



JENIFER COLLINS-BROWN
Chief of the Department

Town of Topsfield
Fire Headquarters

27 High Street
Topsfield, Massachusetts 01983-1403
(978) 887-5148 • Fax (978) 887-1512

www.topsfieldfire.com

Martha A Morrison, Chair
Topsfield Planning Board
8 West Common St.
Topsfield, MA 01983

October 11, 2018

Thank you for the opportunity to offer feedback on this important project. The plans and maps included in the application do not provide me with enough information to make informed decisions or to be able to offer complete recommendations. I look forward to engineered plans containing detailed information.

My feedback on the application as submitted, with limited available factual information is that the road width of twenty feet is not wide enough to support a piece of fire apparatus and any other traffic. Assuming no on street parking at all, the road is still too narrow and snow will compound the access issue.

In addition to the road width, it is unclear whether our Truck One would be able to safely and successfully complete the turns in the complex, in particular the turn between buildings 10 and 13. Again, that is assuming no on street parking. I would need more information to determine if that critical piece of fire suppression equipment would be able to navigate the property.

There is no information on the size of the water mains or the water flow. I would need this information to determine if there was enough flow to provide for fire suppression activities from the hydrant system.

I look forward to adding more input as the project progresses.

Sincerely,

Jenifer Collins-Brown, MS
Chief of the Department

Cc: Donna Rich



**Topsfield Highway Department
279 Boston Street
Topsfield, MA 01983**

October 12, 2018

Planning Board Members,

I have reviewed the submittal for Perkins Landing. While severely lacking in anything of substance to review, my comments are as follows:

- The roadways within the project are far too narrow and do not come close to meeting the minimum standards necessary for safe vehicle passage. Snow removal, on street parking, and navigation of emergency vehicles will be extremely problematic and unsafe. There is no provision for an emergency access road should the main roadway become impassable. There are no provisions for pedestrian facilities. No handicapped accessibility is shown.
- The stormwater collection system appears to be inadequate. While vaguely referenced in the application, it does not appear that any provisions have been made to mitigate roof runoff infiltration.
- Perkins Row is a very narrow winding road with minimal sight distances in numerous places. There are no sidewalks or street lighting. The additional vehicle traffic and foot traffic will certainly increase the chances of a vehicle or pedestrian accident.
- Route 97, AKA High Street carries nearly 13000 vehicles per day at the intersection of Perkins Row. Development of the property as proposed will likely lead to the queuing of vehicles at this intersection during peak traffic times.
- The Schedule of Values for project construction appears to be grossly overstated. Even taking into account the significant costs to construct the numerous walls on the plans, the numbers are very high. One can

- make a viable comparison to the recent construction of Rolling Green project on Boston Street since that project is still ongoing to see that these proposed numbers are inflated.
- The existing electrical infrastructure (owned by National Grid) is not sufficient to handle the additional load that will be required by this project. It is unclear if this has been accounted for in the overall scheme of things.
- Included in the application is a self-assessment that the project would be “walkable” to the downtown area including the schools and library. There are no sidewalks on Perkins Row, High Street or Central Street adjacent to the site. Pedestrians would have to cross State Route 97 and State Highway Route 1 in order to reach the downtown area on foot. There are no crosswalks to facilitate this.

David M. Bond
Highway Superintendent
Tree Warden
Stormwater Coordinator



Topsfield Water Department
279 Boston Street
Topsfield, MA 01983

October 15, 2018

Ms. Martha Morrison, Chair
Topsfield Planning Board
8 West Common Street
Topsfield, MA 01983

RE: Perkins Landing LLC, 57 Perkins Row

Dear Ms. Morrison,

Having reviewed the plans for the Perkins Landing development the Water Department offers the following comments.

1. The Town has limited water resources and needs to curtail unnecessary water use to provide for future growth. Steps should be taken to reduce the additional water consumption caused by this development such as requiring high efficiency appliances and fixtures and prohibiting automatic irrigations systems. This will minimize the increase in use and allow the water savings to be used elsewhere in Town.
2. The development is much denser than previous proposals and will likely require higher fire flows. The eight-inch main that they plan on connecting to is a dead-end main that begins at Howlett Street. How much water is needed for fire protection and the flows required needs to be determined.
3. The proposed development will increase the number of units served by the existing dead-end main by 30%. Having a concentrated use at the end of the main will improve water quality for those upstream but doesn't improve the reliability of the service. Water quality could be improved further by providing a loop connection which would also enhance distribution system redundancy. The applicant should be required to connect to the main as detailed in the proposal as well as extending the main an additional 1,700 feet on Perkins Row towards 97 so water can be fed from both directions.
4. The plans seem preliminary in nature and it is unclear how some of the buildings are going to be connected to the water mains. The last connection on any main must be a fire hydrant so the main can be flushed properly.
5. The location of valves on the water mains in the development are not shown. Sufficient valving should be provided so that each section of road could be turned off without turning off the entire development.

Please feel free to contact me if the Board has any questions or requires more information. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Gregory Krom
Water Superintendent



TOWN OF TOPSFIELD

Board of Health

8 West Common Street, Topsfield, Massachusetts 01983

(978) 887-1520/Fax (978) 887-1521

Website: www.topsfield-ma.gov; email: health@topsfield-ma.gov



October 17, 2018

To: Planning Board
From: Board of Health

Re: Perkins Landing, 57 Perkins Row

At the September 20, 2018 meeting, the Topsfield Board of Health discussed the proposed development project at the property known as 57 Perkins Row.

The consensus of the Board of Health was that it is premature to offer input prior to receipt of an onsite wastewater disposal design plan.

The issue will be discussed further at the next Board of Health meeting, October 25. Meeting starts at 7:30 pm in the Conference Room on the first floor of Town Hall.

John Coulon, RS
Agent, Board of Health



MEMORANDUM

TO: BOARD OF SELECTMEN: MARK LYONS, CHAIR; LYNNE BERMUDEZ, CLERK;
BOYD JACKSON, JOHN SPENCER, DICK GANDT.
KELLIE HEBERT, TOWN ADMINISTRATOR

FROM: HEIDI GAFFNEY, ADMINISTRATOR, TOPSFIELD CONSERVATION
COMMISSION

SUBJECT: 57 PERKINS ROW, PERKINS LANDING, NOTICE OF FILING OF PROJECT
ELIGIBILITY APPLICATION – PRELIMINARY COMMENTS

DATE: OCTOBER 23, 2018

CC: TOPSFIELD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Preliminary comments regarding the submitted materials to accompany the Notice of Filing of Project Eligibility Application submitted to MassHousing by Perkins Landing, LLC.

For the Conservation Commission, I submit the following comments:

There are several concerns and inconsistencies with the submitted application materials and plans:

- The application materials/plans lack information in many areas, some of which are listed below.
- A new delineation of Wetland Resource Areas should be required:
 - The Order of Resource area Delineation (MA DEP File #307-0720) issued on 5/4/2015 has expired and only verified certain resource areas.
 - Riverfront Area as shown on the plan is inaccurate - Mean Annual High Water under the MA Wetlands Protection Act has never been flagged, reviewed or confirmed.
 - The delineation shown on the plan is incomplete. Wetlands continue beyond (west of) WF #A20, as well as #C1 and #B13.
 - Bylaw Riverfront Area should be shown.
 - A likely Vernal Pool exists within the B/C series wetland ponded area west of the existing driveway. This was recognized in the past and the previous ORAD and OOC's clearly state a failure to submit adequate information to the contrary.

- With regard to a statement in the letter from Scott Cameron of The Morin-Cameron Group, Inc., dated September 11, 2018: An Order of Conditions issued under the Wetlands Protection Act (MA DEP File #307-0724), for a proposed roadway only, does not reaffirm the wetland delineation.
- Stormwater: On page 4 of the application, it states “The stormwater management system will be designed to fully comply with all the standards of the MA DEP Stormwater Management Regulations.” – however, no information is provided indicating how what is proposed on the plans would comply.
 - Given the density and layout of the proposed project, it appears that very little consideration has been given to the Mass Stormwater Management Standards.
 - Per Standard 3: Loss of annual recharge to groundwater shall be eliminated or minimized through the use of environmentally sensitive site design, low impact development techniques, stormwater best management practices, and good operation and maintenance. At a minimum, the annual recharge from the post- development site shall approximate the annual recharge from pre-development conditions based on soil type. This Standard is met when the stormwater management system is designed to infiltrate the required recharge volume as determined in accordance with the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook.
 - From Vol. 1, Ch. 1 of the Stormwater Handbook:
 - Proponents of projects subject to the Stormwater Management Standards must consider environmentally sensitive site design and low impact development techniques to manage stormwater.
 - Environmentally Sensitive Site Design: Environmentally Sensitive Site Design means design that incorporates low impact development techniques to prevent the generation of stormwater and non-point source pollution by **reducing impervious surfaces, disconnecting stormwater sheet flow paths and treating stormwater at its source, maximizing open space, minimizing disturbance, protecting natural features and processes, and/or enhancing wildlife habitat.**
 - It is noted on Page 31 of the application under “(4) Use Natural Resources Wisely” that the “uses low impact development (LID)...” box is not checked, this is inconsistent with the statement on Page 4 (referenced above).
 - The proposed project provides virtually no open space.
 - Significant impervious surfaces are proposed.
- The existing tree line as shown on the plans is not correct. The existing wooded area is far more significant than shown. The current significant wooded buffer would be almost entirely gone.
- Likely significant impacts to wildlife habitat functions and values.

- Although it does not have a regulatory purpose, it is worth noting that the entire property is mapped within BioMap2 - Core Habitat and a portion is mapped within BioMap2 - Critical Natural Landscape.
- Other items of note:
 - Page 4 - states 20-foot wide roadway, plans scale to a 22-foot wide roadway. (also noted that 62+ is checked off)
 - Page 5 - wetland area and flood/hazard area #'s are questionable due to incomplete delineation and are misleading as there is a large wetland area that is within the flood/hazard area and presumably not counted to avoid double counting, however this should be counted and noted what portion overlaps with the flood/hazard area. Other non-buildable area would likely include Riverfront Area that is precluded from building under MA WPA regs, however Riverfront Area under MA WPA has never been established (flagged, reviewed or confirmed).
 - Page 29 - "compact and/or clustered so as to preserve undeveloped land" – checked off, this is inconsistent with the design plan.
 - Page 30 - (3) Protect Land and Ecosystems - design plan and explanation is inconsistent with the boxes checked.
 - Pages 32 & 33 - "explanation (required)" areas are blank.

A history of the property with respect to TCC applications and related issues:

As written by the previous Conservation Administrator, sometime between May 2009 and September 2012 "a large area of the understory vegetation in the Buffer Zone/first hundred feet of Riverfront Area was removed without TCC review or authorization, in violation of the Act and the Bylaw."

The Order of Resource Area Delineation (ORAD) issued on 5/4/2015 only verified certain resource area boundaries and has now expired.

Of note in the ORAD:

- Riverfront Area under the Wetlands Protection Act was not reviewed or confirmed, MAHW under the WPA was not flagged or reviewed.
- Wetland flagging on the site was not complete. Wetland continues beyond (west of) flag #A20 as well as west of flags #C1 & #B13.

A Denial Order of Conditions (307-0724) was issued under the Topsfield General Wetlands Bylaw on 12/18/2015, the denial was appealed and Superior Court affirmed the denial on 9/12/2017.

Of note in the Denial Order:

- The ponded area within the B/C wetland west of the existing driveway was noted to have characteristics of a Vernal Pool. As noted in the Denial Order: "The TCC has not received evidence that the pool is not a Vernal Pool."

- “The TCC finds that the pool (potential Vernal Pool), adjacent/upslope of the crossing has numerous significant wildlife habitat values and may provide evidence of Vernal Pool activity in the spring.”

An Order of Conditions (307-0724) was issued under the Wetlands Protection Act on 12/18/2015 authorizing ONLY the proposed roadway and related activities.

Of note in the Act Order:

- “The pool of the Intermittent Stream has characteristics of a Vernal Pool, i.e. it holds water for months at a time and has an abundance of life much of the year, including frogs, turtles, and invertebrates...”. “TCC has not received evidence that the pool is not a Vernal Pool.”