



April 25, 2023

Mr. Christian Klein, Chairperson  
Arlington Zoning Board of Appeals  
23 Maple Street  
Arlington, MA 02476

**Re: Tetra Tech Comment Letter 3**  
Comprehensive Permit (40B) Peer Review  
1021-1025 Mass Ave  
Arlington, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Tetra Tech (TT) has reviewed submittal materials revised through April 14, 2023, which have sufficiently addressed our prior comments. We have listed two very minor recommended plan edits at the close of the letter which can be addressed easily and require no further response. The following is a final summary of comment status/recommendations and we do not anticipate providing further comments.

## Comments

### Preliminary Site Development Plans (Tab 06)

The Site Development Plans were well organized and readable and include most of the information needed to conduct our review. The following are comments on each sheet included in the set.

#### **Cover Sheet**

1. Resolved 2023-02-17.

#### **Existing Conditions Plan**

2. Resolved 2023-02-17.
3. Resolved 2023-02-17.
4. Resolved 2023-02-17.
5. Resolved 2023-02-17.
6. Resolved 2023-02-17.
7. Resolved 2023-02-17.

#### **Site Demolition Plan**

8. Resolved 2023-02-17.
9. Resolved 2023-02-17.
10. Resolved 2023-02-17.
11. Resolved 2023-02-17.

- 12. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 13. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 14. Resolved 2023-02-17.

**Grading and Drainage Plan**

- 15. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 16. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 17. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 18. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 19. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 20. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 21. Resolved 2023-02-17.

- 22. It's unclear how runoff from the site will be discharged onto the abutting property and how that flow will be conveyed across the paved surface to the stream. Please clarify how the discharge will be managed so that flow will be safely and reliably conveyed from the site to the stream. Include any channel or spillway details and threshold elevation on the plan.

2023-02-17 Update – Grading has been modified to match pre-development conditions more closely, however, the requested explanation for how the discharge will be designed or conveyed across the adjacent parking has not been provided. An overflow spillway is shown but it's not clear how it is intended to function. Our principal concern is that runoff must flow across the adjacent parking lot and redevelopment will change those patterns and intensity despite meeting applicable design standards potentially resulting an unsafe condition. Please provide a brief explanation of how the project expects to match current conditions and how it expects to manage flow across the abutting property if at all.

2023-04-25 Update – Comment addressed as requested. **Comment Resolved**

- 23. Resolved 2023-02-17.

**Site Utility Plan**

- 24. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 25. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 26. Resolved 2023-02-17.

- 27. Although we expect public water and sewer infrastructure would have adequate capacity to serve the Project, the Project represents an increase in demand on municipal water and sewer infrastructure above the current use and is likely much larger than would have been forecasted during original design of municipal services since it is so much larger than otherwise allowed under zoning. We recommend the applicant provide a simple memorandum or similar documentation by a licensed Massachusetts engineer demonstrating the Project can be served adequately without impacts to existing or proposed infrastructure or its users. At a minimum the documentation should describe and quantify proposed demand, describe existing infrastructure serving the site, provide calculations demonstrating available

capacity/service and describing improvements, if any, needed to town infrastructure to serve the Project. If offsite infrastructure improvements are required to serve the Project, please note them clearly in the memorandum. Documentation is requested as factual basis on which the Board can rely in determining the Project can be safely served by local infrastructure. It is not intended to suggest issues may exist.

2023-02-17 Update – Response does not address the comment. What we request is a document prepared by a qualified individual assessing and documenting that capacity is available in the existing infrastructure. Please provide the information requested ideally as a separate document to avoid overcomplication of site plans and notes. Include in your summary an explanation of why the proposed domestic supply is connected to the high-pressure fire main and not connected to the lower pressure domestic supply. Our experience suggests connecting to a 150-psi supply for domestic use may require pressure reduction.

2023-04-25 Update – Requested analysis/statement has been provided. Comment addressed as requested. **Comment Resolved**

28. Resolved 2023-02-17.

#### **Site Details II**

29. Resolved 2023-02-17.

30. The sheet includes a detail for a chain link fence and no other fence detail is provided. Is it the intent to install chain link fence at the locations noted on the Grading and Drainage Plan?

2023-02-17 Update – Vinyl fence detail provided indicates the fence will be approximately 8 feet tall (despite 6-foot label on plans) and does not show the bottom gap described by the landscape architect during the public hearing. In our opinion surrounding the site with a continuous solid vinyl fence is a fairly uninspiring solution in an otherwise well-thought and creative landscape and effectively disconnects and isolates the improvements for abutters and wildlife. We recommend the Board ask the applicant to consider alternate proposals that could address their security concerns but without so completely isolating the space. It is also our opinion that isolating almost all on-site riverfront area from the adjacent brook does not comply with performance standards for work within riverfront area.

2023-04-25 Update – Vinyl fence replaced by cedar fence and any riverfront-related concerns have been addressed through Conservation Commission review. Comment addressed as requested. **Comment Resolved**

#### **Lighting Photometric Plan (Tab 07)**

31. Resolved 2023-02-17.

32. Resolved 2023-02-17.

33. Resolved 2023-02-17.

34. Resolved 2023-02-17.

#### **Conceptual Architectural Plans (Tab 09)**

35. Resolved 2023-02-17.

36. Resolved 2023-02-17.

37. Resolved 2023-02-17.

- 38. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 39. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 40. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 41. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 42. Resolved 2023-02-17.

**Utility Plan (Tab 11)**

- 43. Resolved 2023-02-17.

**Landscape Plans L1-L7 (Tab 12)**

- 44. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 45. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 46. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 47. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 48. Resolved 2023-02-17.

**LEC Impact Analysis of the Natural and Built Environment (Tab 15)**

- 49. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 50. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 51. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 52. Resolved 2023-02-17.

**Stormwater Management Report (Tab 15)**

- 53. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 54. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 55. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 56. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 57. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 58. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 59. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 60. Resolved 2023-02-17.

**Transportation Impact Assessment (Tab 16)**

- 61. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 62. Resolved 2023-02-17.
- 63. Resolved 2023-02-17.

64. The traffic study included a crash analysis of the study intersections. However, crash data for the Massachusetts Avenue/Menotomy Road intersection and the crash rate calculations for all study intersections were not included in the Appendix. Please provide.

2023-02-17 Update – Referenced attachment not provided.

2023-04-25 Update – Comment addressed as requested. **Comment Resolved**

65. Resolved 2023-02-17.

66. Resolved 2023-02-17.

67. It's unclear how delivery/trash pickup/moving trucks will be accommodated. We recommend the Board request the applicant describe how these activities will be accommodated and provide AutoTurn analysis, if needed, to confirm services/vehicles can circulate without impeding on-street parking, bicycle lane operations or site access/circulation.

2023-02-17 Update – Response indicates deliveries/trash pickup/move in will be accommodated in the off-street driveway. In our opinion this approach is impractical and potentially dangerous as it requires backing out onto Massachusetts Avenue. We recommend the Applicant consider requesting a portion of the front of the site be designated as a loading zone for the Project and striped and signed accordingly or provide a means of turning a delivery vehicle in the garage.

2023-04-25 Update – We recommend the Board consider a condition requiring the conversion of existing parallel spaces in the front of the building to a short-term loading zone. Setting aside this space has multiple benefits including (1) providing a space for deliveries/pick-up, (2) increasing visibility for vehicles exiting the garage, and (3) increasing engagement between the building front and the public way.

**Comment Resolved**

68. Resolved 2023-02-17.

69. Resolved 2023-02-17.

70. Resolved 2023-02-17.

71. Resolved 2023-02-17.

72. As part of the project, a new driveway will be constructed for vehicles entering/exiting the proposed covered parking area. This new driveway will be located within approximately 15 feet of the existing bus lane. The minimum length for an on-street parking space (end space) is 20 feet. Therefore, Tetra Tech recommends the Applicant prepare a restriping plan to extend the end of the bus lane or provide hatched pavement markings to provide a no parking zone between the bus lane and the proposed driveway, subject to Town review and approval. The plan should also show the proposed restriping for the on-street parking to the south of the driveway.

2023-02-17 Update – Response indicates applicant will work with the Town to develop an appropriate solution but has not proposed a plan to remedy. We recommend the Board request the applicant provide a plan showing intended modification or encumbrance of the public way during construction and post development so the Board can understand what is being proposed and can condition an approval accordingly.

2023-04-25 Update – Issue addressed in updated Construction Management Plan. **Comment Resolved**

73. Resolved 2023-02-17.

74. Resolved 2023-02-17.

**LEC Bylaw Notice of Intent Application (Tab 19)**

75. Resolved 2023-02-17.

76. Resolved 2023-02-17.

77. Resolved 2023-02-17.

**February 17, 2023 Comments**

78. We understand plans are currently being revised to further address comments and input received during the public hearings. To the extent possible all drawings should be coordinated so as not to include conflicting information.

2023-04-25 Update – Comment addressed as requested. **Comment Resolved**

79. We recommend future plan revisions not include “revision clouds” as those plans may be referenced in a decision and clouds compromise plan readability and content. Clouding changes is not necessary for our review. Please be advised revised submittals should still be noted in the revision box in the title block.

2023-04-25 Update – Comment addressed as requested. **Comment Resolved**

**April 24, 2023 Comments**

80. Sheet 2 of the Site Plan set is labelled “2 of 7” when 10 sheets are in the set. Can be addressed in final submittal in needed. No response required. **Comment Resolved**

81. Sheet 4 has a slightly different title on the cover than on the drawing. Can be addressed in final submittal in needed. No response required. **Comment Resolved**

Given our comments have been either addressed by the applicant or otherwise managed by incorporation of recommended conditions, we have no further comments and request no further changes beyond the two minor edits noted above. We appreciate the cooperation and professionalism shown by the applicant and its design team. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (508) 786-2230 or by email at [Sean.Reardon@tetrattech.com](mailto:Sean.Reardon@tetrattech.com)

Very truly yours,



Sean P. Reardon, P.E.  
Vice President

P:\472184\143-472184-23001\DOCS\1025 MASS AVE-LETTER3 (2023-04-25).DOCX