



August 12, 2022

Planning Board
Town of Pepperell
1 Main Street
Pepperell, MA 01463

RE: Major Site Plan Review Application No. MSP-2022-02: 81 Main Street
Applicant: Marcio and Marli Machado (Pizza Pizzaz, Inc.)
GPR Project #191091

Dear Board Members:

GPR is in receipt of review comments from Pepperell Fire & EMS, Department of Public Works, Conservation Commission, Historical Commission, and Nashoba Associated Boards of Health for Marcio & Marli Machado (Pizza Pizzaz, Inc.): 81 Main Street. The Town Tax Collector also responded with no comments.

On behalf of the Machado's, GPR is responding to the comments below:

Pepperell Fire & EMS

Chief Borneman Comments dated 7/28/22:

1. Recommends adding bollards in front of the bump-out for the main entrance on the front side of the building to protect from traffic in parking lot.
RESPONSE: Bollards will be added to protect the entry vestibule.

Department of Public Works

Kenneth Kalinowski Comments dated 8/5/22:

1. Main Street was just milled and repaved in July 2022. The plans contain a detail for a construction entrance, but the applicant is reminded that extreme care needs to be exercised during construction to ensure the integrity and condition of the roadway with regards to access during construction. Any damage to Main Street as a result of construction activities on the site will be repaired by the project proponent at no cost to the Town.
RESPONSE: The Applicant acknowledges that the Site Contractor is accountable for fixing damage to new pavement on Main Street.

Goldsmith, Prest & Ringwall, Inc.

2. Due to the recent paving, it should be noted that this section of Main Street is subject to a 3-year moratorium on pavement cuts for utility connections, including the proposed gas service.

RESPONSE: The Applicant acknowledges the limitations of the moratorium. The development will utilize existing service connections stubbed into the property and utilize propane gas until the moratorium is lifted.

3. The proposed entrance location is in the same place as the current driveway serving a single-family residence (SFR). It is expected that the proposed use will generate significantly more traffic than the SFR. Given the close proximity between the existing exit lane of the adjacent parking lot, we recommend that any approval include a condition that the section of sidewalk and curbing between the two access points be installed to physically and visually differentiate the sites for motorists and pedestrians. This work would need to be coordinated with the Highway Division staff due to the constraints associated with the new pavement.

RESPONSE: The proposed entrance is being substantially widened, to be appropriate for the proposed business rather than the SFR. The Applicant agrees to install the suggested sidewalk and curbing to clearly separate the shopping center exit from the proposed entrance. Said walk and curbing to be coordinated as required with the Highway Division.

4. The on-site parking turnout appears to be only five feet (5') deep and provides inadequate room for vehicles backing out of the adjacent spots. The engineer should review this layout to determine if additional room is available. This may also provide additional snow storage.

RESPONSE: The fence location is dictated by a minimum separation to the adjacent residence, and the curb of the turnout is a nominal 2' offset to allow for overhang during turning movements. The turnaround cannot be extended, but provides adequate space for turnout movements. The parking area has a 24' wide aisle and 8.5' x 20' spaces that make the 5' deep turnout adequate for backing movements and exiting.

5. Sheet C2.1 indicates that the water service will be extended from the terminus of the current service. The Water Division requires that the service be replaced from the existing curb stop.

RESPONSE: The water service shall be extended from the existing curb stop, as required by the Water Division.

6. The utility plan indicates separate building sewers for what is assumed to be food preparation and domestic uses. Under no circumstances shall sanitary flows be plumbed into the grease trap.

RESPONSE: The interior layout has not been finalized at this time, but the grease trap shall only receive flows from food preparation, and shall not receive sanitary flow.

7. The overall drainage plans on Sheet C2.2 call for recharging the total roof runoff – consistent with the drainage calculations, but plans do not indicate how roof runoff from the rear of the proposed building will be directed to the infiltrators. The plans should be updated to depict the construction in order to allow for the infiltration of all roof runoff.

RESPONSE: *The roof drain collection system will be revised to show the connection of rear roof drains into the infiltration system.*

8. The plans show inadequate area for snow storage. Snow management will also be severely constrained due to the configuration of the parking and waste management access. The project should be updated to provide language and/or area for snow storage. The DPW cannot be responsible for the management of snow for private entities.

RESPONSE: *At no point will the Applicant expect the DPW to be responsible for management of onsite snow. Snow storage will be revised to show that a portion of the paved onsite parking areas will serve as snow storage if needed, since the parking requirements are nominally exceeded by approximately 6 spaces.*

Conservation Commission

Paula Terrasi Comments dated 8/8/22:

1. The Commission reviewed the stormwater management proposed for the site, which will collect and divert the entire roof and paved areas into chambers that will accommodate up to the 25-year storm. Any discharge, after treatment, would be diverted through a pipe from the chambers into stone at the rear of the lot into the Riverfront Area. Currently, there is no stormwater management onsite. The Commission questioned the deep hole test (221.1), which was not very deep. The plan should show the two-foot separation from ground water to the bottom of the chamber.

RESPONSE: *The subsurface stormwater treatment system will be adjusted to maintain a 2-foot separation to the estimated seasonal high groundwater.*

2. The Commission requested the botanical names for serviceberry and Little Bluestem grass, which was misspelled, be corrected and the Taxus Cuspidata, an Asian non-native plant be replaced with a native species. The replacement planting must be approved by the Commission. All plantings proposed for work with the Conservation Commission's jurisdiction will be native.

RESPONSE: *The misspelled and non-native plant species will be corrected and replaced with native species as requested.*

3. The Commission has been informed by the applicant's engineer, that the missing wetlands flags have been replaced. The wetland delineation will be confirmed during the week of August 8, 2022.

RESPONSE: *Acknowledged.*

Historical Commission

Ronald Karr Comments dated 8/7/22:

1. This proposed repurposing of the site, a stand-alone pizzeria, seems unnecessary. (Currently, there is a pizzeria located in the adjacent shopping center, and another located less than 1/8 mile to the west.) This hardly seems the best use of this narrow site, which is only 74 feet wide. The proposed design itself reflects the limitations imposed by the site. Parking and customer egress appear tight, and the important level of existing traffic exiting the adjacent shopping center parking and from the medical center directly across Main Street demand nothing less than a full traffic study.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

2. Serious aesthetic concerns are raised when a new building will be fronted by asphalt and cars, located next to another large parking lot. While strip development may well be the norm on Webster Highway in Nashua or in Billerica, this shouldn't be welcomed on Main Street, Pepperell and is not in accord with the best practices in current suburban or small town design.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

3. The Historical Commission strongly condemns the needless demolition of this historic home.

RESPONSE: In full disclosure of the planned demolition of the existing house, and in several correspondences with the Historical Commission there was no mention or hint of such stern condemnation, so we regret to learn that this is the stance of the Historical Commission.

Board of Health

Kalene Gendron Comments dated 8/10/22:

1. The razing of a dwelling, if applicable, may require the following, Lead Paint and Asbestos notification filings.
 - a. Conditions which may cause for nuisance conditions must be addressed prior to demolition, for example noise, odors and dust. Best construction practices shall be adhered to.

RESPONSE: All potential hazardous materials will be inspected and abated for the structure demolition as required by state and federal laws.

2. A formal application process is required, application can be found for Food Service, on the www.nashoba.org website, under "common applications"

RESPONSE: Food Service and Building Permit applications will be filed appropriately.

3. Site has existing utilities for town sewer and water, and assumed to utilize the same service.
RESPONSE: Same utility service lines will be used in accordance with the 3-year moratorium for open-cutting Main Street.
4. Due to site constraints, there should be a back up site for snow removal in the event of a large snow event.
RESPONSE: Parking is adequate on the property to allow additional snow storage for large events.
5. Grease Trap (GT) – site proposes an external GT, and the jurisdiction for this trap is the Sewer Department.
RESPONSE: Acknowledged. The Sewer Department will be contacted for separately permitting the GT.
6. Building sewer pipe is proposed to be schedule 35. Areas prone to vehicle traffic, pipe should be rated appropriately, for example, schedule 40 or equivalent; Sewer Department to ensure compliance.
RESPONSE: Acknowledged. PVC SDR-35 is proposed, but shall conform to Sewer Department requirements.
7. Stormwater – according to the test hole, 912-2 it identifies no mottles or standing water; therefore, one can assume a water table at bottom of the test hole at 120" or elevation 221.00'. Plans depict the bottom of the stone under the stormwater chambers at elevation 222.45'. This will provide relief of 1.45' which I feel is inadequate offset to an *assumed* water table. Given the close proximity to the abutting property; existing dwelling, and the drainage direction, perhaps a more shallow stormwater chamber design would be a better fit, rather than surge the drainage to one section of the site.
RESPONSE: Acknowledged. The 10-foot test hole provided no mottling, and would have been best to be dug deeper to account for site grading. The stormwater chamber system shall be adjusted to maintain 2-foot separation to the test hole estimated seasonal high groundwater, in conjunction with other comments to be addressed on forthcoming revised plans.
8. Plans depict a stockade fence along the abutters (83 Main St.), and given the acoustics of sound to bounce. Consideration should be given to "absorb" the restaurant, traffic, sounds, etc.
RESPONSE: Acknowledged. The fence is proposed in a fashion and location consistent with Pepperell Bylaws.

Sincerely,



Kyle Burchard, PE

Copy to: Machado / Pepperell
GPR file 191091