



**David A. Libardoni**

Direct Line: (617) 439-2152

Fax: (617) 310-9152

E-mail: [dlibardoni@nutter.com](mailto:dlibardoni@nutter.com)

November 21, 2022

**Via Email and Hand Delivery**

Sutton Planning Board  
Sutton Town Hall  
4 Uxbridge Road  
Sutton, MA 01590  
Attn: Jennifer Hager, Sutton Planning Director  
Email: [j.hager@town.sutton.ma.us](mailto:j.hager@town.sutton.ma.us)

Re: UGPG RE Sutton LLC  
Modification of Definitive Subdivision Plan and Scenic Road Alteration  
Application

Dear Members of the Sutton Planning Board (the “Board”):

On behalf of UGPG RE Sutton LLC (the “Applicant”), this letter is intended to address all public and peer review comments for the proposed Subdivision Modification and Scenic Road Alteration Application in anticipation of the Board’s next meeting on Monday, November 28, 2022

In addition to our written responses to public and peer review comments set forth below, enclosed in this submission is the following:

- Definitive Subdivision Plan of Land, Sutton Massachusetts and Millbury, Massachusetts, prepared for UGPG RE Sutton LLC dated November 15, 2021, last revised November 15, 2022, prepared by WSP USA Inc. (23 sheets); and
- Transportation Improvement Plans for Boston Road prepared by VHB dated November 21, 2022 (27 sheets).

Copies of this submittal have been sent to the Board’s peer reviewers, Graves Engineering, Inc. (hard copy sent via overnight delivery) and to Chappell Engineering Associates, LLC (PDF copies).

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| <b>I.</b> | <b>Robert Nunnemacher (Sutton Board of Assessors) – Email to the Sutton Planning Director dated October 15, 2022</b>                             |
| 1.        | The Board of Assessors will require another single updated AUTOCAD drawing of the approved revised subdivision site (not the individual sheets). |

November 21, 2022

Page 2

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | <u>Response:</u> The Applicant will complete this request upon the Board's approval of the Subdivision Modification.  |
| 2. | Now that the Town has voted to discontinue Caplette Road, the lotting plan should be revised to reflect the ownership of UGPG's half of Caplette Road where appropriate and connect Lots 5 & 9  |
|    | <u>Response:</u> The Definitive Subdivision Plan has been updated to address this comment.  |
| 3. | Are the modifications to the approved subdivision lotting plan of the entire site limited to only sheet 17, lots 3 & 5 or are there changes elsewhere?  |
|    | <u>Response:</u> The lots lines of Lots 3, 5 and 6 (i.e., the lot comprising Unified Parkway) have all been adjusted to accommodate the re-designed Unified Parkway intersection with Boston Road. Additionally, per Comment #2 above, Lot 9, together with the northerly half of Caplette Road abutting Lot 5, have now been combined with Lot 5 as a result of the discontinuance of Caplette Road.   |
| 4. | There should be street widening easements along Dudley Road particularly along the severely constricted area just south of the Marble Road intersection.  |
|    | <u>Response:</u> The Planning Board has reviewed the traffic associated with Buildings 2 and 3 (i.e., Lots 2 and 3) of the subdivision as part of the special permits and site plan approval issued by the Board this past summer. Any other traffic that may be generated by the future development of this subdivision will be reviewed by the Planning Board as part of site plan review process and is not before the Board as part of this Subdivision Modification. The Accordingly, the Applicant does not believe improvements to Dudley Road are warranted as part of the review of this Subdivision Modification. |
| 5. | Is the safety of thousands of vehicles a year being compromised in order to save one tree that appears to be partially owned by UGPG? The tree assessment made no note that core samples were taken to determine if the tree was hollow. After all the proposed work is done in the area the tree may not survive. Would it be more sensible to remove the tree, make a safer Boston Road, straighten Unified Parkway and require UGPG to plant a half dozen new sycamores on their property along Boston Road?   |
|    | <u>Response:</u> The Applicant is responding to comments received from Sutton residents and the Planning Board during the permitting for Buildings 2 and 3  |

November 21, 2022

Page 3

|            |   |
|------------|---|
|            | indicating a desire to preserve the Sycamore Tree while not jeopardizing traffic and safety. The Applicant believes the proposed Subdivision Modification and roadway improvements at the intersection of Unified Parkway and Boston Road will achieve this result.   |
| <b>II.</b> | <b>Memorandum to Planning Board from Sutton Planning &amp; Economic Development Director dated October 20, 2022.</b>  |
| 1.         | Previously granted waivers and conditions should be removed from Sheet 8 of the Definitive Subdivision Plan of Land set until such time as they are reconfirmed by the Board. The Board may choose to alter conditions and although not typical, they may reconsider previously granted waivers as well.  |
|            | <u>Response:</u> Noted. The previously granted waivers and conditions have been removed from the Definitive Subdivision Plan submitted with this letter.  |
| 2.         | Subdivision Rules & Regulations – 3.C.2.f. – Please indicate the location of permanent benchmarks on the definitive subdivision plan as opposed to the existing conditions plan.  |
|            | <u>Response:</u> This has been updated in Definitive Subdivision Plan submitted with this letter.   |
| 3.         | Subdivision Rules & Regulations – 3.C.2.m. Please indicate which of the 90 plans sheet(s) contains the error of closure note.   |
|            | <u>Response:</u> We understand the Applicant has spoken specifically with the Planning Director regarding this comment. Within the revised Definitive Subdivision Plans, Sheet 1 of 23, Note 4 states the following, “WSP hereby certifies the relative accuracy of the traverse meets or exceeds the minimum standard error of misclosure of 1:15,000”. Per WSP, there is no error of closure. |
| 4.         | Scenic Roadway Bylaw – Please provide the total number, size and type of trees proposed to be removed within or on the Boston [Road] right of way. Also indicate the length of stone wall to be altered within or on the right of way.  |
|            | <u>Response:</u> The total number of trees, size and type to be removed within the Boston Road right of way is detailed below. The trees identified are those with greater than a 4-inch DBH.   |
|            | <u>Station    Offset (ft)    Side    Description (Diameter, Species)</u>  |

November 21, 2022

Page 4

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
|             | <p>25+21      27      Left      12" Unknown</p> <p>25+19      27      Left      10" Unknown</p> <p>26+33      28      Left      36" Pine</p> <p>28+29      14      Right      20" Beech</p> <p>28+37      14      Right      4" Beech</p> <p>28+39      19      Right      12" Beech</p> <p>28+44      10      Right      4" Beech</p> <p>28+53      16      Right      14" Beech</p> <p>28+51      20      Right      16" Maple</p> <p>The length of the stone wall to be altered within or on the right of way is approximately 49 feet, which is the length of the stonewall on the south side of Boston Road in front of the property at 107 Boston Road. The proposed length of the new wall to be constructed will be approximately 100 feet.</p> |
| <b>III.</b> | <b>Peer Review Letter to Planning Board from Graves Engineering, Inc. dated November 7, 2022</b>  |
|             | COMMENTS ON BOHLER DEFINITIVE MODIFICATION PLANS  |
| 1.          | GEI has no engineering issues with the proposed definitive plan modifications near the intersection of Boston Road.   |
|             | <u>Response:</u> Noted.   |
|             | COMMENTS ON VHB OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENT PLANS  |
| 2.          | On Sheet 6, the pipe connecting CBCI 2 to DMH forms an interior angle less than 90 degrees with the outlet pipe. This connection needs to be revised to form an interior angle of at least 90 degrees between this inlet pipe and the outlet pipe.  |
|             | <u>Response:</u> We have revised the location of the catch basin to the other side and uphill of the driveway; this has improved the pipe angle to the DMH.   |
| 3.          | On the "Boston Rd Structure Table" on Sheet 6, the EX-DI-1 outlet elevation of 389.83 and EX-CB-5 inlet elevation of 398.98 were transposed and should be corrected.  |
|             | <u>Response:</u> EX-DI-1 outlet elevations and EX-CB-5 inlet elevation have been revised. Please note that the invert in from EX-DI-1 is lower than the invert out of   |

November 21, 2022

Page 5

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | EX-CB-5. This was retained as it is an existing condition, and the project is not modifying the existing drainage system here, other than the gutter inlet on the south side to align with the new edge of road.  |
| 4. | On Sheet 6, the "Boston Rd Structure Table" lists the rim elevation of EX-CB-5 as 400.65 which is a typographical error that should be corrected. Per other plan information, the rim elevation is approximately three feet lower.  |
|    | <u>Response:</u> EX-CB-5 rim elevation has been revised.  |
| 5. | The typographic contours on Sheets 12 through 14 need to be labeled.  |
|    | <u>Response:</u> We have labeled the contours.  |
| 6. | Sheet 16 shows several trees within the roadway. The printing intensity of these symbols and other existing conditions (e.g., edges of existing driveway) need to be screened back to differentiate the existing conditions from proposed work.   |
|    | <u>Response:</u> We have revised the existing linework to be screened when printed.   |
| 7. | On Sheet 20, the construction detail depicting an accessible curb cut/ramp was mislabeled as "Typical Two-Way Street Center Work Area". The construction detail and its title need to be coordinated.   |
|    | <u>Response:</u> The detail has been revised and moved to construction details.   |
| 8. | The plans need to include construction details for the drain manholes, curbing, and curb transitions.   |
|    | <u>Response:</u> The details have been added.   |
| 9. | The plans need to be signed and stamped by a Professional Engineer.   |
|    | <u>Response:</u> It is noted that the permit plan set will be stamped as requested. However, the note on the title sheet, indicating that the plans are for permitting purposes only, will be retained. Final construction documents that will be issued to the contractor will also be stamped and those plans will be suitable for use during construction. |
|    | <b>Peer Review Letter from Chappell Engineering Associates, LLC to Sutton Planning Director dated November 8, 2022</b>  |

November 21, 2022

Page 6

|    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | The Town should consider bicycle accommodations.   |
|    | <u>Response:</u> The current design for lane and shoulder width was decided in discussions with the Planning Board as a way to save the 68" Sycamore tree. 11' lanes and 2' shoulders is the maximum roadway width that could be achieved within the available ROW, while still holding the existing edge of pavement on the north side of the road. If the roadway is widened an additional 6' to provide bicycle accommodating shoulders, it would not be possible to retain the 68" Sycamore tree. The currently proposed cross-sectional features have been reviewed with the Planning Board and Planning Department staff during prior hearings and review of the preliminary design plans. Additionally, the Planning Board and residents also prioritized improvements to accommodate pedestrian traffic along Boston Road as evidenced by a proposed sidewalk that will meander around the Sycamore tree and run along the Applicant's frontage with Boston Road. Bicycle accommodations were not discussed as a priority for the Planning Board or residents. |
|    | PLAN SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO VHB PLANS  |
| 2. | Sheet 1 – In addition to Design Speed and Functional Classification, MassDOT's Design Designation information includes traffic data such as ADT, K, D, T, and DHV. Is this data available?   |
|    | <u>Response:</u> It is noted that detailed traffic data was summarized and analyzed in the original traffic studies for the project that preceded the development of the improvement plans. Posting a data summary in the form of a design designation chart is typically required for projects subject to MassDOT review. While there is no MassDOT jurisdiction over these improvements, the requested design designation information has been added to the revised plan set.  |
| 3. | Sheet 4 – (a) A Typical Section is needed for Unified Parkway.   |
|    | <u>Response:</u> A typical section for Unified Parkway has been added.   |
| 4. | Sheet 4 – (b) If the cross slope of the Proposed HMA Walk is constant it should be noted.  |
|    | <u>Response:</u> The cross slope has been added.   |

November 21, 2022

Page 7

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| 5.  | Sheet 4 – (c) The thickness of the Proposed Scored Concrete Pavement (8” – 9”) is in conflict with the thickness shown on Sheet 22 of 24.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The pavement notes have been revised to match the detail.  |
| 6.  | Sheet 4 – (d) The existing Town Layout lines should be represented on the Typical Sections.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The Town layout lines have been added.   |
| 7.  | Sheet 4 – (e) Additional comments noted on the plan.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.  |
| 8.  | Sheet 5 – (a) Why is the SMH at ~sta. 21+25 RT called to be adjusted? There is no other work proposed in the area.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> This note has been deleted.  |
| 9.  | Sheet 5 – (b) The proposed HMA walk does not connect to an accessible route. Is this problematic?   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> While the initial design submittal did not include a sidewalk, a sidewalk was added on the northerly side of Boston Road from Unified Parkway to the property line. Per the request of the Town, the current design plans show the sidewalk extending to the limits of the property. Future improvements could start from this point and extend farther, as necessary. |
| 10. | Sheet 5 – (c) Additional comments noted on the plan.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.  |
| 11. | Sheet 6 – (a) Coordinate location of the relocated UP# 94/68 with the location of the buried ET&C lines as shown on the Bohler plans.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The pole location has been coordinated between plan sets.  |
| 12. | Sheet 6 – (b) The relocated OHW from UP# 93/67 to UP# 94/68 will require trimming of the 68” Sycamore canopy.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> It is noted that the utility company (National Grid) will determine the final locations of utility poles and the overhead wires. The Project team has  |

November 21, 2022

Page 8

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | already communicated with the National Grid Engineer, and has been directed by the Engineer to show a preliminary location on the design plans, and that National Grid would finalize the location as part of their work.                                     |
| 13. | Sheet 6 – (c) It should be noted that the proposed masonry wall along the house across the street from Unified Parkway could severely restrict sight lines exiting that driveway depending on how tall it is.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The existing roadway geometry at the driveway is such that visibility looking to the right is impeded by the existing embankment and horizontal curve of Boston Road. The proposed design does not materially change the existing condition. |
| 14. | Sheet 6 – (d) Additional comments noted on the plan.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.  |
| 15. | Sheet 7 – (a) The guy wire proposed at UP# 97/71 may need to be replaced with a push brace.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> A push brace has been added. However, as noted earlier, National Grid retains the final control of the design and treatments of the utility poles along the corridor.  |
| 16. | Sheet 7 – (b) Additional comments noted on the plan.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.  |
| 17. | Sheet 8 – (a) Add station and elevation of angle point at ~station 23+60.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.  |
| 18. | Sheet 8 – (b) Additional comments noted on the plan.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.  |
| 19. | Sheet 11 – (a) The Boston Rd. PGL gives 399.19 at the intersection of the two baselines. From the Boston Rd. grading it appears that the Unified Parkway PGL should continue to slope downward past the Boston Road gutter line, on Boston Road itself.       |



November 21, 2022

Page 9

|     |  |
|-----|--|
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.   |
| 20. | Sheet 12 – (a) Non-concentric northside curbline geometry is not provided from the limit of work to the PT sta. 24+18.61, 24.00' LT.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comment has been addressed.   |
| 21. | Sheet 13 – (a) Non-concentric northwest curbline curve data is not provided from Boston Rd. PC sta. 27+65.44, 24.00' LT to Unified Parkway PCC sta. 55+33.9 RT.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comment has been addressed.   |
| 22. | Sheet 13 – (b) Non-concentric northeast curbline curve and tangent data is not provided from Unified Parkway PT sta. 54+86.4, 17.0' LT to Boston Rd. PRC sta. 29+42.80, 24.50' LT.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comment has been addressed.   |
| 23. | Sheet 13 – (c) See the insert Sheet 13 lower left. The grading in the vicinity of the scored concrete island raises some concerns. For example, at Boston Rd. station 29+50 there are significant grade breaks between the southern edge of the scored concrete island, the SYL offset by 2', and the Boston Rd. southern EOP offset by an additional 13'. The grading in this area should be reviewed and revised as necessary as the design is further developed.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The grading at this island has been revised.  |
| 24. | Sheet 13 – (d) Additional comments noted on the plan.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.   |
| 25. | Sheet 14 – (a) The Sheet 4 Typical Section defines the swale geometry. The Bohler Grading and Drainage Plan E does not take into account this swale. It appears that for the most part the swale can be constructed without impacting the berm proposed by Bohler as part of their Stormwater Management Area #4, however this is not the case for Boston Rd. stations 31+25 to 31+75. Please review and revise as necessary. The grading of the proposed swale should be further developed and shown on Sheet 14. |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The contours have been revised to show the swale on the roadway plans (Sheet 14), as it will be constructed by the roadway contractor. The grading has  |

November 21, 2022

Page 10

|     |   |
|-----|---|
|     | been tied into the berm of the detention basin shown in the Site Plans, but should not impact the work of the site contractor. The limits of work between the two projects will be differentiated on the final CDs, during the coordination between the site and roadway contractors.                         |
| 26. | Sheet 14 – (b) Additional comments noted on the plan.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.  |
| 27. | Sheet 16 – (a) The right-turn by trucks from Boston Rd. WB on to the Unified Parkway NB does not appear to be prohibited.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> Heavy vehicles arriving from Providence Road, if any, are able to access Unified Parkway and the Site from Providence Road without the need to use Boston Road. For this reason, the subdivision approval only calls for a “no left turn” restriction from Unified Parkway onto Boston Road. |
| 28. | Sheet 16 – (b) Consider including right turn lane only pavement markings on Unified Road.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> Right turn only lane markings have been added.   |
| 29. | Sheet 16 – (c) Include an R3-8L sign for EB left turns into Unified Parkway near Sta. 27 or 28.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> An additional R3-8L sign has been added at Station 26+50.  |
| 30. | Sheets 19 and 20 – (a) See plans for comments.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comments have been addressed.  |
| 31. | Sheet 21 – (a) Consider providing a tree protection detail. If there are locations where tree protection would be advisable, add to Construction Plans.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> A tree protection detail has been added and locations have been added on the construction plans. A note has also been added to the plans that field adjustments shall be performed as directed by the Engineer or Town.  |
| 32. | Sheet 21 – (b) Consider specifying that the catch basin grate must be bicycle safe.   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The comment has been addressed.  |

November 21, 2022

Page 11

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 33. | Sheet 24 – (a) Add existing Town Layout lines station 27+50, LT and RT.  |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The Town Layout lines have been added.  |
|     | RESPONSE TO RMA TRAFFIC COMMENTS   |
|     | <u>Response:</u> The CEA Letter indicates that all comments are resolved except for one comment pending the town’s desire to accommodate bicycle travel along Boston Road. Please refer to the Applicant’s response above on this comment. |

With this submission, the Applicant is confident that it has sufficiently responded to and closed out all outstanding public and peer review comments for the Subdivision Modification and Scenic Road Alteration Application and expects to receive clean peer review comment letters from Graves and CEA prior to the Board’s next hearing. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Board close the public hearing at its next public meeting on November 28<sup>th</sup> so that the Board may vote favorably on the Applicant’s pending applications. If you have any questions in the meantime, please do not hesitate to reach out.

Very truly yours,



David A. Libardoni

DAL:

5775601.3