



100 GROVE ST. | WORCESTER, MA 01605

July 7, 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 July 7, 2022 via email:

- Email from Keith Curran of Bohler to the Sutton Director of Planning & Development dated July 6, 2022 containing a list of plan revisions.
- Sheets C-101, C-406, C-701, C-702, C-703, C-704, C-705, C-706 and C-903 of plans entitled Proposed Site Plan Documents for Unified<sup>2</sup> Global Packaging Group Industrial Development, Unified Parkway, Town of Sutton, Worcester County, Massachusetts dated March 28, 2022 and last revised July 6, 2022, prepared by Bohler for Unified<sup>2</sup> Global Packaging Group. (9 sheets)

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 letters dated May 13, 2022 and June 24, 2022. For clarity, the comments from our previous letters are *italicized* and our latest comments to the design engineer's responses are depicted in **bold**. For brevity, comments previously addressed by the design engineer and acknowledged as such by GEI have been omitted. 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, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. For warehousing - Land Use Code 150, the Manual shows an average parking demand and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile (the point at which 85 percent of the demand falls at or below the*

X:\Shared\Projects\SuttonPB\UnifiedBostonRdProvRd\Buildings2&3\Reviews\spb070722unifiedblgs2&3.docx

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.**

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.**

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, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, light industrial activity is considered a land use with higher potential pollutant load (LUHPPL) and per Volume 1, Chapter 1, Page 14, 5<sup>th</sup> 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)*

June 24, 2022:

*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.*

**Acknowledged. The underdrain was eliminated from the Bioretention Area construction detail on Sheet C-706.**

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)*

*June 24, 2022:*

*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).*

**GEI understands that the disposition of the tree will be addressed as part of an upcoming application to modify the Unified Parkway definitive plan relative to the intersection of Unified Parkway and Boston Road.**

### **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.**

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

*June 24, 2022:*

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

**Compliance with the MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards and Handbook is reasonable.**

### **General Engineering Comments**

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

**No further comment necessary.**

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.*

*June 24, 2022:*

*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").*

**Acknowledged. Sheet C-903 was revised to show a 15" diameter outlet pipe.**

**General Comments**

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.*

**Acknowledged. The Drawing Sheet Index on Sheet C-101 was revised.**

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.*

**Acknowledged. The rim elevation on Sheet C-406 was revised.**

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.*

**Acknowledged. The rim elevation on Sheet C-406 was revised.**

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.*

**Acknowledged. The rim elevation on Sheet C-406 was revised.**

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  
John Kucich, P.E.; Bohler  
Matthew Piekarski; The Kraft Group, LLC  
Kirsten Braun, P.E.; Ron Müller & Associates  
Brandon Faneuf; Ecosystem Solutions, Inc.  
Donald Provencher, P.E.; Provencher Engineering, LLC