improvement and address many of our prior noted concerns. There is still room for improvement in quality and consistency, but the information submitted is clear enough to support our technical review and are suitable as Preliminary Plans needed to support a decision with some minor changes.

Major Points Summary (November 30, 2021 Update)

Plan Content and Organization – The plans show improvement and support our technical review but will require some attention to ensure sheet numbering and revision labeling is consistent and up to date given recent changes proposed in response to Fire Department Comments. We would appreciate if future submittals could continue to improve on presentation quality and readability.

Stormwater Design and Documentation – The revised submittal includes information demonstrating viability of the Project as shown. Detailed design must be approved by the Dover Conservation Commission pursuant to Massachusetts wetland regulations (310 CMR 10.00) and we are confident that any outstanding items can be addressed through that required process. Any resulting changes or modifications should be included in Final Plans submitted for review prior to issuance of a building permit.

Emergency Access – The Fire Department has requested a fire access along the west side of the building which will erode some of the space previously intended for landscape buffer. It is clear, that the Project can meet the Fire Chief's expectation but should explain to the Board how it will provide adequate visual and sound mitigation along the west boundary. In addition, the Fire Department has requested the fire cistern be relocated outside the building fall zone and Plans should be modified to incorporate the requested change.

Wastewater Disposal – The Project has provided documentation supporting viability of a wastewater disposal system capable of discharging proposed facility design flow. Detailed design must be approved by the Dover Board of Health pursuant to Massachusetts wastewater disposal regulations (310 CMR 15.00) and any changes or additional details resulting from that process should be included on the Final Plans.

Water Supply – The project has provided documentation supporting the reasonable conclusion that fire supply needs can be met and public potable water can be provided. There is still uncertainty given the history of concern with the water company which will should be addressed prior to issuance of any building permit.

Plan Comments

Existing Conditions Plan

The Existing Conditions Plan is very rough and lacks important information and professional endorsement. Given the nature of the Project and the extent to which it requests relief from local regulations and standards a clear understanding of existing conditions on the Project Site and the adjacent public way as well as the relative location of key features on abutting properties will be critical. We request of the Existing Conditions Plan be improved as noted below.

1. We recommend engineering plans NOT be submitted in color to avoid confusion when/if plans are copied.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plans have been submitted in black and white but are virtually unreadable in many cases. Please review content shown on each plan and organize information so it can be readily understood by the Board, town departments and the public. These plans will eventually be referenced in a decision and must be clear and explicit.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans have been modestly improved and are sufficient to support our review.

Comment Resolved.

2. The Existing Conditions Plan is not endorsed by a licensed land surveyor and does not include labeled property line bearings. Given the proposed project density and extent of work it is critical that the boundary shown is accurately defined by a licensed surveyor and confirmed boundary shown on the plans. Please update the plan to include at a minimum, surveyor reconciled bearing and distances for all property lines, vertical datum reference, scale bar, and endorsement by a Massachusetts licensed surveyor as to the source and reliability of information shown.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plans have been updated to include boundary information and datum reference but have not been endorsed by a licensed surveyor. We request the applicant provide a stamp or similar certification of the information.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Applicant has committed to providing wet stamps on final versions of the Preliminary Plan submission to the Board. This is acceptable. **Comment Resolved.**

3. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021
4. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021
5. No information is provided regarding proposed demolition or anticipated methods for pre-construction erosion and sedimentation control. We recommend the applicant include this information on the existing conditions plan to prove that required perimeter controls and temporary basins fit within the available property and proposed construction footprint.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – A plan appears to have been added in response (Sheet C11) but lacks basic information and organization and is apparently mis-titled “Drainage and Grading Plan” Please review content and organize so its readable and addresses the issues noted.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans have improved but still include spelling errors and confusing labels. Request the Applicant to continue improvement and attention to detail. Plans are sufficient to support our review and serve as the basis for a decision by the Board. **Comment Resolved.**

6. The plans show an extensive program of subsurface investigation which is very helpful, but results are not provided on the plans and several test pits share the same Test Pit number. We request the Applicant include test pit logs in the plans and that logs include the performance date as well as the name and qualifications of the person reporting the results. Care should be taken to ensure all elevations reference the same vertical datum and that the datum be referenceable (not assumed for Project).

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plans do not provide requested information. Test pit results should be summarized on the plans to provide for Board and public review.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Applicant defers to test pit information previously submitted which is sufficient to support review but we recommend a condition requiring a test pit summary plan be provided as part of the Final Plans submittal to be reviewed and approved by the Board prior to issuance of a building permit.

Comment Resolved.

Site Layout and Utilities Plan

The Site Layout and Utilities Plan provides for a basic understanding of major project components. The Project appears to be generally well-suited for its location off Route 109 and near other similarly dense residential development. However, the plan provides only basic information and lacks design detail typically provided for review. Typically, utilities are shown on a separate plan and include all information needed to confirm infrastructure installed below grade is coordinated and constructible. We request future submittals include a specific Layout and Materials Plan showing proposed surface finishes and demonstrating that space allocated to those finishes is sufficient to accommodate the intended objective. At a minimum, we expect the Layout Plan will provide enough information to show how the site will be used and accessed by the residents and that surface improvements shown are coordinated with the construction and maintenance needs of underground infrastructure.

7. It would be helpful to have parking space dimensions and totals provided on the plan along with a comparison to the number of spaces required for the proposed use.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plans include parking space dimension (Sheet C2) but no summary or comparison to required parking is provided. Please provide information requested and remove “Utilities” reference from sheet title since sheet does not show utility information.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested. **Comment Resolved.**

8. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.
9. The plan shows a proposed fire system storage tank. Please provide documentation as to its intended use and operation parameters.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – No documentation or response has been provided. At a minimum, please provide confirmation that size and location shown have been approved by the Dover Fire Department.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Technical data requested has been provided. However, it is our understanding that the Fire Department would prefer the cistern not be located within the building fall zone. We recommend the cistern be relocated outside the building fall zone and suggest it be located partially under the front driveway so that as much of the proposed planting can be maintained as possible.

10. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.
11. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.
12. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.
13. The plan does not show parking lot light fixtures. The lighting plan suggests light fixtures will be located at the end of stalls reducing the effective stall dimension. Please show all proposed surface features on the Layout Plan.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plans show proposed light pole locations and appear to be coordinated with below grade structures. However, no fixtures are shown at the front of the site or along the access drive nor are lighting plans/details or a photometric plan demonstrating lighting levels provided. We request the applicant provide a lighting plan showing all intended exterior fixtures and corresponding photometric plan.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include most of the information requested but do not provide specific fixture model information or bulb intensity. Please provide detailed information on proposed fixtures so that the model and intensity used in the photometric plan can be confirmed with Final Plans.

14. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

Standard Title V System Plan and Detail Sheet

The septic system design provided does not appear to meet basic standards. Correction will likely result in a much larger system footprint potentially impacting the layout of the proposed stormwater detention system.

15. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021
16. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.
17. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.
18. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

Presby Sanitary System Plan

This plan appears to present an alternate subsurface soil absorption system. The Presby system is an approved Title 5 innovative/alternative technology and can be used provided all aspects of its DEP approval are met. Although an approved technology, it has far less performance history and as such less demonstrable reliability than traditional systems designed per the requirements of 310 CMR 15.00. In addition, the Presby system includes much more maintenance and proprietary components. We recommend the Board request the applicant to provide a traditional system meeting all requirements of 310 CMR 15.00 instead of proposing

an innovative/alternative technology. If the Presby system is to be used comments 14 and 15 must be addressed.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested. **Comment Resolved.**

Drainage and Grading Plan

The Drainage and Grading Plan is difficult to read and understand but it does contain most of the information needed to understand intended management strategy. Given the number of technical issues that need to be addressed between the septic system and the stormwater design, we question if the adequate area exists on site to meet applicable standards and design requirements.

19. Please use consistent and clear labeling and take care to make sure line types match those noted in the legend and that all acronyms and abbreviations are defined.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plans are extremely difficult to read with multiple lines representing varying content with very similar appearance. Plans include irrelevant information such as pavement hatching and interior building room layout which could be removed to make drawing more readable. Please try and improve presentation quality.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans have improved substantially. Request the Applicant to continue improvement and attention to detail. Plans are sufficient to support our review and serve as the basis for a decision by the Board. **Comment Resolved.**

20. The entire parking lot drains to a single catch basin/water quality unit. This makes the system susceptible to flooding in the event the structure is compromised and can lead to system bypasses if the structure is blocked.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plans now show parking lot draining to what looks like a vegetated swale but grading suggests direction to a low point and its unclear if the pavement edge is curbed. If vegetated swale please avoid consolidation of flow so runoff is more equally distributed over the swale length and clearly indicate edge of pavement treatment and terminus points.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans still show a grading pattern that concentrates flow which we advise against however any issues created will be the responsibility of the Applicant to repair or maintain and as such we defer final design decisions to the engineer of record and to the Conservation Commission who maintains review responsibility under state wetlands regulations. **Comment Resolved.**

21. The grading plan suggests underground infiltration systems will be constructed in areas of fill supported by retaining walls. The design will need to address how proposed retaining walls will manage hydrostatic loads from infiltrating stormwater without allowing breakout or excessive loading of the wall.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plans indicate an impervious barrier will be installed to limit potential short-circuiting through the wall, but barrier only extends to the bottom of recharge system. Barrier should extend to the top of the infiltration system, be shown on infiltration system detail and included in required mounding analysis.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested. **Comment Resolved.**

22. The applicant's response to town comments indicates a site-specific wall design has been provided. We were unable to find the design. Please provide a copy for review and confirm that the wall will have no weep holes or similar controls that will allow infiltration bypass.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Detailed wall designs have been provided in prior responses that show a viable wall system and the revised plans propose a significantly smaller wall. Please update wall design documentation to reflect current wall layout and include reference to wall system on drawings.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested. **Comment Resolved.**

23. A trench drain and drywell are proposed at the entry to the site but no calculations or test pit information has been provided documenting its performance and no pretreatment is shown prior to infiltration. Please address in subsequent designs.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Drywell has been eliminated but plans indicate a catch basin will be added to collect runoff from the drop off area however the catchbasin accepts flow from a yard drain and roof drains and bypasses downstream water quality measures. Please revise the plans to maintain separation of pavement drainage from clean roof and yard runoff and provide required treatment prior to discharge.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans still indicate comingling of roof and pavement runoff which is not recommended however it does not result in non-compliance provided treatment systems are sized for the combined flow. Verification of treatment system size is required for Conservation approval and must be demonstrated in the Final Plans. **Comment Resolved.**

24. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021

25. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021

26. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

27. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

Landscape Plan

The Landscape Plan appeared to be well thought and appropriate to the application and suggests a robust assortment and density of site landscaping. Tree sizes are specified at 3-inch caliper which is also appropriate.

28. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

29. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

30. Please show the location and design of the proposed facility sign

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – No information has been provided related to the proposed facility sign. Recommend the Board not grant relief from local sign regulations unless detail of sign is provided.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Applicant has indicated it will comply with local sign requirements and requests no relief. **Comment Resolved.**

31. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

32. Site distance triangles should be added to the landscape plan to ensure proposed plantings will not interfere with required site lines for traffic entering onto Route 109.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Updated sight distance calculations have been provided but triangles are not shown on the plans. Request the applicant provide a plan or figure depicting required sight distance triangles to confirm required lines of sight are met and maintained.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested however the triangles are not included on the Grading and Drainage Plan which appears to show grading (looking east) that obstructs the required site line. Please address by showing site lines on Grading Plan and any other plans where improvement may obstruct sight lines.

33. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

Lighting Plan

34. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

35. The Lighting Plan suggests no lighting will be provided at the main entrance, along the driveway (except for building wall packs), in the landscaped area between the buildings or for the Dog Park or Community Garden. Please confirm that all proposed exterior lighting is shown on the plan or otherwise describe what is excluded from the analysis.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – A Lighting Plan was not found despite Cover Sheet indicating one was included in the submittal. Please provide lighting plan showing information requested.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Lighting Plan was provided as requested and indicates no light spillage beyond the subject parcel however the plan lacks information on the specific fixtures used to generate the photometric plan. Specific fixture and wattage information should be included on the plans to confirm consistency with final design.

Storm Water Report

It is our understanding that the Stormwater Report has been submitted for initial informational purposes and should be considered draft despite its inclusion of a stamped endorsement on the cover. We appreciate having the information but expect a more accurate and thorough report will be submitted later since the draft version contains multiple typographical and grammatical errors as well as substantive errors in design that must be addressed to allow for a more thorough review. What has been submitted does not demonstrate compliance with applicable standards. Some of our concerns are noted below for the purposes of defining expectations on future submittals.

36. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

37. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

38. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

39. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

40. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

41. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

42. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021

43. Please provide a plan demonstrating how construction period erosion and sedimentation controls will be installed and maintained.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plan that we suspect was provided in response to this comment is not labeled properly and does not include information requested. Please revisit the request and provide a clear plan showing all erosion and sedimentation control measures.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Updated Plan provided as requested. Although the Plan is still difficult to understand it depicts a reasonable construction sequence and strategy. Given the Conservation Commission has the primary responsibility to review erosion and sedimentation controls during its review under state regulations we have no further requests. **Comment Resolved.**

44. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

Traffic Report

The Traffic Report was professionally prepared, well organized and addressed traffic related project impacts in a manner consistent with applicable guidance and expectations. We concur with the report's fundamental conclusion that the project will result in a negligible impact on nearby intersection function and that the Project driveway is at a location providing adequate site distance in each direction. We offer the following comments and recommendations

45. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021

46. The Traffic Report includes an offer to prepare a Traffic Signal Warrants Analysis for the Route 109/Walpole Street intersection. We recommend the ZBA accept the offer and ask that the applicant perform the analysis and provide a summary report. The report will provide additional information in support of its eventual decision and can be valuable information available for general use by the Town

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Signal Warrant Analysis has not been provided.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Applicant has consented to a condition requiring the analysis be provided. We recommend a condition requiring the analysis be provided prior to issuance of the building permit. **Comment Resolved.**

47. We request that sight distance triangles be shown on at least the Project Site Layout Plan along with a note specifying that it must be maintained as necessary to ensure minimum required sight distances are met.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Plans do not show sight distance triangles. We recommend they be added to the plans prior to any approval.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Comment redundant with Comment 32. **Comment Resolved.**

48. Resolved Sept. 29, 2021.

Conservation Commission Comments

As part of our review, a Tetra Tech wetland scientist conducted a site visit to review the location of the wetland line noted on the plans and to perform a reconnaissance of the potential vernal pool located to the rear of the property. Neither of these actions are considered delineations as that responsibility should remain with the applicant and should be documented through processes included in the Massachusetts Wetland Regulations 310 CMR 10.00. Based on our field visit, the wetland line noted on the plan appears to be accurate. The wetland is fairly well-defined by topography and is not likely to vary significantly from that shown on the plans. Its actual boundary must be approved by the Dover Conservation Commission per Massachusetts Wetland Regulations. Our scientist also inspected the area identified as a “potential vernal pool” and determined it would meet MassWildlife's Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program (NHESP) vernal pool certification requirements.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – Revised plans include an “A series” wetland line which we understand corresponds to the edge of wetland as determined by methodology prescribed under the local bylaw. The plans also include a “VP series” line which corresponds to the limit of potential vernal pool and edge of Bordering Vegetated Wetland (BVW) as regulated under the state wetlands regulations (310 CMR 10.00). Our wetland scientist has inspected the VP series line and has confirmed that it is a reasonable approximation of both the edge of vernal pool and the limit of BVW.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans have been revised to include information requested. **Comment Resolved.**

Construction Management Plan

49. The documentation submitted does not include any information on construction staging or temporary controls to manage runoff during construction. We recommend the ZBA request the Applicant to provide a Construction Management Plan clearly describing how construction on such a limited site will be accomplished without risk to abutters or the use of the Route 109 right of way. At a minimum, the CMP should show the proposed building footprint and limit of excavation, construction trailers, contractor parking, construction dumpsters, emergency access, material/soil stockpile areas, delivery/turnaround area, crane staging area (if applicable) and construction period erosion and sedimentation controls meeting requirements of the USEPA NPDES Construction General Permit.

Sept. 29, 2021 Update – The added site area reduces potential for impacts to abutting properties, but the Project still occupies nearly the entire site. We recommend the Board require the Applicant to provide a basic plan addressing expected schedule and sequencing and designating areas where critical construction functions will be performed.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Additional information has been included on the Plans demonstrating an ability to construct the Project without impacts to abutters or the public. The Applicant has consented to a condition requiring a Construction Management Plan to be provided prior to issuance of a building permit. **Comment Resolved.**

New Comments (Sept. 20, 2021 Update)

50. Request the drawings be organized so that plans are presented sequentially with details at the back to make review and references in decision easier. Please restrict plan content to information that is relevant to the sheet title and subject. Suggest the following sheets be used (in order): Existing Conditions Plan, Demolition and Erosion Control Plan, Layout Plan, Grading and Drainage Plan, Utility Plan (showing outline of Presby System disposal area), Landscape and Lighting Plan, Fire Truck Access Plan. (example from sample project attached for reference)

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include changes requested. **Comment Resolved.**

51. Sheet A1.1 and Sheet C2 are redundant. Consider consolidating information on a single sheet, ideally a Site Layout and Materials Plan.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include changes requested. **Comment Resolved.**

52. Plans should clearly distinguish “State” wetland resource area boundaries and buffer zones from “Local” wetland resource areas and buffer zones. If the Project intends to seek a waiver of the local wetlands bylaw, we recommend removing reference to waived local resource area boundaries.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested. **Comment Resolved.**

53. Main entry turnaround face of curb appears to be within several inches of the proposed vestibule column creating an almost certainty that it will be hit by circulating traffic or damaged during snow removal. Recommend resolution of conflict including consideration of an alternate access geometry. The proposed front entry and circle, although workable, is a bit awkward and inefficient. We recommend the applicant consider a “u-shaped” front access that provides a secondary means of access and better circulation. See attached sketch.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include changes requested. **Comment Resolved.**

54. Show stop bar at exit and provide sight distance triangles as requested in prior comments. Please note, grading shown suggests sight lines facing east may be blocked by earth mound.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested but do not demonstrate the mounding noted would not obstruct sight lines.

55. Concrete walkway and bench at front should extend to the edge of road and include an area for wheelchair maneuvering.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested. **Comment Resolved.**

56. Please modify parking island layout to eliminate outward facing 90-degree curb transitions. Pointed transitions will damage tires and are a danger to snow removal. Please confirm if the grass pavers noted on the landscape plan and the fire access plan are required emergency access. If so, please provide a detail of the proposed installation so Fire Department can confirm suitability for application and provide a more direct means of access from the parking area.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested but changes should be shown consistently across the plans set. Fire Department access details will be coordinated under prior comment. **Comment Resolved.**

57. Show proposed limit of clearing on the plans and indicate where tree protection, as shown in detail on Sheet C8 will be used.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested but should be modified as changes to the landscape plan are considered. **Comment Resolved.**

58. Review proposed contours and confirm contours tie out properly in all locations. For example, contours at main entry do not appear to close properly and indicate an extremely step grade change along the west curb face.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested. **Comment Resolved.**

59. Note storage and surrounding stone dimension on R-Tank Chamber Detail (Sheet C7) as well as proposed connections (size and elevation) so dimensions can be confirmed with modeling analysis. Please also show the location and elevations of proposed impermeable barrier on the detail.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include only some of the information requested but missing information isn’t critical to our review and is content that must be presented in detail for Conservation Commission review under state regulations. **Comment Resolved.**

60. Provide call out for specific stormwater treatment unit on the drainage plan. Model shown in detail on sheet C7 does not appear to accommodate a double grate arrangement shown on the plan. Please also provide information demonstrating the unit selected is sized appropriately for the application.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include only some of the information requested but missing information isn't critical to our review and is content that must be presented in detail for Conservation Commission review under state regulations. **Comment Resolved**

61. Applicant has indicated they intend to use a "commercial" loading rate when designing the "Presby System" rather than the "residential" loading rate. The proposed use is, without question, a residential application and should incorporate residential loading rates and/or design requirements.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested. **Comment Resolved**.

62. Please show any private wells within 200 feet of the current project boundary and a note indicating such on any plans showing the wastewater disposal system and note location of any proposed vent.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Response indicates there are no known wells within 200 feet of the Project Boundary and such assumption must be confirmed as part of the Board of Health review of the propose wastewater disposal system required under state regulations. **Comment Resolved**.

63. Please show where fence will be located and indicate material type and height. The only fence noted is on the landscape plans and shown only in the vicinity of the community garden.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested but may be revised to address Fire Department access. **Comment Resolved**.

64. Remove "Registry Use" note included on the cover sheet is unless required.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – The note remains and as such is presumed to be required. **Comment Resolved**.

65. Sheet C2 includes an "RT" in the revision no. box, please address in future submittals

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include relatively consistent revision tracking. **Comment Resolved**.

66. Show model information and dimensions for vehicle used on the Fire Access Plan (Sheet C10).

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include information requested. **Comment Resolved**.

67. Please eliminate any extraneous details. For example, Sheet C8 includes a detail for permeable pavement but none is shown on the plans and same for pole lamp detail. Same applies for duplicate trench detail on Sheet C9.

Nov. 30, 2021 Update – Plans include changes requested. **Comment Resolved**.

New Comments (Nov. 30, 2021 Update)

68. Please note, Applicant's response to comments letter deviates from comment numbering at Comment 54 due to a response being allocated a comment number. Please make sure to adjust numbering on future responses.
69. Proposed generator should be shown on all plans as well as any required grading or other site accommodation needed.
70. The Cover Sheet includes inaccurate references to submittal content (ie. No Soil Test Pit Plan of Detail Sheet 6.1 was included in the set). Please take care to accurately document the submittal to avoid confusion.

Red Robin Pastures
Comprehensive Permit Peer Review
(Letter 3 – November 30, 2021)

We appreciate the work done by the project team to address our technical comments and concerns regarding readability and quality. Although there is still room for improvement, the information is complete and understandable enough to demonstrate the Project can meet applicable standards. Most importantly any outstanding issues will be covered in detail as part of the Projects required reviews under the Massachusetts wetlands regulations (Conservation Commission) and on-site sewage disposal regulations (Board of Health). As such, it is our opinion the documentation provided is reasonably complete and accurate to serve as the Preliminary Plan required to support the Board's consideration for granting a Comprehensive Permit and if needed, to condition an approval.

As always, please feel free to contact me at (508) 786-2230 with any questions.

Very truly yours,



Sean P. Reardon, P.E.
Vice President

P:\327239\143-327239-21001 - RED ROBIN 40B\DOCS\DOVER-REDROBIN-LETTER3 (2021-11-30).DOCX