



OFFICE OF PLANNING
AND ENGINEERING

TOWN OF MILFORD

52 MAIN STREET, MILFORD, MASSACHUSETTS 01757
508-634-2317 Fax 508-473-2394
mdean@townofmilford.com

Michael Dean, P.E.
Town Engineer

March 16, 2021

David R. Consigli, Chairman
Milford Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA)
52 Main Street
Milford, MA 01757

Re: **“The Residences at Stone Ridge – Phase II”**
Application for Comprehensive Permit (40B)
Response to SMMA’s Response Letter

Dear Mr. Consigli:

The following information is in reference to **“The Residences at Stone Ridge – Phase II”** and is in response to a letter prepared by SMMA, William Park, P.E., Dated March 9, 2021.

The proposal is for an affordable housing development under MGL Ch40B and consists of Approximately 296, one-, two- and three-bedroom residential units in three 5-story buildings on 17.5 Acres. All of the units are rental units, with 75 of the units to be restricted as affordable. The land is zoned **Business Park (BP), not Residential.**

The project is at the end of Deer Street as shown on Assessor’s Maps 14 & 15, Lots 4, 3A, & 4B.

New Comments:

- The drawings still do not scale properly (the scale bars do not match the scale of the associated drawing, not sure if the scaling and plotting has made the scale inaccurate), this is stated in one of my original comments below (#3) and has still not been corrected. If the scales are not accurate this could lead to improper interpretations of the information shown on the plans.

- None of the submitted plans show the actual roadway layout of Deer Street (the Extension), in which the project / parcel has its frontage on.

The following items are the original comments in my letter (*numbered and italicized*), followed by the response by William Park, P.E. of SMMA and are **shown in blue color (R.)** and then followed by my current response to SMMA's most recent letter, shown as **RTE** (Response Town Engineer).

1. *This site will be creating residential housing in a Business Park Zone. This BP Zone was created in hopes of attracting first class businesses such as Research and Development Companies, in which the town worked diligently with the land owner during the approval process to create such a project. This proposal will eliminate any opportunity for future businesses to generate job opportunities and economic growth utilizing this parcel.*

R. Concur. There has been no market demand for construction of ground up office space and the COVID pandemic has further depressed office demand as more employees work from home. The last development parcel remains available for potential office use. The Planning Board supports the proposed affordable housing use.

RTE. The facts are still the same. The above response states “The Planning Board Supports the proposed affordable housing use.” I am not sure what this statement actually means, I would defer to the letters prepared on behalf of the Planning Board to the ZBA (if one such exists).

2. *The site was originally designed and approved for a business park use, not a residential use. The site is at the end of an 1,800-foot-long dead end which includes a bridge (over the Charles River). This long dead end with residential units poses some safety concerns. If the Town / Planning Board was aware of residential units at the end of this very long dead end, the final subdivision may have been designed differently. The dead-end road was approved / designed with a **dedicated** travel lane / **looped driveway** system, separate from the parking areas which provided safe access to the Building “sites” from the end of Deer Street (See Exhibit “A”). The current proposed 40B – Phase II project highlights the fact that there will be essentially three (3) independent sites ultimately erasing the original safer looped driveway system originally approved at the end of Deer Street. The remaining third (3rd) site is still shown as “Future Commercial” use, just as this current Phase – II was shown during the Phase – I (first 40B) permitting process (See Exhibit “B” & “C”). The 3rd site could potentially add another 290 residential units to the end of Deer Street, potentially bringing the total residential units to well over 800 units. This long dead end with the current design does not compliment a high density, residential development. If the Charles River was to ever compromise the Bridge, 550+ residential units would not be accessible (with a potential of 800+ units upon completion of the development).*

R. The main access driveway was designed to support 625,000 SF of office and 2,098 parking spaces. The Restaurant Depot, Phase I residential, proposed Phase II residential and remaining land (supports approximately 160,000 SF and 480 parking spaces) yields 1,759 parking spaces. The Applicant's traffic consultant and Town's traffic peer reviewer have agreed the proposed full build out will generate less traffic volume.

The dedicated travel lane is maintained to all building sites and the looped driveway will be maintained, albeit through a parking area for a portion, in case of emergency. The design has been reviewed and approved by the Fire Department. Similar to the Phase I residential project, the Applicant will provide an emergency evacuation area as shown on the Conformance Set of drawings.

RTE. This comment is not related to traffic volume, it is in relation to the safety concerns associated with the actual use, densely populated residences and the activities that are associated with such a use, located at an 1,800-foot-long dead-end road.

It may be more beneficial to locate the evacuation area closer to the Route 495 layout.

3. *Sections of the proposed drives are designed at almost 10% slopes; this may pose some additional safety issues for emergency apparatus. The original approvals showed the main Looped Driveway system at or around only 5% slopes (see Exhibits). Profiles of the proposed drive should be submitted. **The scale indicated on the plans are not accurate.***

R. The main access driveway is the same vertical and horizontal alignment as the previously approved design at 5% slope. The drawings for the current Project use 1-foot contours vs the previous drawings that used 2-foot contours, which may have led to confusion. The main access driveway is unparked and max. 5% slope, the parking areas are between 1% to 4% slopes, and there is a short section of internal driveway south of Building 2 that is unparked and 8% slope.

RTE. As the response states there is a section of driveway that is 8%, it may even be 9%, however the scales of the drawings are not accurate so it is tough to determine the slopes with in 1%, by scaling.

4. *The original site was designed for a commercial / office park, not for residential use. The site had **One** proposed pump station to handle the sewage (for the entire development). The existing pump station will be undersized to handle the increased sewage flows associated with the residential use, total flows and peaking factors will be higher than the original flows once the development is fully built out. During the **first** 40B proposal (Phase – I), the existing pump station needs to be modified / upgraded to handle the flows associated with the Phase – I - 40B. Now, for the 2nd 40B- **Phase II** there is another totally separate Pump Station being proposed in an entirely new location (than the*

existing pump station), in which it appears gravity would work (no need for a pump station). I defer to the Sewer Department to evaluate this type of proposal. The proponent needs to make sure the Sewer Department approves the new pump station design for this use and full build out. Will there be a 3rd pump station proposed for the next Phase of this development, Phase-III? What type of Association is in place for the future maintenance / ownership of the Pump Station? The Water Company may not be able to provide the water flows needed for the project, residential use demands more water than a typical office use.

RTE. I defer to the sewer department.

5. The proponent had been out on site performing exploratory drilling for what is believed to be a potential source for drinking water. The plans show the development connecting to Milford Water. The plans do not show a proposed public drinking water supply / well. The Board should inquire about the status of the water source, so the plans that are being submitted for approval are accurate. The plans should show the location of the existing exploratory wells.

R. The Technical Report submitted with the Comprehensive Permit application states that the Applicant proposes to connect to Milford Water Company (MWC) infrastructure. During the hearing process to date, this connection has been discussed including the MWC Director confirming their water system model review indicates adequate infrastructure to support the Project. Similar to the Phase I residential project, the Applicant will work with the MWC to secure water for the Project.

The two exploratory well locations will be added to the Conformance Set of drawings.

RTE. How are these wells going to be abandoned?

6. *The project is associated with a Definitive Subdivision Approval, which contained many different aspects that were approved by the Planning Board and agreed upon by the owner. One of the main items is the traffic / street improvements at the intersection of Deer Street and Cedar Street (Route 85) & signalized intersections at Route 85 & Route 495. The owner / applicant is bound by these approvals associated with a Definitive Subdivision. If any one of these items change, the applicant could possibly need to modify the subdivision by submitting back to the Planning Board. What type of Association is in place for the future maintenance of the Roadway?*

R. The Town's traffic peer reviewer has performed a satisfactory review of the Project's traffic impacts and concluded that the Applicant has (or has committed to upon completion of the Project as applicable) adequately address all traffic impacts.

The roadway (ie Deer Street and Deer Street Extension) as well as all of the internal driveways and parking lots have been, and will continue to be, maintained privately by the owners of the parcels at the development through a contractual road maintenance agreement based on each owner's proportionate share.

RTE. No further comment.

7. *There is a total of 559 proposed parking spaces for 296-units, calculates to be 1.88 spaces per unit. Town of Milford Representatives / Department Heads typically request 2.0 spaces per unit, $296 \text{ units} * 2.0 \text{ spaces / unit} = 592 \text{ total parking spaces}$. This proposal is 33 spaces shy of the 2.0 spaces per unit.*

R. The drawings have been revised to provide 2.0 parking spaces per unit.

RTE. No further comment.

8. *The project will need to file a Notice of Intent with the local Conservation Commission. The project is in close proximity to the Charles River and is in a Surface Water Protection Zone associated with the Towns water supply.*

R. Concur - the Applicant will submit a Request for Amended Order of Conditions (OoC) DEP #223-987 to the Town of Milford Conservation Commission. Areas subject to jurisdiction under the Massachusetts Wetland Protection Act (WPA) will be reviewed as part of the Conservation Commission hearing process.

The limits of work and proximity to any wetland resources of the proposed Project are in keeping with the currently approved Order of Conditions for the Stone Ridge development site.

RTE. No further comment.

The above items are in response to above referenced letter prepared by SMMA. If you need any additional information please contact me at your earliest convenience. There will also be further evaluations once the project is submitted to the Milford Conservation Commission.

Respectfully,



Michael Dean, P.E.
Town Engineer