

**RJO'CONNELL & ASSOCIATES, INC.**  
**CIVIL ENGINEERS, SURVEYORS & LAND PLANNERS**

80 Montvale Ave., Suite 201  
phone 781-279-0180

Stoneham, MA 02180  
fax 781-279-0173

---

May 31, 2013

Mr. Richard Sampson, Chairman  
Town of Winchester  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
71 Mt. Vernon Street  
Winchester, MA 01890

Via Hand Delivery

Regarding: CVS/Pharmacy  
278 Washington Street  
Winchester, MA  
11071.00501

Dear Mr. Sampson:

On behalf of G.B. New England 2, LLC, RJ O'Connell & Associates (RJOC) is submitting this letter in response to the comment letter received from the Town Engineer, Beth Rudolph, PE and Assistant Town Engineer, Matt Shuman, PE, dated May 9, 2013.

In association with this response letter, RJOC has submitted revised materials to the Winchester Zoning Board of Appeals, which have incorporated revisions to the site/civil plans and supporting documents in response to the Town Engineer's comment letter of May 9, 2013 and comments received from the ZBA hearing the night of May 14. The submission includes nineteen (19) copies of the following:

1. Site Plans titled "Site Plan for CVS/pharmacy-Washington Street and Swanton Street – Winchester, MA, prepared by RJ O'Connell & Associates, dated 10/5/12, last revised 5/29/13. Included in the plan set are the CVS building elevations, floor plan and perspective elevations as prepared by BKA Architects.
2. Stormwater Management Report titled "Stormwater Management Study – CVS/pharmacy #278 Washington Street – Winchester, MA prepared by RJ O'Connell & Associates, dated 10/5/12, last revised 5/31/13.
3. Groundwater Mounding Analysis report, prepared by Ransom Consulting, Inc. dated 5/31/13.
4. Seasonal high groundwater elevation letter prepared by Ransom Consulting, Inc. dated 5/30/13.
5. Exhibit Plan EXH-1 titled "Interior Landscape Area Exhibit Plan", prepared by R J O'Connell & Associates, dated 5/29/13
6. Site Light Fixture catalog cut sheet

Outlined below are the Town Engineer's comments per the letter of May 9, 2013 followed by RJOC's response.

### **Site Plans**

**Comment No. 1:** This comment has been addressed. As part of the Demolition Permit, existing services will be capped at the building. During construction, existing services will be capped at the main. The Applicant should coordinate all work with the DPW and Engineering Department. DPW prefers a 2-inch direct tap for the water service with a curb stop with drain and recommends a "doghouse" style manhole be provided at the sewer service connection.

**Response:** RJOC has revised dwg. No. C-4 "Utility Plan" as follows:

- a. RJOC has revised the domestic water service note to require the domestic water service to be a direct tap to the existing water main with a curb stop and drain.
- b. RJOC has revised the note to SMH-3 to require the contractor to install a "dog house" manhole over the existing sewer main located within Swanton Street.

In addition to the revisions performed to Dwg. No. C-4 – Utility Plan the 2" Domestic Water Service Connection Detail as shown on Dwg. No. C-8 has been revised to reflect a direct water tap connection.

**Comment No. 3A:** The opening of the proposed basin/swale is located in the southeast quadrant of the property, which under existing and proposed conditions, is the high point of the property. Therefore, it appears that a large portion of the property will not be intercepted in the basin. The applicant should discuss how runoff from the remainder of the site will be addressed during construction.

**Response:** RJOC has revised Dwg. No. C-1 "Demolition & Erosion Control Plan" to incorporate temporary diversion swales which will convey stormwater runoff during construction to the sediment basin. The temporary diversion swales will be installed by the contractor when the paved surface upgradient of the diversion swale is removed. Note 28 has been added to the Demolition Notes, which requires the contractor to construct temporary diversion swales at the end of each work day to accommodate earthwork activities performed.

**Comment No. 3B:** The Engineering Department remains concerned with the location of the temporary sedimentation basin. Although it has been sized in accordance with the EPA standards, if it were to fail it could cause significant damage to the property at 26 Swanton Street, which is immediately downstream. The Engineering Department recommends relocating the basin to an alternate location.

**Response:** RJOC has reevaluated relocating the temporary sediment basin. The existing site features such as the topography, the demolition of the existing site structures and the location of the contaminated soil plume area does not allow for the temporary sediment basin to be relocated to an alternative location on-site. RJOC has revised the grading of the temporary sediment basin to provide an earth berm along the southwest corner of the property to add additional protection to the downstream abutters. In addition to providing an earth berm, the size and volume of the basin has been increased (from 3,600 cf of storage to 4,000 cf of storage) and exceed the minimum sizing requirements under the EPA NPDES requirements.

**Comment No. 3C:** The detail on Sheet C-5 of the plans shows that the top of the sedimentation basin is at elevation 47-feet. The rim of the catch basin is at elevation 46.85-feet, so there is only

0.15-feet of freeboard in the system. The Engineering Department recommends that the system be redesigned so that there is a minimum of one-foot of freeboard and higher where the basin abuts adjacent homes.

**Response:** The temporary sediment basin has been redesigned to provide an earthen berm to elev. 48.0 along the southwest corner of the property. The rim elevation of the catch basin (CB-2) will be set at elevation 46.0 which will provide two (2') feet of free board for the adjacent properties and one (1') foot of free board will be provided on-site.

**Comment No. 18:** However, the Engineering Department is concerned that the analysis shows that the groundwater mound will extend into the bottom of the infiltration system, thereby compromising the storage capacity of the system. The analysis presented by Ransom Consulting, Inc. indicates that the peak mound during the 100-year storm event will reach an elevation of 40.8 feet. The detail provided on Sheet C-9 indicates that the bottom of the stone is at elevation 40.0-feet and the bottom of the perforated pipes is at elevation 40.5 feet. Once the groundwater mound intercepts the infiltration system, the infiltrative capacity of the system is reduced and the assumptions used to size it are no longer valid. The applicant must design the system so that the groundwater mound does not intercept the infiltration system by raising the elevation of the proposed system above the groundwater mound. Alternatively, the applicant could demonstrate that the function of the system (i.e., hydraulics, size, and dewatering time) would not be impacted by the groundwater mound.

**Response:** The groundwater mounding analysis as prepared by Ransom Environmental (dated February 12, 2013) incorrectly stated the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation to be at elevation 36.8 in lieu of elevation 35.8 as determined by test pit 104 performed by Ransom Environmental in January 2013. Included within this submission is a revised groundwater mounding analysis report with the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation of 35.8. The conclusions outlined in the February report remain unchanged, and that is for a 100 year storm event and when the groundwater is at its seasonally high elevation of 35.8, storm water will mound to an elevation of 40.0 +/- (bottom of basin) and will not surcharge the infiltration basin.

In addition, Ransom Environmental has also included with this submission written documentation that the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation was conservatively estimated to be at elevation 35.8.

**Additional comments on revised submittal:**

**Comment 3A:** The existing concrete retaining wall has a taller section of exposed concrete on the western face than it does on the eastern face. The reveal on the eastern side remains constant at about 15-inches, while the exposed face on the western side climbs from approximately 2-feet to over 4-feet. The detail shows that under proposed conditions, the wall will have an equal exposure on both sides (at the section drawn it is 2'9"), meaning that soils would need to be removed from the eastern side of the wall. The Engineering Department is concerned that this could damage the existing wall.

**Responses:** RJOC has revised the retaining wall detail section C-C (shown on Drawing C-7) to depict the bottom of the modular block retaining wall (western side) to be consistent with existing grades. The bottom of the modular block retaining wall will have a design elevation that is approximately six (6") inches below the top of the concrete retaining wall.

**Comment 3B.** The detail also shows that there will be an approximately 1'4" gap between the existing and proposed walls. This will be extremely difficult to maintain and clean given its

location and will look very odd from Swanton Street. It could also pose a hazard for young children who could easily fall into this area or access it from Swanton Street end of the wall.

**Response:** The modular block retaining wall section detail (Section C-C) has been revised to infill the gap between the concrete retaining wall and the modular block retaining wall with loam and mulch for the purposes of creating a landscape planter. Daylilies and Iris's will be planted within the limits of the planter.

**Comment 3C:** The Engineering Department questions whether the applicant would be able to construct the proposed block retaining wall from their property or whether a temporary construction easement would be required. It appears that at least a temporary easement would be required to remove the soil from the eastern side of the existing wall, since a portion of it appears to be on the abutter's property.

**Response:** The first course of segmented block will be installed six (6") inches away from the westerly property line. The depth of excavation to install the first course of block is approximately eighteen (18") inches below existing grade. Due to the shallow depth of excavations to install said wall land disturbances or encroachment onto the abutting property is not anticipated and as a result, a temporary construction easement will not be required.

**Comment 3D:** Then Engineering Department questions how the applicant will address the wall construction in the vicinity of the existing utility pole that is located near the end of the existing retaining wall. The applicant's current design has the potential to undermine the integrity of that pole.

**Response:** RJOC has added a note to dwg. Nos. C-2 and C-3 which requires the site contractor to coordinate with the Electric Company prior to wall construction regarding the need to temporary brace the existing utility pole in order to install the proportion of the wall within the vicinity of the existing utility pole.

**Comment 3E:** Has the applicant considered providing a "living fence" instead of the privacy fence, as this will also impact views from the abutter's property and Swanton street?

**Response:** The installation of a wooden privacy fence along the length of the retaining wall was a recommendation the Project Applicant agreed to during meetings held with the Planning Board and Design Review Committee. The wooden fence also provides screening to prevent automobile headlamp glare onto abutting properties during nighttime hours of operation.

In addition to addressing the comments raised by the Town Engineer in its memorandum of May 9, 2013, RJOC has performed additional revisions to the site plans, stormwater management report and groundwater mounding analysis report to address comments received at the Zoning Board of Appeals hearing of May 14, 2013. Outlined below is a summary of the comments received followed by RJOC's response.

**Comment No. 1:** It appears the location of the snow storage area is in conflict with future landscape plantings.

**Response:** RJOC has revised the layout of the snow storage area such that it is not in conflict with the landscape plantings planned along the southerly property line. The Project Applicant has agreed during the Architectural Design Review process that the height of the snow storage area shall not exceed six (6') feet. Once the snow storage area has reached full capacity, surplus snow will be disposed off-site in accordance with local and MADEP requirements.

**Comment No. 2:** A request was made to substitute Eastern White Pines (7 total) with an alternative Evergreen species.

**Response:** RJOc has revised the site landscape plan (Dwg. No. L-1) to replace the seven (7) Eastern White Pines with seven (7) Fraser Fir's.

**Comment No. 3:** The ZBA made a request to the applicant to consider enhancing the landscape buffer along the southerly property line.

**Response:** To accommodate the request of the ZBA, RJOc has revised the site grading along the southerly property line (see Dwg. NO. C-3 – Grading & Drainage plan) to create a three (3') foot high landscape berm at the southwest corner of the property. In addition to the landscape berm, a row of arborvitae's (7'-8' plant height) will be planted along the southerly property line for the purpose of enhancing the screening of the residential properties from the site.

**Comment No. 4:** Provide supporting documentation as to how interior landscaping was calculated.

**Response:** RJOc has included in this submission an exhibit plan titled "Interior Landscape Area Exhibit Plan," Dwg. No. EXH-1. The exhibit plan depicts how the interior landscaping requirement for the parking lot was calculated. The zoning ordinance requires 2% of the parking lot area to be landscaped. The CVS development is providing 3%.

**Comment No. 5:** Design Review Committee requested the wooden fence which screened the transformer pad to be removed.

**Response:** RJOc has revised the Site, Parking & Traffic Control Plan, Dwg. No. C-2 to remove the fence enclosure around the perimeter of the transformer.

**Comment No. 6:** Design Review Committee requested a catalog cut sheet for the site light fixture.

**Response:** RJOc has included in this submission a catalog cut sheet of the site light fixture to be utilized for this project.

**Comment No. 7:** Concerns were raised as it pertained to the swale located at the southwest corner of property as the proposed yard drain may get clogged and water in swale would overtop onto abutting residential properties.

**Response:** RJOc has revised the grading at the southwest corner of the property to create a landscape berm (3' in height) adjacent to the residential properties. The creation of the landscape berm eliminates the need for a yard drain as shown on previous submissions. The landscaped area at the southwest corner of the property has been regraded to drain to CB-2 which discharges into the subsurface infiltration basin.

**Comment No. 8:** ZBA requested RJOc confirm that the volume of water associated with the 100 year storm event is contained within the on-site stormwater management system. ZBA expressed concern regarding the rim elevation of catch basin CB-5.

**Response:** The subsurface basin has been increased in size such that the volume of water associated with the 100 year storm event is contained within the on-site stormwater management system. For the 100-year storm event, stormwater will rise to elevation 44.16' within the

subsurface basin and the lowest rim elevation within the on-site system occurs at CB-5 which is at elevation 44.45.

I trust the responses provided to comments received from the Town Engineer and the ZBA hearing of May 14 will meet with the Board's approval. Upon the Board's review, should there be any questions on the need for additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 781-279-0180 x103.

Sincerely,

RJO'CONNELL & ASSOCIATES



Brian P. Dundon, PE  
Vice President

cc: Mary Winstanley O'Connor  
Ken Ingber  
Debbie Constantine  
Paul Beck  
Kevin Paton  
Giles Ham