



ENGINEERING,  
INC.

ENGINEERS  
SURVEYORS

August 19, 2020

Town of Wareham Planning Board  
Memorial Town Hall  
54 Marion Road  
Wareham, MA 02571

RE: Site Plan Review  
Master Millwork, Inc.  
55 Charlotte Furnace Road  
Response to Second Peer Review  
**G.A.F. Job No. 19-9342**

Attention: Mr. George Barrett, Chairman

Dear Chairman Barrett,

G.A.F. Engineering, Inc., on behalf of our client Master Millwork, Inc., has prepared revised plans and respectively submits the following responses to the peer review letter submitted by Charles L. Rowley, P.E., P.L.S. dated August 18, 2020.

This letter has been formatted for clarity by listing the review comment first in standard type followed by the G.A.F. response in bold type.

The following comments are based on the information contained in the revised plan set.

1. The new plan shows a turning area located at the extreme northeast corner of the project rather than at the southeast corner as noted previously. This apparently a requirement of the fire department according to Capt. Chris Smith. I have discussed the matter with both Capt. Smith and with Bill Madden and shared with both that the plan shows an encroachment into the 10-foot wide buffer that is supposed to be maintained around the perimeter. As shown, it would be a violation of Section 1042 of the Zoning By-Law. An adjustment needs to be made in the site plan to remove the encroachment.

**Response: The proposed building has been shortened by ten feet to create the space needed for the 10 foot wide perimeter landscape buffer at the turning area.**

266 MAIN ST.  
WAREHAM, MA  
02571  
TEL 508.295.6600  
FAX 508.295.6634

gaf@gaf-eng.com

2. Exterior dust control is located on the exterior of the existing building. I am advised that similar equipment for the new building will be on the inside of the structure. The Board may wish to make this a condition of approval of the Special permit.

**Response: Informational. No response required.**

3. The response for the need for a second access driveway suggests that the new one is required. If that is the case it is recommended that the existing driveway be modified in width to 20 feet to accommodate customers and office staff traffic only.  
According to the response all employee and truck traffic would use the new entrance. Reducing the width of the current driveway would also provide the opportunity to enhance site landscaping in such a way as to reduce the visual impact of the large flat wall space of the proposed building that will be seen from Charlotte Furnace Road.

**Response: We have reduced the width of the existing access drive to twenty-four feet as this is the minimum width required for two-way traffic. This matches the minimum parking aisle width for 90° parking. Landscaping has been specified for the area where the pavement is being removed.**

4. The Board may wish to consider whether an increase in traffic of 125 vehicle trips per day from the facility warrants a further look at traffic mitigation.

**Response: In our opinion an increase of 125 vehicle trips per day does not warrant a traffic study. Left to the discretion of the Planning Board.**

5. A fire flow test is proposed as part of the sprinkler design considerations. This test should be provided prior to any construction taking place. The test result should provide proof that the water main is capable of sustaining fire flow for the new building and that the fire main shown on the plans is adequate for that purpose. A copy of the test results should be provided to the Planning Board. It is recommended that this be made a condition of approval.

**Response: We have no objection to the recommended condition.**

6. It is the preference of the design engineer to maintain the pavement cross section as shown on the plans. The same cross section is to be used for re-surfacing of the current gravel parking area.

**Response: No response required.**

7. If no additional dumpster location is required, is the current pad and equipment sufficient to handle the increase in waste from the new building?

**Response: The current pad and existing dumpster and space within the new building will be sufficient to handle waste generated at the site.**

8. If "eliminator" style catch basin hoods are to be used for oil/gas traps, then inspection of the structures should be made a requirement of the Stormwater Operation and Maintenance Plan. Inspections should be made frequently to prevent the potential discharge of oil or grease into the stormwater system.

**Response: Inspection and maintenance of the catch basins is a standard requirement and is included in the Operation Maintenance Plan.**

#### Stormwater Comments

1. It is unclear how stormwater falling directly on a storage basin will be retained and not infiltrated immediately. Using a runoff curve number of 98 for this purpose appears to be unnecessary. The basin will infiltrate runoff at the same rate whether rainfall is direct or whether it is received through some other means. It would appear that using a curve number for grassed surfaces would be more appropriate and would reduce to some degree the total runoff that is accounted for.

**Response: We revised the runoff curve number as recommended which resulted in a reduction in calculated inflow and peak storm elevations.**

2. Removing loam and seed from the bottom of the basin and leaving it as a sandy bottom will not provide the required infiltration results if the sides of the basin still have loam and seed.  
The bottom of the basin should be enhanced with crushed stone or similar materials for appearance if for nothing else.  
The calculation still needs to be revised to take the loam and seed cover on the basin sides into consideration if they are used at all in the calculation of storage capacity or for the calculation of maximum detention time.

**Response: We have added a layer of pea stone to the basin bottom. The basin exfiltration calculations were revised to include only the horizontal bottom surface. The side slopes will remain finished with loam and seed.**

Please contact me directly if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William F. Madden". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "William" and last name "Madden" clearly distinguishable.

William F. Madden, P.E.

WFM/lmf

Cc: Charles L. Rowley, PE, PLS  
Hanan Masse, Master Millwork, Inc.