



100 GROVE ST. | WORCESTER, MA 01605

June 24, 2022

Sutton Planning Board
4 Uxbridge Road
Sutton, MA 01590

T 508-856-0321

F 508-856-0357

gravesengineering.com

**Subject: Buildings 2 & 3 – Unified Parkway
Site Plan, Special Permit and Scenic Road Review**

Dear Planning Board Members:

We received the following documents in our office on June 9, 2022:

- Correspondence from Nutter McClennen & Fish LLP to Sutton Planning Board dated June 8, 2022 RE: UGPG RE Sutton LLC, Unified Buildings 2 and 3 (40 & 42 Unified Parkway) (the "Project"), Providence Road/Boston Road, Sutton, Massachusetts with attachments.
- Correspondence from Bohler to Sutton Planning Board, dated June 3, 2022 RE: Supplemental Drainage Information, UGPG RE Sutton, LLC, Unified Building 2 & 3 (40 & 42 Unified parkway), Providence Road/Boston road, Sutton, Massachusetts with attachments.
- Correspondence from Tech Environmental, Inc. to UGPG RE Sutton LLC, dated April 21, 2022 RE: 40 & 42 Unified Parkway, Sutton, MA Sound Study.
- Plans entitled Proposed Site Plan Documents for Unified² Global Packaging Group Industrial Development, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Worcester County, Massachusetts dated March 28, 2022 and revised June 3, 2022, prepared by Bohler for Unified² Global Packaging Group. (41 sheets; missing the existing conditions and architectural sheets)
- Plan entitled Alternative Deicing Restriction Areas Exhibit, Proposed Site Plan Documents for Unified² Global Packaging Group, Proposed Industrial Development, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Worcester County, Massachusetts dated June 3, 2022, prepared by Bohler for Unified² Global Packaging Group. (1 sheet)
- Plan entitled Fertilizer Use Restriction Areas Exhibit, Proposed Site Plan Documents for Unified² Global Packaging Group, Proposed Industrial Development, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Worcester County, Massachusetts dated June 3, 2022, prepared by Bohler for Unified² Global Packaging Group. (1 sheet)
- Plan entitled Commom (sic) Driveway Exhibit, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Massachusetts dated June 3, 2022, prepared by Bohler. (1 sheet)
- Plan entitled Exterior Signage, UNIFIED2 – Sutton/Unified Parkway dated June 2, 2022, prepared by SUNSHINE Sign for UNIFIED2 – Sutton/Unified Parkway. (1 sheet)
- Plan entitled Interior Landscaping Exhibit, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Worcester county, Massachusetts dated June 3, 2022, prepared by Bohler. (1 sheet)
- Plan entitled Land Bank Exhibit, Proposed Site Plan Documents for Unified² Global Packaging Group, Proposed Industrial Development, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Worcester

County, Massachusetts dated June 3, 2022, prepared by Bohler for Unified² Global Packaging Group. (1 sheet)

- Plan entitled Overall Groundcover Exhibit, Proposed Site Plan Documents for Unified² Global Packaging Group, Proposed Industrial Development, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Worcester County, Massachusetts dated June 3, 2022, prepared by Bohler for Unified² Global Packaging Group. (1 sheet)
- Plan entitled Truck Turn Exhibit A Inbound, Proposed Site Plan Documents for Unified² Global Packaging Group, Proposed Industrial Development, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Worcester County, Massachusetts dated June 3, 2022, prepared by Bohler for Unified² Global Packaging Group. (1 sheet)
- Plan entitled Truck Turn Exhibit B Outbound, Proposed Site Plan Documents for Unified² Global Packaging Group, Proposed Industrial Development, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Worcester County, Massachusetts dated June 3, 2022, prepared by Bohler for Unified² Global Packaging Group. (1 sheet)
- Document entitled Transportation Attachments undated.
- Document entitled 40 and 42 Unified Parkway, Site Plan Review, Proposed Exterior Site & Building Lighting, Manufacture Cut Sheets undated, submitted by UGPG RE Sutton LLC.
- Illicit Discharge Statement signed and dated June 7, 2022.

Graves Engineering, Inc. (GEI) has been requested to review the documents for conformance with Zoning Bylaw, Sutton, Massachusetts with amendments through May 13, 2019, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) Stormwater Handbook and generally accepted engineering practices.

This letter is a follow-up to our previous review letter dated May 13, 2022. For clarity, the comments from our previous letter are *italicized* and our comments to the applicant's responses are depicted in **bold**. Previous comment numbering has been maintained.

Our comments follow:

Zoning Bylaw

1. *As inscribed on Sheet C-101 and as presented in the correspondence from Nutter McClennen & Fish LLP, the applicant is requesting six waivers from the Zoning Bylaw. GEI has no issues with the waiver requests except as noted in the following comment. GEI understands that the Planning Board will address the waiver requests.*
GEI has no issues with the six waiver requests.
2. *For warehousing, the Zoning Bylaw requires one passenger vehicle parking space per 2,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA), the equivalent of which is 0.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet GFA. The applicant is proposing passenger vehicle parking at the rate of 0.39 and 0.26 spaces per 1,000 square feet GFA for Buildings 2 and 3, respectively. GEI consulted the Parking Generation Manual, 5th Edition published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. For warehousing - Land Use Code 150, the Manual shows an average parking demand and 85th percentile (the point at which 85 percent of the demand falls at or below the*

stated value) of 0.39 and 1.11 spaces per 1,000 square feet GFA, respectively. The Manual also shows that the greatest parking demand occurs between 3:00 PM and 3:59 PM, presumably during a shift change. GEI recommends that if the Planning Board is considering the grant of this waiver, that the applicant first revise the plans to show land allocation (e.g., show reserve or “banked” parking spaces and associated driveways) sufficient to construct the additional parking spaces in the future to comply with the Zoning Bylaw. If the waiver is granted, the grant of the waiver should include the criteria that would obligate the applicant to construct the reserve parking spaces. (§IV(B)3. Table 4)

The Land Bank Exhibit and Sheet C-302 propose a 142-space parking lot on the western side of Building 2, replacing thirteen trailer parking spaces. On the western side of Building 3, a 120-space parking lot is proposed, replacing 41 trailer parking spaces. GEI has no issue with the proposed layout of the “banked” parking spaces. We understand the Planning Board will address the waiver request.

3. *The site plans need to include the addresses of abutting properties and the names and addresses of owners of parcels within 300 feet of the property line. Only the abutting property owners were identified on the Existing Conditions Plans. (§IV(C)4.c)*

The applicant responded that per conversations with the Planning Director, the applicant understands that only direct abutters need to be listed on the plans and that the 300-foot reference is referring to abutter notification.

4. *On Sheet C-301 in the Zoning Analysis, Building 2 is shown to have frontage on both Unified Parkway and Providence Road, and Building 3 is shown to have frontage on both Unified Parkway and Boston Road. Relative to compliance with the frontage requirement, the Zoning Analysis needs to be revised to account for frontage on only one street. (§I.B & §IV(C)4.d)*

Acknowledged. Sheet C-301 was revised to include Note 8, specifying that the frontage is measured along Unified Parkway. The frontage lengths in the Zoning Analysis Table were reconfirmed.

5. *The site plans need to include the location, type, and screening for waste disposal containers. (§IV(C)4.f)*

The applicant responded that the project proposed concealed compactors against the building adjacent to the loading docks, making screening difficult and impractical. In GEI’s opinion, the response is not unreasonable. GEI defers further consideration of waste container screening to the Planning Board and its staff.

6. *Sheet C-304 depicts the fifteen-foot-wide road northeast of the Building 3 trailer parking as one-way. The site plans should include signs to reflect this. (§IV(C)4.h)*

Acknowledged. Sheet C-304 was revised to include a “Do Not Enter” sign on the eastern end of the road, and a “One-Way” sign on the western end.

7. *The Zoning Bylaw requires that infiltration basins and subsurface infiltration facilities shall be preceded by oil, grease and sediment traps. Furthermore, per the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook Volume 1, Chapter 1, Page 12, 3rd paragraph, light industrial activity is considered a land use with higher potential pollutant load (LUHPPL) and per Volume 1, Chapter 1, Page 14, 5th bullet an oil/grit separator (pre-treatment BMP) followed by a sand filter, organic filter, filtering bioretention area, or equivalent (treatment BMP’s) is required prior to discharge to an infiltration structure. The plans propose hooded catch basins and forebays (two pre-treatment BMP’s) but no treatment BMP’s prior to the stormwater being discharged to the infiltration structures. The proposed treatment trains need to be revised to include a treatment BMP for runoff generated from the pavement areas. (§V(B)6.c.6)*

The treatment trains that discharge to the Zone II of the public water supply were revised to include water quality units, shutoff valves and bioretention areas, and sizing calculations were provided. GEI has no issue with the concept of providing treatment via the bioretention areas, the sizing of the bioretention areas nor the use of water quality units and shut-off valves. However, the construction detail on Sheet C-706 for bioretention areas will have to be modified for this project and/or the bioretention areas will need to be raised. The construction detail shows an underdrain to convey treated water away from the bioretention areas, but the grading plans show no such underdrains and propose the bottom of each bioretention area to be at the same elevation as the bottom of the adjacent (downstream) stormwater management area.

8. *GEI has no issues with the proposed common driveway. (§VI.I)*
No further comment necessary.

General Bylaws, Chapter 15 – Scenic Road

9. *Sheet 6 of the off-site transportation improvement plan prepared by VHB proposes the removal of an existing 68" diameter tree at the Unified Parkway and Boston Road intersection. A previously prepared concept plan had contemplated an intersection configuration that may have allowed the tree to remain in place. GEI recommends that the Planning Board ask the applicant to explore a configuration that would allow the tree to remain. The Planning Board may also wish to ask the applicant to provide evidence (e.g., an evaluation by a qualified arborist) that the considers whether the tree can be saved and if so, what conditions need to be addressed in order to save the tree. (§15.6)*

The applicant responded that they are in contact with Tree Tech, a professional arborist firm, to examine the condition of the Sycamore tree. Additionally, the design team is evaluating alternative geometries for the intersection. The applicant notes that alternative will likely involve further impacting Boston Road (e.g., widening).

Hydrology Calculations & Stormwater Management Review

10. *GEI reviewed the hydrology computations and found them to be in order except as noted in the following comment.*

The hydrology computations are in order.

11. *The hydrology calculations for Pond B3a list a 15-inch outlet pipe, however Sheet C-405 depicts this outlet as a 12-inch pipe. The information needs to be consistent.*

Acknowledged. Sheet C-405 was revised to depict the outlet as a 15-inch pipe.

12. *Compliance with the MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards and Handbook is reasonable except as noted in the following three comments.*

Compliance with the MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards and Handbook is reasonable provide the construction detail referenced in comment 7 is modified.

13. *Please refer to comment 7 relative to stormwater treatment.*

Please see the response to comment 7.

14. *Per the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook Volume 1, Chapter 1 Page 13, 2nd paragraph, the long-term pollution prevention plan shall provide for the use of an emergency shut-off where appropriate to isolate the system in the event of an emergency spill or other unexpected event. Considering the project's location (partially within a Zone II) and proximity to the Zone I of a*

public water supply well, the project's long-term pollution prevention plan needs to be revised to include provisions for an emergency shut-off within the stormwater systems. In GEI's opinion, there are various ways to provide for a shut-off (e.g., shutoffs at the stormwater system inlets or shutoffs within the piping system).

Acknowledged. Shutoff valves were added to the drain manholes immediately before the water quality units, as well as at the outlet pipe at Stormwater Management Area B3a.

15. *The Illicit Discharge Statement needs to be signed and dated.*

Acknowledged. An Illicit Discharge statement signed and dated June 7, 2022 was included in the review submission.

General Engineering Comments

16. *GEI has no issues with the Rational Method pipe sizing calculations.*

No further comment necessary.

17. *On Sheets C-402 and C-405, the gravel access driveway to the Wilkinsonville Water District's well and building will be too steep; a 3H:1V grade is proposed on part of the driveway.*

Acknowledged. The gravel access driveway was revised to originate from Unified Parkway. GEI has no issues with the access location or the driveway's grades.

18. *The site plans need to include construction details for bollards and the proposed gates.*

Acknowledged. Sheet C-901 was revised to include the necessary construction details.

19. *On Sheet C-305, the northern driveway needs to include a stop sign and stop line at the intersection with Unified Parkway.*

Acknowledged. Sheet C-305 was revised to include a stop sign and stop line at the intersection.

20. *On Sheet C-406, the following drainage structures are missing out invert elevations: DMH 402, DMH 403, DMH 404, DMH 405, DMH 505A.*

Acknowledged. Sheet C-406 was revised to provide invert elevations for the aforementioned drainage structures.

21. *Sheet C-406 lists two inverts for OCS-400, one to DMH-400A and the other to DMH-402. However, the Subsurface System Outlet Control Structure Detail on Sheet C-903 depicts only one invert, to DMH-400A. The second invert needs to be included in the construction detail or deleted from Sheet C-406.*

Acknowledged. The Subsurface System Outlet Control Structure Detail was revised to depict one invert to DMH-400A, which is consistent with Sheet C-406.

22. *The rim elevations for OCS-100 and OCS-600 as well as the outlet pipe diameter for OCS-600 need to be consistent between Sheet C-406 and the Typical Outlet Control Structure Detail on Sheet C-903.*

The plans were revised to consistently show the rim elevations for OCS-100 and OCS-600, however the outlet pipe diameter for OCS-600 is still inconsistent between Sheets C-406 (15") and C-903 (24").

General Comments


23. *The site plans need to identify which of the accessible parking spaces are van accessible.*
Acknowledged. Sheets C-30 through C-306 were revised to identify the van accessible parking spaces.
24. *The Seed Mix Key on Sheet C-701 needs to include the hatch type (appears to be riprap) used along the perimeter of the eastern loading spaces for Building 2.*
Acknowledged. The legend on Sheet C-701 was revised to identify the hatch type as proposed crushed stone.
25. *GEI did not review the water and sewer utilities and understands that they will be reviewed by the respective utility providers.*
No further comment necessary.
26. *GEI did not review the off-site transportation improvement plans in detail yet. GEI participated in an initial technical review teleconference with the applicant's team and Ron Müller & Associates on April 20, 2022. GEI understands that additional survey work associated with the existing drainage system was going to be performed and that the plans were going to be updated.*
The applicant responded that the applicant is currently updating the off-site roadway improvement plans, and will provide them when they are available.

Additional Comments June 24, 2022

27. **The Drawing Sheet Index on Sheet C-101 has mislabeled Sheet C-607 as Sheet C-606 and is missing the Sheet C-606 in the listing for Plans A – E.**
28. **Sheet C-406 lists the rim elevation of DMH-8C as 375.13, however Sheet C-405 shows this elevation as approximately 378. The rim elevation needs to be consistent.**
29. **Sheet C-406 lists the rim elevation of DMH-9 as 388.55, however Sheet C-404 shows this elevation as approximately 394. The rim elevation needs to be consistent.**
30. **Sheet C-406 lists the rim elevation of DMH-108 as 389.33, however Sheet C-402 shows this elevation as approximately 380. The rim elevation needs to be consistent.**

We trust this letter addresses your review requirements. Feel free to contact this office if you have any questions or comments.

Very truly yours,
Graves Engineering, Inc.



Jeffrey M. Walsh, P.E.
Principal

cc: Keith Curran, P.E.; Bohler Donald Provencher, P.E.; Provencher Engineering, LLC
Matthew Piekarski; The Kraft Group, LLC Brandon Faneuf; Ecosystem Solutions, Inc.
Ron Müller, P.E.; Ron Müller & Associates