



VIA EMAIL: lhansen@wayland.ma.us

January 5, 2023

Town of Wayland Conservation Commission
c/o Conservation Department
Linda Hansen, Conservation Administrator
41 Cochituate Road
Wayland, Massachusetts 01778

Re: **DEP File No.: 322-1003**
4, 8, 14 Andrew Avenue
368 Boston Post Road
Wayland, Massachusetts

Dear Members of the Commission:

On behalf of the applicant/owners, Town of Wayland, Meridian Associates, Inc. (MAI) is pleased to submit the following documents:

- Comment Response Letter;
- Revised Notice of Intent Application;
- Stormwater Management Report;
- Revised Site Plans;

The documents were revised based on comments provided by the Town of Wayland Conservation Department in a letter dated December 28, 2022. Please see the comments below in black font and the responses in **blue** font.

1. The 200-foot riverfront line is labeled on the existing conditions plan, but not on the other plans in the plan set. Both the 100-foot and 200-foot riverfront lines end where they meet up with the 100-foot wetland buffer line. They need to extend to the property line.
MAI Response: The Site Plans have been revised to show the 200-foot riverfront line extending to the property lines on all of the plan sheets.
2. The property to the NW is labeled Twenty Wayland LLC. The label should read Town of Wayland.
MAI Response: The Site Plan set has been revised accordingly to read "Town of Wayland" as the abutter to the northwest of the project site.
3. The NOI and Chapter 194 application state in the project description, "an overlook to the Sudbury River". Can you clarify if one or two overlooks are proposed?
MAI Response: The current project proposes two (2) river overlooks. The locations are shown on the Site Plans. The locations have been revised based on input received during the Site Walk with the Commission on January 5, 2023.



4. Please provide the number of trees (> 6 inch diameter) to be removed both within and outside the riverfront area.

MAI Response: Existing trees with six (6) inch or greater diameters, that are to be removed within the buffer zones will be shown on the Site Plan set for review by the Commission. Notes have been added in the vicinity of the proposed boardwalks that state: 'The proposed path of the boardwalks are to meander amongst the existing vegetation and are to be located as to minimize the removal of mature trees with diameters in excess of 6". Final location of boardwalk to be determined and coordinated with the Commission based on the location of existing trees.'

5. The proposed trail to connect to Cow Common is located on River Trail Place property—please move this proposed trail to the far right side of the Town of Wayland property.

MAI Response: The location of the proposed trail, to be permitted and constructed by others, that is to connect to Cow Common, has been shifted to the west owned by the Town of Wayland.

6. The proposed rip-rap slope on the plan needs to be moved to within the Site.

MAI Response: The Site Plans have been revised to depict that the proposed rip-rap slope is located within the site.

7. The Deed reference is for a deed dated 1874. Please provide evidence that the properties are owned by the Town of Wayland and the deeds are recorded at the Registry.

MAI Response: The deed reference has been adjusted in the Notice of Intent Application to a more recent deed (Deed Book 66628 Page 081). A copy of that deed is attached in the NOI Application Packet.

8. Does the proposed alteration of the riverfront area (page 3 of the NOI) include the square feet of the existing building? These values should reflect the proposed alteration in the riverfront for both the inner and outer riparian area.

MAI Response: The proposed alteration calculation of the work within the riverfront, on page 3 of the NOI Application, has been adjusted to depict the 'proposed alteration', not including the existing building or previously existing altered areas, within both the 100-foot inner and 200-foot outer riparian zones. Additionally, a new sheet was added to the plan set entitled: 'Sheet C 2.1 Layout and Area Calculations Plan' which describes the proposed riverfront alteration areas for each of the four (4) parcels that comprise the project site. Additionally, an Alternatives Analysis has been provided and is attached in the NOI Application Packet.

9. The NOI treats the Site as one property although the NOI lists four separate parcel numbers. The alteration of the riverfront should be calculated separately for each lot.

MAI Response: A new sheet was added to the plan set entitled: 'Sheet C 2.1 Layout and Area Calculations Plan' which describes the proposed riverfront alteration areas for each of the four (4) parcels that comprise the project site.



10. This project needs to meet the performance standards of Riverfront Area depending on whether the lot is undeveloped or previously developed (310 CMR 10.58(5)). The four performance standards include: 1. Protection of Other Resources Areas, 2. Protection of Rare Species, 3. Practicable and substantially equivalent Economic Alternatives, and 4. No significant adverse impact.

MAI Response: The four (4) mentioned performance standards have been addressed in a narrative that has been added to the NOI Application.

11. On the developed lot, proposed work shall not be located closer to the river than existing conditions (or 100 feet, whichever is less). Note that the trail is both closer and within 100 feet.

MAI Response: The Site Plans have been revised to depict that the proposed riverwalk is located in previously altered areas except for the two (2) locations shown for the proposed overlooks. A portion of these previously altered area are located within the 100-foot inner riparian zone, but work is not proposed any closer than what had previously been altered. The two (2) overlooks are to be elevated above existing grades using posts as to disturb as little of the vegetated areas as possible. Additionally, notes have been added in the vicinity of the proposed boardwalk overlooks that state: 'The proposed path of the boardwalks are to meander amongst the existing vegetation and are to be located as to minimize the removal of mature trees with diameters in excess of 6". Final location of boardwalk to be determined and coordinated with the Commission based on the location of existing trees.'

12. On the undeveloped lot, the proposed work shall not be located within the 100 foot inner riparian area.

MAI Response: The Site Plans have been revised to depict that the proposed riverwalk is located in previously altered areas except for the two (2) locations shown for the proposed overlooks. A portion of these previously altered area are located within the 100-foot inner riparian zone, but work is not proposed any closer than what had previously been altered. The two (2) overlooks are to be elevated above existing grades using posts as to disturb as little of the vegetated areas as possible. Additionally, notes have been added in the vicinity of the proposed boardwalk overlooks that state: 'The proposed path of the boardwalks are to meander amongst the existing vegetation and are to be located as to minimize the removal of mature trees with diameters in excess of 6". Final location of boardwalk to be determined and coordinated with the Commission based on the location of existing trees.'

13. If the proposed trail system was located entirely on an undeveloped riverfront lot, then you could apply for a permit under the limited project provision, but it appears that the trail is located on both developed and undeveloped riverfront lots.

MAI Response: The proposed riverwalk is located on both developed and undeveloped portions of the four (4) lots that comprise the project site.

14. On sheet no. 3.0, please include the test pit and the Cultec locations on the plan.

MAI Response: Sheet C 3.0 Grading and Drainage Plan, of the Site Plans has been revised to show the test pit information as well as the Cultec chamber location and configuration.



15. The peer reviewer will address the Stormwater Management comments, however, please prepare a table with the total amount of impervious surfaces, both existing and proposed. For example, the narrative in the stormwater report states that the current building is 12,759 SF, although the HydroCAD report states the building is 10,683 SF.

MAI Response: 'Sheet C 2.1 Layout and Area Calculations Plan' of the Site Plans has been added to describe the existing and proposed lot coverages (grass, woodland, pavement, buildings etc.).

16. Also, the CN value for the stone dust trails is 96. Is there an subsurface impervious substance under the stone dust trail?

MAI Response: A CN Runoff Value of 96 is used for the compacted stone dust trails to be conservative when determining the amount of stormwater runoff produced from the site. This is used to simulate potential future compaction of the trail which could reduce the amount of infiltration through the trail.

We look forward to meeting with you at the next hearing and if you have any questions please feel free to contact me at dkelley@meridianassoc.com or (978) 299-0447, ext. 246.

Sincerely,

MERIDIAN ASSOCIATES, INC.

David S. Kelley, PE
Director of Engineering

P:\6452_10 Andrew Ave, Wayland, Ma\ADMIN\Reports\NOI\Letter_Conservation_2022-12-01.docx

cc: Department of Environmental Protection-NERO
Town of Wayland