

# COPY Exhibit 13



100 GROVE ST. | WORCESTER, MA 01605

February 8, 2021

**RECEIVED**

Christopher McGoldrick  
Town Planner  
Grafton Municipal Center  
30 Providence Road  
Grafton, MA 01519

**February 8, 2021**

**Planning Board**  
Grafton, MA

T 508-856-0321

F 508-856-0357

gravesengineering.com

**Subject: 130 & 134 Worcester Street  
Special Permit and Site Plan Review**

Dear Chris:

We received the following documents on January 27, 2021:

- Plans entitled Special Permit Submission for Discern'd Cannabis Purveyors, Inc., 130 & 134 Worcester Street dated January 8, 2021, prepared by WDA Design Group for Discern'd Cannabis Purveyors, Inc. (9 sheets)
- Hydrology calculations entitled Draft – 130 & 134 Worcester Street – Grafton dated January 6, 2021, prepared by WDA Design Group.
- Correspondence from WDA Design Group to Town of Grafton Municipal Center dated January 26, 2021, re: 130 & 134 Worcester Street, North Grafton, MA, with attachments.
- Architectural plans entitled Discern'd Cannabis Purveyors, Inc., 130 & 134 Worcester Street dated January 18, 2021, prepared by John Marrow Architect. (7 sheets)

Graves Engineering, Inc. (GEI) has been requested to review and comment on the plans' and supporting documents' conformance with applicable "Grafton Zoning By-Law" amended through October 21, 2019; Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) Stormwater Handbook and standard engineering practices.

**Our comments follow:**

## Zoning By-Law

1. Each sheet of the plans needs to bear the signature and stamp of the professional that prepared the plans. (§1.3.3.3.d.9)
2. Ownership of all abutting land on the western side of Worcester Street and approximate locations of buildings, driveways, and parking areas thereon within a maximum distance of 200' of the property lines need to be shown on the plans. (§1.3.3.3.d.11)
3. Parking setback lines need to be shown on the plans. (§1.3.3.3.d.13)
4. Lot coverage calculations showing percentage of buildings and percentage of pavement need to be added to the plans. On Sheet C2.00, the 40% maximum lot coverage requirement

x:\shared\projects\grafftonpb\worcesterst130&134\reviews\gpb020821ms130&134.docx

pertains to buildings only and the 17% shown as provided combines the areas of all proposed buildings and pavement. The values for percentage of buildings and percentage of pavement need to be shown separately. (§1.3.3.3.d.15)

5. There appears to be a sewer manhole shown on the proposed sewer line on the site. If this is indeed a proposed sewer manhole, it will need to be labeled and elevation data will need to be provided. (§1.3.3.3.d.28)
6. Loading spaces need to be clearly identified on the plans. There appears to be a loading area located southwest of the proposed building that is not at least 50 feet away from the closest street line. The applicant should identify the largest vehicle expected to access the site for deliveries, and confirm that the loading space meets the required setback and that there is enough room in the loading area for this vehicle to maneuver. (§1.3.3.3.d.19 & §4.2.3.2)
7. The size of the parking spaces needs to be shown on the plans. The parking space dimensions were scaled and found to be nine feet by eighteen feet, which is satisfactory. (§2.1)
8. The limits of the proposed covered front porch were not shown on the plans. Based on the architectural plans provided, the limit of the porch appears to be close to the front yard setback established in the "Intensity of Use Schedule". The porch should be added to the plans. (§3.2.3.2)
9. The required number of parking spaces at the site needs to be added to the Zoning Summary Table on Sheet C2.00. (§4.2.2)
10. GEI will comment on the extent of ground water recharge once sufficient stormwater management documentation is submitted. (§7.5.D)

#### **Hydrology & MassDEP Stormwater Management**

11. GEI did not receive any maps showing the pre-development and post-development watersheds. In order for GEI to complete our review, pre-development and post-development watershed maps must be submitted.
12. GEI did not receive any hydrology computations for existing conditions. In order for GEI to complete our review, existing conditions hydrology computations must be submitted.
13. The plans were lacking information pertaining to the outlet control structures of the three stormwater impoundments (e.g. orifice diameters, orifice elevations, weir elevations); GEI could not confirm the modeling of the outlet control structures in the hydrology computations. This information needs to be provided on the plans.
14. The width of the underground infiltration area in the "storage description" for Pond 3P: Underground Detention was conservatively modeled (underestimated) as 44.25 feet wide, but could be increased to 66 feet to be consistent with the plans.
15. The design engineer needs to submit documentation to demonstrate compliance with the MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards.

16. Soil testing information needs to be submitted to confirm that there is at least two feet of separation between the bottom of the infiltration basins and the estimated seasonal high water table (ESHWT).
17. On Sheet C2.00, there is a catch basin proposed at the proposed concrete dumpster pad. This design raises concern due to the potential of pollutants from the dumpster to discharge unknowingly directly into the stormwater management system. The catch basin should be located away from the dumpster pad.
18. Infiltration basins must not be used for snow storage. Sheet C2.00 currently states that snow storage will occur in Detention 2P. The plans will need to be revised to show the snow storage at a different location.
19. If the intent is for water to infiltrate into the ground from all three stormwater management structures (two basins and one underground system) then the word "Detention" needs to be replaced with "Infiltration" within their titles for consistency with the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook.
20. Riprap needs to be provided at the discharge ends of pipe systems and at the outlets of the stormwater impoundments.

#### **General Engineering Comments**

21. On Sheet C2.00, the location of the door at the top of the ramp on the south side of the building is inconsistent with the location of the door shown on the "Right Side Elevation" sheet of the architectural plans. The design engineer should confirm which door location is correct and revise the civil plans if necessary.
22. The Signage Summary Table on Sheet C2.00 indicates that only one of each handicap related sign is required. Handicap signage needs to be provided for each proposed handicap space.
23. There needs to be more information added to C3.00 regarding the handicap accessible parking to ensure compliance with Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (e.g. spot elevations). The slope within handicap parking and loading spaces must not be greater than 2% in any direction. Based on the current spot elevations provided, the slope within the staff handicap parking space and loading area is 4.5% between spot elevations 344.69 and 344.15.
24. The locations of the handicap accessible curb cuts for the two southern handicap parking spaces are not practical as they are located at the parking spaces and pedestrian access will be impeded by parked vehicles.
25. The location of the proposed handicap staff parking space does not appear to be practical. The intent is for handicapped staff members who park in this space to enter the door on the northeast side of the building. Based on the architectural plans, the building does not have an elevator. Therefore, a handicapped staff member who would like to access the first floor would have to travel in the parking lot from the staff handicap space to the next closest handicap accessible entrance.
26. On Sheet C3.00, all proposed drainage structures including manholes, catch basins, flared ends, and area drains need to be labeled and the rim and pipe invert elevations need to be

provided for each structure. All proposed drainage pipes also need to be labeled, and the diameter, slope and material of each pipe needs to be provided.

27. On Sheet C3.00, the design engineer needs to identify the wide lines shown on the east side of the two infiltration basins.
28. On Sheet C3.00, there are two dark boxes imposed on proposed contour lines. One is located in the concrete walkway northeast of the proposed building and the other is between the proposed infiltration basins. If these boxes are supposed to contain text identifying the elevations of the contours, they need to be corrected so that the elevation is properly displayed.
29. On Sheet C3.00, Detention 2P is missing a contour line for elevation "343."
30. There are several construction details missing from the plans. Construction details for the following need to be added: drain manhole, catch basin, drain pipe trench section, flared end outlet, sewer manhole, fence, picket fence (if different from fence), cape cod berm, infiltration basin outlet structures, underground infiltration system, dumpster enclosure, and evergreen tree.

### **General Comments**

31. On Sheet EC-30, the assessors map reference information for only 130 Worcester Street was provided. Information for 134 Worcester Street needs to be added.
32. On Sheet C1.00, there are several notes that incorrectly reference the "Town of Westborough." These references should be changed to "Town of Grafton."
33. On Sheet C1.01, it is unclear what the symbol comprised of a circle with an "X" in the middle is representing. This symbol needs to be added to the legend.
34. The thick dashed line shown approximately along the centerline of Worcester Street is not identified in any of the legends and appears on several sheets. This line should either be labeled or added to the legend.
35. On Sheet C4.00 there is a leader label that reads "Doesn't Match GIS. Their Property Line Goes to Water Line" but the leader is not pointing to anything. The leader location needs to be corrected or the label deleted if it is not relevant.
36. GEI did not review for compliance with the Town of Grafton's Wetlands Regulations or Stormwater Management Regulations. The design engineer should be cognizant of these regulations and make sure all necessary and applicable requirements are met.
37. GEI understands that the Grafton Water District and the Grafton Sewer Department will review the plans relative to their respective utilities.
38. GEI did not review the architectural plans.

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: Carolyn Burke, RLA; WDA Design Group