Open Comments

Defer to Board

Conditions of Approval

PROJECT NAME 550 King Street Peer Review

DATE 1/13/2026

UPDATED:

PROJECT NO. 25008

Peer Review Comment Form

NO.	SHEET NO.	SECTION	GREEN'S COMMENT	Applicant's RESPONSE	CONFIRMED BY	DATE
Stormwater Review						
	PLANS & DETAILS					
1	All Plans	§ 38-16.C.2/38-17.C.2 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan/Stormwater Management Plan	Please update the legend or provide a separate legend on each set of plans. There are missing items such as various hatches that should be labeled in the legend.			
2	Demolition Plan C-4	§ 38-16.C.7. Erosion and Sediment Control Plan	For the construction entrance, the VGC median is called to be removed, but the stone for the construction entrance does not expand across the median. Consider extending the stone to prevent tracking onto Great Road.			
3	Demolition Plan C-5	§ 38-16.C.7. Erosion and Sediment Control Plan	The proposed construction fence extends onto private property and connects to a private building on C-5. Has this been coordinated with the property owner? Consider revising fence limits.			
4	Drainage & Utility Plan C-16		DI-1 has two inlets but no outlet. Where does this drain to?			
5	Drainage & Utility Plan C-16, C-18, and C-19		There are catch basin to catch basin connections throughout the project. Catch basin to catch basin connections are not recommended and do not provide any additional pretreatment. There are many drop inlet to drop inlet connections with no sump, these are not recommended to be online since they are prone to clogging the drain pipes. Since the project is in a LUHPPL, catch basins should have deep sumps with hoods and be offline to maximize pollutant removal like oil. Please revise drainage layout.			
6	Drainage & Utility Plan C-19		BMP4 is a different size on C-19 than C-23. Please confirm the correct size and make sure it matches what is modelled in HydroCAD. BMP4 also has no pretreatment. Please provide pretreatment prior to discharge to all BMPs.			
7	Roadway Plan and Profiles C-25		Is DI-9 needed? Can this be removed to reduce DI to DI connections? It seems that runoff would mostly drain to DI-10. Is DI-11 at the low point? The profile is unclear where the low point is located. Please clarify.			
8	Roadway Plan and Profiles		The roadway plans and profiles shows the proposed contours at 1 foot intervals but the existing contours are shown at 2' intervals. It is recommended that the proposed and existing contours are shown at the same contour interval so, the proposed contours tie into existing contours. Please consider revising.			
9	Construction Details C-37		The subdivision plans currently show a generic water quality unit but the Phase 1 plans provide the unit models. Please provide the unit models and required water quality flow rates for each water quality structure in the details for both sets of plans.			
10	Construction Details C-37/38		The plan details show a typical CMP Infiltration system and a rain garden for the proposed stormwater BMPs. They do not reference the specific BMPs that are proposed on the plans and do not provide any specific detail for each BMP. The BMP details should have the specific BMP number that matches the plans, elevations for the design to match the plans & hydrocad, and estimated seasonal high groundwater relative to each BMP. Please revise.			
11	Construction Details C-37		OCS-1 indicates two of the sides of the structure being shorter to create an external weir and the grate sits on two sides of the structure. How will the grate be secured to the structure? It is recommended that the grate sits on all four sides of the structure and orifice cut outs are made to the side of the structure.			
12	Construction Details C-37		OCS-3 is missing from the detail sheets. Please revise.			
13	Phase I C-7/C-15		Is OCS-101 in the plans the same as OCS-1 in the details? Please use consistent naming. The rim and invert out on the detail sheet does not match the plan. Please revise. Please make sure Hydrocad matches the plan with any updates.			
14	Phase I C-7		The rim for DMH-111 should be under 286 based on the grading but it is shown as 286.30. Please revise.			
15	Phase I C-7	MA Stormwater Handbook Chp2 Vol2	There is a 3:1 slope adjacent to the subsurface infiltration system. This is similar to an underground infiltration trench which has a setback requirement of 100 feet from any slope greater than 20%. Please revise the slope or describe out potential breakout in the slope will be mitigated.			
16	Phase I C-15		There is a detail for OCS-2 and subsurface detention system in the detail sheets but we were unable to locate where this is proposed on the plans. Please confirm.			
	STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT					
17	Standard 2	MA Stormwater Handbook Standard 2	The peak flow rates reported in Table 1 do not consistently match the corresponding HydroCAD model outputs. Please revise Table 1 to ensure all tabulated values are consistent with the model results: DP-5: The 10-year post-development peak flow rate does not match the HydroCAD model output. DP-5 and DP-6: The 25-year post-development peak flow rates do not match the HydroCAD model outputs. All DPs except DP-1: The 50-year pre-development peak flow rates do not match the HydroCAD model outputs.			

Open Comments

Defer to Board

Conditions of Approval

PROJECT NAME 550 King Street Peer Review

DATE 1/13/2026

UPDATED:

PROJECT NO. 25008

Peer Review Comment Form

NO.	SHEET NO.	SECTION	GREEN'S COMMENT	Applicant's RESPONSE	CONFIRMED BY	DATE
18	Standard 2	MA Stormwater Handbook Standard 2	As shown in Table 1, the post-development peak discharge rates do not appear to be met for the following storm events: DP-4: The 50-year storm event post peak discharge rates exceed existing peak rates. DP-5: The 10-, 25-, 50-, and 100-year storm event post peak discharge rates exceed existing peak rates. DP-6: The 50-year storm event post peak discharge rates exceed existing peak rates. DP-9: The 50-year storm event post peak discharge rates exceed existing peak rates. Please revise so the post development peak rates do not exceed the predevelopment peak rates.			
19	Standard 3	MA Stormwater Handbook Standard 3	There is a discrepancy between the total post-development impervious area listed in Table 2 for Standard 3 (1,326,183 sq. ft.) and the area used in the HydroCAD model (1,332,852 sq. ft.). Please clarify the correct value and revise the calculations and/or report as necessary to ensure consistency.			
20	Standard 3	MA Stormwater Handbook Standard 3	Please provide hydrocad stage storage information as back up for the provided recharge volumes.			
21	Figure D-2 - Post Development Drainage Areas		Please clarify how the Subcatchment area 0.11 enters DP-1 Headwall? It appears this area would be part of 0.1 and/or 0.2.			
22	Figure D-2 - Post Development Drainage Areas		Subcatchment area 2.1 appears to discharge to P1 per the plans but it discharges to P2 in HydroCAD. Also, the boundary should be adjusted based on the catch basin layout. Please revise.			
23	Figure D-2 - Post Development Drainage Areas		3.1 appears to discharge to P1 per the plans but it discharges to P3 in HydroCAD. P3 is not shown in the design plans. Please revise.			
24	Figure D-2 - Post Development Drainage Areas		It appears that it would be difficult for runoff from Subcatchment area 9.1 to get to P9 based on the building layout, proposed utilities, and the distance between the two. Please confirm this design is feasible.			
25	Figure D-2 - Post Development Commercial Phase 1 Drainage Areas		7.53 has two area drains within the subcatchment. Therefore, this should be split into two separate subcatchments. Please revise.			
26	Figure D-2 - Post Development Commercial Phase 1 Drainage Areas		The watershed boundaries for 7.46, 7.47, 7.48, 7.49, 7.50, 7.51, 7.56, 7.57, 7.35, 7.30, 7.31, 7.29, 7.28, 7.27, 7.24, 7.40, 7.23, and 7.22 appear to be drawn arbitrarily. These boundaries should be revised based on the catch basin layout and grading in this area or additional grading should be provided to make the boundaries more accurate.			
27	Figure D-2 - Post Development Commercial Phase 1 Drainage Areas		DI-111 is listed as a WQU-101 but in the subdivision design plans it is not listed as a WQU. Please clarify.			
28	Figure D-2 - Post Development Commercial Phase 1 Drainage Areas/HydroCAD		7.8 is shown discharging to P7 in HydroCAD. This area is graded to sheet flow offsite and not enter P7. Please clarify.			
29	Figure D-2 - Post Development Commercial Phase 1 Drainage Areas/HydroCAD		7.19, 7.44, and 7.45 each tie into two different roof leaders in the watershed plan meaning these subcatchments should be split up but in HydroCAD they are shown going to one roof leader. Please clarify.			
30	Mounding Analysis		A mounding analysis is provided but there is no information on which BMP this mounding analysis is for. Please confirm. If this is for the subsurface system (Pond 7), it appears that the groundwater will mound up beyond the property line. Has the impacts to 534 King Street been analyzed?			
31	Existing HydroCAD		P1 and P2 are unable to be reviewed since we do not have the as built information for these BMPs.			
32	Proposed HydroCAD		P4, P12, P11, P6, P5, and P10 are unable to be reviewed since there are no design plans or details for these BMPs.			
33	Proposed HydroCAD		The rain garden's OCS inverts in hydrocad do not match the plan. The rain garden's OCS has a 20" x 10" horiz orifice/grate modelled in hydrocad and this does not appear to match the design details. Please revise.			
34	Proposed HydroCAD		P9 subsurface detention system's inverts in HydroCAD do not match the plans. The weir is modelled as a broad crested weir instead of a sharp crested weir. Please revise.			
35	Appendix D: The Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan		Please provide a signature on the submitted LTPPP.			
36	Appendix D: O&M Plan	§ 38-18.B.2. O&M Plan	The O&M Plan does not include the inspection and maintenance of subsurface infiltration basins and rain gardens. Please update.			
37	Appendix D: O&M Plan	§ 38-18.B.2. O&M Plan	The O&M Plan refers to cascade separator but the plans and model numbers in standard 4 refer to CDS units. Please clarify. Please include the O&M from the manufacturer in the report.			
38	Appendix D: O&M Plan	§ 38-18.B.3. O&M Plan	The O&M Plan shall be signed.			
39	Appendix F: Illicit Discharge Statement	MA Stormwater Handbook Standard 10	The illicit discharge statement needs to be signed.			
40	Test Pits	§ 38-17.C.5 Stormwater Management Plan	ESHGW should be determined for all test pits where infiltration, detention, and retention BMPs are proposed. Some of the test pits are missing ESHGW. Please revise.			