



TOWN OF LYNNFIELD

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

TOWN HALL
55 SUMMER STREET
LYNNFIELD MA 01940-1843

JOHN M. TOMASZ, DIRECTOR
PATRICK MCALPINE, P.E.

PHONE: 781-334-9500
FAX: 781-334-9509

02/15/2022

Planning Board Members:

I have reviewed the response to comments from Peter Ogren dated January 27th 2022 in regards to the proposed sub-division known as Vallis Way. Previous comments were provided in an email on 12/15/2021, that may not have been incorporated in the past memo. Outlined below are my comments and concerns. The previous response from Hayes Engineering is provided in *italics* for reference.

Comments from the Town Engineer

6. The applicant's engineer has arranged a meeting with the Water District Superintendent to resolve any issues relative to the water system. The plans for RMLD for servicing the future lots are unknown to the undersigned at this time. The developer has indicated that natural gas is not being provided to this subdivision.

Response: What is the justification for not providing natural gas? Article 10 Subsection 375-10.7 of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations requires that Natural Gas be provided to each lot. It is my opinion this requirement should be adhered to. Natural Gas should be incorporated into the plan or a sufficient justification needs to be provided.

Sheet 3 of 8 (Now 10) - Plan and Profile

H. It has been determined that the applicant will be blasting the entire hill away to bring the grade down as requested by the abutter.

Response: It is my understanding that part of the request for a waiver pertaining to road length was tied to the ledge being in place. With the ledge being removed, there may be justification for an alternate road geometry that would not require a waiver.

L. The Planning Board needs to make a determination as to this.

Response: An easement should be attached to the wall construction as it is integral to the road construction. Any future road work may impact the wall and if the road is accepted this will become the town's responsibility.

Sheets 7 & 8 of 8 (Now 8, 9, & 10) - Detail Sheets

AA.A The note can be added to the plan. The applicant has verified that the STC 900 can accept the pipes as indicated, the discrepancy will be corrected (To the best of our knowledge, the new Town Engineer has not weighed in on the drainage system.)

And

DD. The drain configuration will be revised, sizing calculation provided, and test holes conducted.

Response: The drainage system needs significant reworking and vetting. Locating an infiltration system under the road is highly inadvisable, especially when it is required to prevent potential overflow of the primary infiltration basin.

- 1.) If the Perforated HDPE Pipe becomes clogged and does not allow for proper infiltration, failure of the downstream systems could occur and impact abutters. This is critical as the legal liability for such an event has not been confirmed.
- 2.) If the infiltration system works as intended, the water could create a condition where the road is undermined. There are locations around town where water sometimes seeps up through the road and creates a hazard and damages the road during the thaw and freezing cycles. This potential is increased by locating a system designed to put water back in the ground under a road.
- 3.) Infiltration systems generally need more maintenance than piping systems for obvious reasons. Locating the infiltration system under the road, specifically a dead end creates multiple complications. The 5 year moratorium on paving would hinder and immediate maintenance of the system. Given the location, if maintenance is needed, the street would potentially be closed. Being a dead end, this would restrict residents from accessing their homes and create a public safety issue for emergency crews. This is especially applicable given the extended length of the currently proposed road.

General Comment

Multiple comments reference updates to the plans and providing additional calculations. Updated plans should be generated and additional information supplied prior to approval. Specifically:

Comments from Linden Engineering: 11 and 19

Comments from the Town Engineer: 4d and 7

Plan Comments: G, H, J, O, AA.A, DD, GG, and MM

It is my opinion that the above comments should be addressed prior to acceptance of the subdivision plan. If there are any questions regarding the above comments please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Patrick McAlpine PE
Town Engineer
Lynnfield DPW