



1150 Pawtucket Avenue
Rumford, RI 02916-1897
(401) 434-8880 Office
(401) 434-1615 Fax
www.cwltld.net

TO: Keith Rondeau, Chairperson, Town of Seekonk Zoning Board of Appeals

DATE: December 21, 2021
Rev. January 21, 2022

RE: Engineering Peer Review – Response to Initial Comments
Greenbrier II

Caputo and Wick Ltd. has reviewed the November 23, 2021 peer review correspondence prepared by Hancock Associates. This correspondence addresses our initial response to the comments. Below, we have provided the peer review comments and our responses in italics.

Comment 1.

A Site Plan Layout and Materials plan and Zoning Table should be included with the Comprehensive Permit Application.

Response: See sheets C-301.1 to C-301.3 for layout and material information. A zoning table has been incorporated on sheet C-101.

Comment 2.

Approximate first floor elevations for each of the buildings should be noted on plans.

Response: See sheets.

Comment 3.

Snow storage noted at the access drive intersection with Cole Street appears inadequate to service the whole site and may obstruct site distance from the west for vehicles heading south from the Community Center.

Response: Snow storage is clarified on separate snow storage sheet. Snow storage at the access drive intersection with Cole Street is proposed to be approximately 10' north of the sidewalk and 15' northeast of the proposed walk along Cole Street and will not obstruct sight lines. No snow storage is proposed within 50' of the wetland resource areas.

Comment 4.

Several stormwater structures as noted below, appear to be set higher than the adjacent grade. If this is the intent, future inspection/access to the structures will be difficult. If the structures are to be brought flush to proposed grade, the depth of the pipe inverts is such that many structures are not constructible.

Response: Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.

Comment 5.

Sidewalks are depicted as 4' wide and run along many head-in parking spaces. Recommend a minimum



sidewalk width of 6' along parking spaces where vehicular bumpers may overhang the sidewalk.

Response: Sidewalks are 5' wide, and a planter strip is proposed along walks where adjacent to parking stalls.

Comment 6.

Stormwater Plans and Drainage Report are not stamped by a registered engineer.

Response: Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.

Comment 7.

Structures labelled "LCB" are not listed in the legend and are assumed to be Leaching Catch basins. Please confirm if these structures are indeed leaching catch basins and if so, please provide a detail for review.

Response: Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.

Comment 8.

The sewer to building #2 does not appear to connect to anything.

Response: Sewer connection has been clarified.

Comment 9.

LCB-B2 is assumed to be a leaching catch basin, however the rim is set higher than the adjacent grade.

Response: Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.

Comment 10.

DMH-RL-B6A is depicted almost 4' higher than adjacent grade.

Response: Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.

Comment 11.

Proposed Sewer service is not depicted for the Community Center building.

Response: Sewer connection for Community Center is now depicted on the plan.

Comment 12.

In the event the outlet control device within Infiltration basins 2 and 3 become clogged, each basin should be constructed with a 5' wide rip-rap emergency spillway with 1' of freeboard to the top of basin. Chain link fencing is recommended around all detention ponds. Guard rail is recommended along the south side of access road along detention pond #2.

Response: Response to stormwater concerns to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.. Chain link fence and guardrail have been added to the plan.



Comment 13.

Several drainage structures are called out to be higher than adjacent pavement grade.

Response: Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.

Comment 14.

Roadway slope east of Building #5 is 0.4%. Hancock Associates recommends a minimum of 1.25% roadway slope and 0.75% along gutter grades.

Response: The grade has been raised in this area slightly to increase the slope. The rim elevations of drainage structures will need to be raised slightly to conform with the grade adjustments.

Comment 15.

Roof water from building 3 appears to discharge to a detention area behind the building, however no information is given. If this is an existing pond serving the adjacent development to the north, a stormwater capacity analysis should be provided.

Response: Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.

Comment 16.

No sewer service is depicted for Building #3.

Response: Sewer service was not legible and has been clearly identified.

Comment 17.

Stormwater Plans and Drainage Report are not stamped by a registered engineer.

Response: Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.

Comment 18.

Provide MassDEP Stormwater Checklist.

Response: Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.

Comment 19.

The report states “The project includes installing new catchment and conveyance structures located and sized to capture and convey storms up to and including the 25-year storm event.” Diversion manhole DMH2 adjacent to Infiltration Basin #1 is noted as being overtopped during the 25-year storm event within the HydroCAD analysis. Applicant should provide 25-year storm event rational method pipe design calculations to determine if sufficient pipe capacity is provided. Additionally, a 1” storm event



HydroCAD analysis should be provided to determine if the bypass structure directs all stormwater to the proposed Stormceptor.

Response: *Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.*

Comment 20.

This project does not provide peak flow mitigation to some of the wetland resource areas for the 2, 10, and 25-year storm events, and none of the wetland resource areas for the 100-year storm event as required by Stormwater Checklist Standard #2.

Response: *Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.*

Comment 21.

The water quality volume calculation should be performed for the inflowing area of each detention basin.

Response: *Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.*

Comment 22.

Infiltration basin storage and exfiltration cannot be utilized when the bottom of the basin is within 2-feet of the estimated seasonal high groundwater elevation, or if the groundwater mounding elevation exceeds the bottom of basin elevation.

Response: *Response to be provided by BETA Group, Inc.*