
May 13, 2021

Ms. Karen Sherman
Town Planner
Town of Holliston
703 Washington Street
Holliston, MA 01746

**Re: 2021 Definitive Site Plan Modification Zoning & Planning Regulation Peer Review 2
555 Hopping Brook Road Holliston MA Commercial Development
CMG ID 2020-002**

Dear Karen,

CMG is providing this letter report detailing our second engineering peer review of the “555 Hopping Brook Road, Holliston, MA” commercial development project Site Plan Modification. The project is located within the Hopping Brook Business Park on the 72.73 +/- Acre parcel identified as Lot 4 (the “Site”). The project Applicant, *CRG Integrated Real Estate Solutions*, is proposing to construct an 800,000 +/- s.f. warehouse and distribution facility, associated parking, driveway, and utilities within an Industrial zoning district.

CMG is in receipt of the following documents:

- Site Plans entitled “555 Hopping Brook Road, A Modification of The Definitive Site Plan in Holliston Massachusetts” Sheets 1 – 35, prepared by Engineering Design Consultants, Inc., date 11/16/19, revise date April 13, 2021.
- “Stormwater Calculations” report for 555 Hopping Brook Road Holliston, MA prepared by Engineering Design Consultants, Inc., date 11/16/19, revise date April 13, 2021.

CMG is providing this letter summarizing our review comments for the above documents to evaluate the project’s compliance with the following regulations for Planning Board consideration:

- Town of Holliston Zoning by Law date May 6, 2019 with August 14, 2019 Amendments.
- Town of Holliston Planning Board Site Plan Review and Special Permit Regulations updated through February 12, 2015.

General Site Plan Comments

1. Property lines for proposed development don't match Existing Conditions plan. Proposed development extends beyond property lines shown on existing conditions plan.

EDC Response: The Existing Conditions plan updated to reflect the correct property lines.

CMG Comment #2:

EDC's previous Revision 3 - February 5, 2021 "555 Hopping Brook Road A Modification of the Definitive Site Plan" set included the following:

- 1) **"Existing Conditions Plan" Sheet 35 of 37, date February 7, 2020 prepared by Engineering Design Consultants, and stamped by Richard W. Reid Jr, Professional Land Surveyor.**
 - **This plan showed the Lot 4 Property Boundary, deed and Plan references, test pit data, site topography, existing conditions, stone walls, abutters, wetlands flagging and buffer zones, and Hopping Brook Road Extension layout as required by the Town regulations.**

EDC's Revision 4 - 4/13/21 Site plan set just submitted to the Planning Board contains a different Existing Conditions Plan as follows:

- 2) **"Existing Conditions Plan" Sheet 34 of 36, date November 16, 2019, prepared by Engineering Design Consultants (EDC) is now stamped by Walter M. Lewinski, Professional Engineer.**
 - **The November 16, 2019 plan now does not show the following: wetlands flagging D-Series (in the area of the proposed cul-de-sac), wetland flagging AB-Series, deed and plan references, existing lot property boundaries, existing Hopping Brook Road Extension layout, existing conditions, stone walls, and the topography appears slightly different. It also appears the Lot 4 is now labeled as Lot #1 with a different area which is similar to the lot area you are proposing for the current project.**

CMG notes there are several issues with the current November 16, 2019 existing conditions plan submitted and it is not stamped by a Licensed Land Surveyor. The February 7, 2020 plan appears to be the actual existing conditions plan for the Site.

2. Proposed lot area is 3,458,910 SF, Existing Conditions plan shows 3,168,300 SF. Applicant should document any proposed property line changes.

EDC Response: The Existing Conditions plan indicates the correct lot area of 3,458,910 S.F.

CMG Comment #2: CMG notes the Applicant will need to provide a "modification" to the Hopping Brook Road Extension subdivision plans to ensure compliance with Zoning and Stormwater Management Standards for the proposed Lot configuration, modified roadway layout, and stormwater basin design.

The current plan set does not provide any plans showing the comparison between the existing and proposed changes to the lot layout and Hopping Brook Roadway Extension subdivision plan.

3. An Overall Site Layout Plan should be provided showing the entire property at a suitable scale to include the proposed site layout, building setback lines, and limited existing conditions to verify compliance with zoning and clearly depict the proposed property lines.

EDC Response: Overall Site Layout Plan included indicating zoning compliance is satisfied.

CMG Comment #2: Comment Remains (Also See Comment #2)

4. It is not clear from the plan how the alignment of the proposed cul-de-sac connects to Hopping Brook Road. The proposed cul-de-sac location and alignment does not agree with the Hopping Brook Road roadway layout shown on the Existing Conditions Plan. More detail is required.

EDC Response: The Planning Board's original approval of Hopping Brook Road allowed for a terminus as far as Roadway Station 66+25, however with the large acreage associated with the CRG Proposal the roadway can now easily be reduced to less than 58+00. Final roadway and water main extension details shall be managed with the Planning Board through the definitive subdivision amendment process which we anticipate will be a condition of this Site Plan Approval.

CMG Comment #2: Comment Remains (Also See Comments #2 & #3)

CMG defers to the Planning Board to determine if the Hopping Brook Roadway Extension design should be modified prior Site Plan approval or as a "condition" of Site Plan approval as suggested by the Applicant's Engineer.

5. Expansion of the off-site stormwater basin associated with Hopping Brook Road is proposed. Existing conditions mapping, roadway layout, and property lines and easement information relating to this basin should be provided in the plan set.

EDC Response: As stated in item 4, final roadway and associated infrastructure and easement details shall be managed with the Planning Board through the definitive subdivision amendment process which we anticipate will be a condition of this Site Plan Approval.

CMG Comment #2: Comment Remains. At a minimum Applicant's Engineer should provide a copy of the original "Stormwater Management Design" for the Hopping Brook Roadway Extension and any current as-built information for the existing stormwater basin to confirm the assumptions provided in EDC's April 13, 2021 "Stormwater Calculations".

CMG understands the Applicant is requesting the Planning Board consider allowing the subdivision amendment process be complete prior to the start of project construction activities as a condition of approval.

6. Two (2) EV charging stations are required to be shown on the plans per 3/11/20 Site Plan Approval Condition 29.

EDC Response: Two EV charging stations on sheet 5 and two on sheet 6 are included and will charge a total of four EV spaces.

Comment Addressed

7. Sheet 30 Stormwater Details is missing from the Site Plan Modification set.

EDC Response: Sheets are renumbered and inclusive of Stormwater Details.

Comment Addressed

8. Sheets 33, 34 and 35 are incorrectly numbered and don't correspond with the Sheet List shown on the Title Sheet.

EDC Response: Sheets are renumbered and correspond to Sheet List.

Comment Addressed

Holliston Zoning By-Law Comments

9. No dimensions or setbacks provided for proposed "Landmark Sign" indicated on Landscape Plan. Location appears closer than the 10-FT setback required by Section V-B.

EDC Response: The plan has been revised to show a 10 ft. minimum setback.

CMG Comment #2: Landmark sign is not shown on Sheet 2 or 4 "Layout and Materials Plan" with the proposed setback dimension. Sign is currently only shown on sheet 26 Landscape Plan.

10. Per Section V-C g. industrial establishments require one parking space per 1.3 employees on largest shift. The 403 spaces proposed accommodates 523 employees. Section V-C g also states parking for "industrial establishments" should be expandable to not less than one space per 300-SF of gross floor area. For an 800,000-SF building that would be 2,667 spaces. Section V-C j. also allows for the parking requirements of "other uses" to be determined by the Building Inspector.

CMG recommends the Applicant demonstrate compliance with Section V-C g or provide supporting evidence to justify alternative Site parking standards in accordance with Section V-C j.

EDC Response: Although this facility would never be utilized as a 100% industrial use-type facility, in order to address this concern EDC has prepared a Parking Layout Sketch indicating that the proposed paving limits will support 2,670 parking spaces and attached herewith.

Comment Addressed

11. Section V-C b. requires that 10% of the interior of parking lot over 40 spaces be landscaped, including trees. Applicant should provide calculations to support compliance.

EDC Response: The area of the perimeter of the pavement to the Hopping Brook Road Property Line is 1,906,085 s.f., while the building area is 800,420 s.f. with the net area equal to 1,105,655 s.f. The net interior landscaped area provided is 325,185 s.f. or 29.4 % which is significantly greater than the 10% required by this section.

CMG Comment #2: CMG is not in agreement with the above provided calculation. CMG believes the interior of the parking lot refers to the landscape islands within the limits of the designated parking areas over 40 spaces. The intent of this requirement is to break up larger pavement expanses with landscaping and shade trees.

Interior landscape islands are shown within each of the employee parking areas which would meet this requirement. However, it is unclear which “interior” landscape areas the Applicant’s Engineer is using to account towards the 10% for the trailer parking areas. Applicant’s engineer should provide a figure detailing which interior landscape areas are being accounted for and calculations to support compliance with this section for both employee and trailer parking areas.

12. Section V-C d. limits parking lot luminaire mounting height to 15-FT. Lighting plan notation suggests 30-FT mounting height. Applicant should clarify and provide a light pole detail.

EDC Response: The plan has been revised with proposed 15-foot high mounted lighting.

Comment Addressed

13. Section V-C d. also limits off-site illumination levels to no more than one foot-candle. There appear to be some minor exceedances at the proposed Hopping Brook Road driveway entrance property line.

EDC Response: The plan has been revised with the proposed site lighting levels not extending beyond lot boundaries other than the site driveway and that light fixture can be incorporated as part of the municipal lighting system to ensure vehicle and pedestrian safety at the site driveway / street intersection.

Comment Addressed

14. Section V-C g. requires a minimum of 150-FT of visibility in each travel lane. Applicant should note sight line on Hopping Brook at driveway.

EDC Response: The sight distance is significantly greater than 150 feet and has been added to the layout sheets 2 and 4.

CMG Comment #2: Actual sight distance should be shown on the plan along with stop sign and stop bar locations at the exit driveway. Landmark sign and sight triangle should be noted on the plan to insure there are no future plantings or signage to be located within this area.

15. Section V-C requires bike racks to accommodate 1 bike per 20 parking spaces. Location and number of bike racks should be shown on the plan. Location of bicycle racks and bicycle lanes are also required in accordance with 3/11/20 Site Plan Approval Condition 31.

EDC Response: Bicycle racks have been added to sheet 6 and now include a total of 3 bicycle racks for the project with 7 bicycles per rack thus providing a total of 21 slots satisfying the bicycle accommodation formula of $403 \text{ spaces} \times 1/20 = 21 \text{ bicycle spaces}$.

Comment Addressed

Holliston Planning Board Site Plan Review & Special Permit Regulations

16. Section 7.3.1 b) requires a general description of the project. To meet this requirement, we recommend that street names, zone lines and municipal boundaries be added to the locus map.

EDC Response: The locus map has been revised.

Comment Addressed

17. Existing and proposed electrical utilities should be shown in the plan set.

EDC Response: Proposed electrical utilities have been added to sheet 7 & 8.

CMG Comment #2: Comment remains. Existing and proposed electric utility connections, in addition to water and gas, within Hopping Brook Road are not shown. CMG is aware a large existing electrical conduit bank, water, and gas utilities are constructed along the Hopping Brook Road Extension but it is unclear how far up the roadway these utilities currently extend.

18. Information related to the connection to the existing Hopping Brook Road and an overlay of the proposed development on the Existing Conditions plan should be provided.

EDC Response: As stated in item 4 above, the Planning Board's original approval of Hopping Brook Road allowed for a terminus as far as Roadway Station 66+25, however with the large acreage associated with the CRG Proposal the roadway can now easily be reduced to less than 58+00. Final roadway and water main extension details shall be managed with the Planning Board through the definitive subdivision amendment process which we anticipate will be a condition of this Site Plan Approval.

CMG Comment #2: Comment Remains (Also See Comments #2, #3, & #4)

CMG defers to the Planning Board to determine if the Hopping Brook Roadway Extension design should be modified prior Site Plan approval or as a “condition” of Site Plan approval as suggested by the Applicant’s Engineer.

19. Section 7.3.1 f) Zone boundaries within 200-FT should be shown on the plan.

EDC Response: Zone boundaries have been added to the plan set.

Comment Addressed

20. Section 7.3.1 g) Boundaries of the property line and lines of existing streets are required. There appear to be discrepancies between the Existing Conditions plan and the proposed development. (Also See Comments 3 & 4)

EDC Response: The existing conditions plan has been revised to reflect the revised property lines.

CMG Comment #2: Comment remains (See Comment #1)

21. Section 7.3.4 requires that the Landscape Plan be signed and sealed by a registered landscape architect. The plan is signed and sealed by an engineer.

EDC Response: The Landscape & Lighting Plans will be sealed with PE & LA seals.

Comment Addressed

22. Section 7.3.4 requires the following missing items be included on the Landscaping Plan: topography, light fixture structures, grass seed mixture, seeding rate, method of seed distribution and proposed mulching.

EDC Response: Landscape Plan details and reference notes have been updated as outlined.

Comment Addressed

Section 7.4 Performance Standards for Non-Residential Developments

CMG offers the following comments for the Planning Board’s consideration as to whether the project is in keeping with the standards set forth in Section 7.4. The comments below are not meant to comprehensively account for all items in the performance standards, simply to highlight some key items relating to this project.

7.4.2 Standards

A. Aesthetics

23. Architectural details should be “compatible with New England architectural style”.

EDC Response: The proposed facility includes modern detailing that is in keeping with both older and newer Hopping Brook Industrial Park buildings.

For Planning Board Consideration

24. Consideration should be given to “harmony in scale, bulk, massing, and density”.

EDC Response: Again, the proposed facility is in harmony with the Hopping Brook Industrial Park noting that to date approximately 800K has been developed on approximately 100 acres of land which is substantially similar to what is proposed for the 555 Hopping Brook Road site with almost 200 acres remaining and less than 1.5 million square feet of development remaining, yet this and any future project will have the ability to create significantly less traffic volume, efficiently collect and treat storm water, provide significantly greater setbacks to abutting properties, provide an effective visual and acoustical landscape berm barrier to abutting properties, and improve water quality and distribution for the western side of town just to name a few of the outstanding benefits that a project of this scale and scope can actually deliver to the town.

For Planning Board Consideration

B. Lighting

25. Wall and pole mounted fixtures should be mounted no higher than 15-FT above grade.

EDC Response: The plan has been revised with proposed 15-foot high mounted lighting.

Comment Addressed

C. Landscaping and Screening

26. Proposed development shall be integrated into the natural landscape.

EDC Response: The site is a large land area that has been properly balanced for cut and fill, providing significant buffer separations to abutting properties and natural buffers exceeding 100-feet to wetland resource areas that are both on and off locus.

CMG Comment #2: For Planning Board Consideration. Applicant’s Engineer states Site cut and fill is balanced, however, no supporting calculations or figures are provided for reference.

27. Grade changes shall be in keeping with the general appearance of the neighboring developed areas.

EDC Response: Again, the site is a large land area that has approximately 142-feet of total grade change from the highest to lowest point, yet the site has been properly balanced for cut and fill, provides significant buffer separations to abutting properties that affords only a 23.1 % building coverage and approximately 32 % open space which is significantly better than most properties within Hopping Brook Park.

For Planning Board Consideration.

D. Stormwater Management

28. Applicant has submitted a Stormwater Management Report, revise date February 5, 2021. CMG will provide a separate peer review letter for this document.

EDC Response: No Comment Required.

CMG Comment #2: See CMG Stormwater Peer Review 4 letter provided under separate cover.

E. Site Development Standards

29. To the extent practicable, the proposed site development shall be located to preserve the natural features of the site.

EDC Response: Natural features are retained along the project perimeter and particularly near designated wetland buffer zone areas.

For Planning Board Consideration.

30. 7.4.2 E. 4. (A) Placement of buildings, structures, or parking facilities shall not detract from the site's scenic qualities and shall blend in with the natural landscape.

EDC Response: Again, natural features are retained along the project perimeter and particularly near designated wetland buffer zone areas.

For Planning Board Consideration.

31. 7.4.2 E. 4. (B) Building sites shall be directed away from the crest of hills, and foundations shall be constructed to reflect the natural terrain.

EDC Response: The site is a large land area that has been properly balanced for cut and fill, providing suitable foundation limits for the proposed building and affording significant buffer separation to abutting properties.

CMG Comment #2: For Planning Board Consideration. Applicant's Engineer states Site cut and fill is balanced, however, no supporting calculations or figures are provided for reference.

32. 7.4.2 E. 8. Finished grades should be limited to no greater than a 3:1 slope. The majority of the project's sloped grading areas are designed with steeper 2:1 slope.

EDC Response: The slopes proposed are constructed of rock fill the will generally have a slope of 2:1.

CMG Comment #2: For Planning Board Consideration. Earth berm section shown on Sheet 29 notes use of 6" loam treated with jute and hydroseed and not rock fill. CMG recommends the Planning Board consider requiring slope stabilization design, construction methods, and materials for Site slopes equal to or greater than 2:1 be designed and specified by a licensed Geotechnical Engineer.

F. Pedestrian and Vehicular Access; Traffic Management

33. CMG understands the Traffic Management aspects of the projects are being reviewed separately by MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc.

EDC Response: No comment required.

For Planning Board Consideration.

G. Utilities, Security and Emergency Systems

34. Site will be serviced by Town Water and an on-site septic system to be permitted and installed under the supervision of the Holliston Water Department and Board of Health, respectively.

EDC Response: No comment required.

For Planning Board Consideration.

H. Fiscal Analysis

35. CMG defers to the Planning Board for consideration of the need for analysis of fiscal costs from the development

EDC Response: No Comment required.

For Planning Board Consideration.


36. 7.4.4 Waiver of Standards: The Planning Board in the course of granting a Special Permit may waive any the performance standards where such waiver “is not inconsistent with public health and safety, and where such waiver does not derogate from the purpose of this section”. CMG recommends the Applicant provide a detailed waiver list for any performance standards not met by the proposed project for consideration by the Planning Board.

EDC Response: It is our belief that the project does not require any special relief from the Board, however should the Board find that any site detail not be in full compliance then we would respectfully request that the Board condition its approval to grant special relief within the terms of the conditional approval granted the Special Permit and Site Plan.

For Planning Board Consideration.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (508) 864-6802.

Sincerely,
CMG ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.



David T. Faist, PE
Principal Engineer – Engineering Services