LAND DESIGN COLLABORATIVE

April 1, 2026

Ms. Patricia M. Kendall, Chair
Planning Board
c/o Ms. Jasmin Farinacci, Director of Planning & Economic Development
101 Main Street
Ashland, Massachusetts 01721

Re: Site Plan Review- Responses to 2nd Peer Review Comments
240 & 260 Pleasant Street
Ashland, MA, 01721

Dear Ms. Kendall and Members of the Board:

On Behalf of the Applicant, Metrowest Facilities, we are submitting herewith a Response to 2nd Peer Review Comments raised by GCG Associates Inc. in their letter dated March 24, 2026. For your convenience, we've presented the GCG initial comments in *"italics"*, 2nd Peer Review Comments in *"italics"*, and the LDC responses in a conventional font.

We have enclosed the following for distribution to the Planning Board & Conservation Commission:

1. One (1) original plus five (5) copies of the Peer Review Response letter,
2. Four (4) copies of the Stormwater Management Report- Addendum III, prepared by Land Design Collaborative, dated March 2026,
3. Three (3) copies of Plans (24x36) entitled "Site Plan for 240 & 260 Pleasant Street, Ashland, MA 01721", prepared by Land Design Collaborative, dated February 5, 2025, revised June 9, 2025, March 9, 2026 & April 3, 2026,
4. Five (5) copies of Plans (11x17) entitled "Site Plan for 240 & 260 Pleasant Street, Ashland, MA 01721", prepared by Land Design Collaborative, dated February 5, 2025, revised June 9, 2025, March 9, 2026 & April 3, 2026,
5. Issuance packet in PDF format provided via email.

GCG Associates, Inc.- Peer Review Letter

Site Plan Set (Civil Plan)

C-201 – Site Preparation and Erosion & Sediment Control Plan:

5. *Erosion control wattle or similar device should be provided at the northeast lot corner and along the southeastern property line between the 200 contours. The updated existing conditions plan V-101 indicated a low spot at 199.3 near the northeastern lot corner toward 200 Pleasant Street. Erosion control wattles should be provided across the low spot to protect the abutting property.*

   This comment was addressed previously, however, the linework may have been obscured by other information. The site plans have been revised accordingly to include additional ECB callouts and additional leader.

C-202 – Layout, Materials & Planting Plan:

9. *The proposed gravel parking lot with crushed stone course over compacted gravel does not meet the infiltration BMP pretreatment requirements. Hot mix asphalt pavement parking lot proposed, since the subsurface infiltration system consists of 2.41in/hr exfiltration rate, Hence, the system is classified as rapid*

soil infiltration BMP. A minimum of 44% TSS removal pre-treatment credit is required. The proposed deep sump hooded catch basin provided 25% TSS removal credit only, additional pre-treatment required.

The Site Plans have been revised to replace the two deep sump hooded catch basins with two CDS Pretreatment Units to achieve the required TSS removal prior to discharge to a subsurface detention/infiltration system.

15. *Section 5.2, Loading Requirements – this proposed development would not require any loading area. The loading requirements should be determined by the Building Inspector. See comment number 12 above. The proposed use should not require Loading area, Board approval required.*

    Acknowledged

16. *Section 5.3.8. - the proposed standalone sign should not be placed within the required 30' side yard setback as shown. The proposed sign is at the 10 feet side yard setback, where 30' is required.*

    We recommend that the Planning Board include a Condition in its Decision that prior to applying for a sign installation permit, the applicant seek a determination from the Building Commissioner as to whether the sign location shown on the plan is located in the front or side yard setback.

17. *Snow storage areas should be specified on the plan; no snow storage should be placed within the drainage swale area. Snow storage areas specified on plan, the storage areas are limited. The applicant should state that "Excessive snow to be removed offsite by the owner with no additional costs to the Town."*

    Snow Storage/Removal Notes have been added to the sheet.

20. *Section 5.4.3.1 – the development site is facing residential uses across Pleasant Street. The plan shows utilizing the existing vegetation along the site frontage for screening. Existing trees along the frontage were not identified (shown tree line only). The plan has specified to require the owner, contractor and project landscape architect to evaluate the vegetative screening from the public way, following the removal of trees and shrubs with the limit of work area. GCG recommends including the Planning Board or its representative to evaluate the vegetative screening at the time. Based on 5.4.3.1's requirement of 1 tree per 30 feet linear feet of street frontage, a minimum of 11 trees are required for the 325+/- linear feet of road frontage. GCG recommends adding the Planning Board or its representative to be included in the review of the vegetative screening prior to the vegetative augmentation as part of the approval conditions.*

    The note on the plan has been revised accordingly to address the comment.

C-203 – Grading & Drainage Plan:

23. *The poured in place texture rubber play area detail and material should be specified on the plan. Rubber surfaces should be permeable and equipped with a double washed crushed stone layer underneath to allow surface runoff storage and exfiltration. Safety surface is required under 6.06 CMR 7.07 for selected playground equipment, which requires Building Inspector approval. (Grass surface does not meet safety surface requirements.)*

The area is no longer proposed as the poured in place texture rubber playground but rather as recreational green space to be loamed and seeded as shown on the revised site plans. The intent of this space is to provide space for gathering.

24. *Synthetic Turf specifications should be specified on the plan and shall be permeable. Synthetic Turf should be equipped with a crushed stone course underneath to provide surface runoff storage for exfiltration. A minimum permeability of 30 inches per hour per square yard rate should be specified for the synthetic turf.*

    The details on Sheets C-401 (Stormwater Infiltration System – P 1P, Note) & C-402 (Synthetic Turf Field, Note 5) have been revised to indicate that the turf shall be permeable at the recommended rate.

25. *Rubber surface and synthetic turf should be maintained to retain their permeability property. Gravel parking surface runoff flow toward the rubber and synthetic turf surface should be avoided. Rubber surface and synthetic turf were called out shall be maintained to retain permeability properties on C-401 and C-402, the method of maintenance and minimum schedules should be specified on the O&M plan.*

    The O&M Plan has been revised accordingly.

27. *The proposed contour 199 at the south side of the AD-04 should be connected, (contour 199 is needed between proposed contour 198 and proposed spot grade 199.9). The latest grading plan shown a contour 199 inside the synthetic turf ball field, the applicant should verify that is the intention to create a slight dip in the ball field.*

    The grading is necessary due to the sidewalk associated with the accessible spaces. The edge of the sidewalk coincident with the head end of the parking spaces is flush. The ADA/ MAAB compliant walk requires grading the field such that the weed barrier concrete curb is flush with the back of sidewalk to avoid a tripping hazard.

30a. *Stormwater Infiltration System – P 2P should be equipped with cleanout/inspection ports for operation and maintenance access. The proposed infiltration system P 1P (below Synthetic Turf Field) should be equipped with inspection ports (standpipe with cover for inspection and monitoring infiltration function). Based on the HydroCAD report, the parking lot is expected to surcharge on top of catch basin DCB-01 during the 100-year storm event, (see additional Stormwater Report comment below). Slight water ponding within the parking lot is acceptable for outdoor recreation facility parking lot, and an outdoor sport event would most likely be cancelled during 100-year storm event.*

    The plans have been revised to include inspection ports.

SL-101 – Photometric Plan:

39. *The plan shows 7 lights (3 type A and 4 type B) on the luminaire location table. However, the plan shows 6 lighting locations only, (2 LP-1 and 4 LP-2). The four LP-2 light fixtures are located at the four corners of the soccer field with 25 feet mounting heigh on pole. The parking lot light fixtures have mounting height of 20'. There is no specific mounting height for the lighting fixtures. However, for reference comparison, Section 8.6.10.7, which specified outdoor lighting fixture is limited to 15' mounting height in Wildwood District. There is no specific mounting height restriction for lighting fixtures in Industrial District. Therefore, relief is not required. The Board has the authority to approval the light fixtures mounting height as deemed appropriate. Section 9.4.4.8 does require description of all outdoor and streetlighting, including methods of screening adjacent properties and public way from glare. The luminaire table has been removed from Plan SL-101; The plan proposed two parking lot area lighting fixtures in the parking lots and four (potential future) stadium lighting fixtures at the ball field corners, lighting fixtures mounting height shall be specified on the plan. The*

applicant must demonstrate sufficient glare screening from the street and adjacent properties. Since there are existing residential uses at the northern side of Pleasant Street, the stadium lighting glare should be addressed, especially during winter months.

The Plan and Illumination Schedule have been revised to reflect the mounting heights. The parking lot light fixtures are proposed with a mounting height of 20 feet to reduce the number light poles while maintaining proper illumination. Likewise, the four light poles at the corners of the field are proposed at 25 feet, which is lower than the top of the tree canopy and reduces the number of light poles for the field. As noted previously to the Planning Board and municipal officials, the applicant reserves the right not to install light poles around the soccer field and is proposing to run conduit to the pole locations where capped riser pipes would be installed 6 inches below finish grade until such time the applicant decides on whether light poles will be installed. The project is located within an industrial district where typically 20-25' mounting heights for light fixtures are not uncommon.

As shown on the plans, the perimeter of the property is vegetated with trees and brush which will be augmented along the project frontage with additional landscape material. The light fixtures proposed on the north end of the soccer field closest to Pleasant Street will be equipped with light shields. In addition, the foot candle distribution exhibited on the plans, particularly to the north of the site, conservatively, does not account for the tree canopy which will be in full foliage during the majority of the soccer seasons. During the winter months, activity on the field will be dormant.

40. *Hours of operation (lighting system) should be specified. The applicant suggested that a Condition be placed in the Decision specifying the hours of operation. The hours of operation would also determine the necessity of stadium lighting fixtures.*

    Acknowledged.

41. *There are luminaire spillovers onto the adjacent abutters and Pleasant Street. However, there are existing streetlight mounting on utility poles on the northern side of Pleasant Street. The updated photometrics plan should specify the mounting height of the lighting fixtures. The applicant should demonstrate no adverse (glare) impacts on the residential uses across street and any adjacent properties*

    Please refer to response to Comment 39.

9.4.8 – Site Traffic – Vehicle Trip Analysis:

42. *An estimated number of traffic trips associated with the proposed use should be provided. The applicant responded that "The new lot will not be in demand until weekly daytime vehicles have vacated the lot(s) or on Saturdays, when other uses on the properties are not active. It is estimated that 30 vehicles will utilize the 46-space lot. That said the peaks for each use will be out of phase, therefore not impacting the peak traffic trips." GCG estimated approximately 71 daily trips generated from the single soccer field and does not anticipate any major adverse traffic impacts from this project.*

    Acknowledged.

Stormwater Report

Post-development – Proposed Hydrology:

9. *Pond P2P and GCG disagree with the pond modeling in this application. The gravel parking lot consists of 16,210 s.f. of surface area with exfiltration. However, the calculations shown 0.0 cfs discard rate through exfiltration. Based on the 16,210 s.f. surface area and 1.020 in/hr. exfiltration rate, a 0.38 cfs, exfiltration/discarded rate should be achieved. GCG recommends installing the stone course underneath the gravel surface for runoff storage, which provides a more suitable walking surface and provide filtering for the surface runoff. Pond P2P consists of 1,502+/- l.f. of 12" perforated pipe embedded within a 100'W x 50'L x 2'H stone bed beneath the proposed parking lot. The HydroCAD modeled the two catch basins CB-01A and CB-01B grates as outlet devices. However, based on the grading plan and HydroCAD report calculations, the outflow during the 100-year storm through DCB-01A with a peak flow rate of 0.3 cfs and 102 c.f. which would be ponded on top of the DCB-01A with no outflow. The applicant may want to modify the HydroCAD model to reflect the outflow conditions. Nevertheless, the drainage system as presented works, the post-development peak flow and volume were decreased in comparison with the pre- development conditions. (However, addition pre-treatments should be provided for Pond P2P (underneath parking lot), to achieve the 44% TSS removal credit prior to discharge into the infiltration system, as required for infiltration BMP with rapid soil.*

   We concur with GCG's comment regarding the surcharging of the CB's "as presented works" and the proposed HydroCAD model is therefore unchanged. The Site Plans have been revised to replace the two deep sump hooded catch basins with two CDS Pretreatment Units to achieve the required TSS removal prior to discharge to a subsurface detention/infiltration system.

10. *Operation and Maintenance (O&M) plan should include a signature block, annual operation budget. The Applicant has requested the O&M budget requirement be part of the approval conditions.*

    Acknowledged.

11. *O&M should include maintenance of the gravel drive/parking lot, play area rubber safety surface, and synthetic turf, all these surfaces require maintenances to maintain permeable for the system to work properly. GCG recommends requiring street/pavement sweeping at a minimum twice per year, (late spring and early fall); Catch basin inlet grate should be inspected and cleaned at least four times per year. Synthetic turf inspection and cleaning (cleaning method and frequency to maintain synthetic turf permeable) should be specified in the O&M plan. Playground safety surface (where required) maintenance requirements should be specified in the O&M plan. Specify "Collected grit, sediment and debris to be disposed offsite in accordance with current Federal, State and Town/city guidelines and regulations."*

    The O&M Plan has been revised accordingly with the exception of the playground safety surface as this element of the site design has been removed.

12. *A signed illicit discharge statement for the site should be provided. The Applicant has requested the signed illicit discharge statement be part of the approval conditions.*

    Acknowledged.

Ms. Patricia M. Kendall, Chair
Planning Board
Ashland, Massachusetts 01721
April 1, 2026

We thank you in advance for your attention to the information provided and look forward to meeting with the Board to discuss the enclosed Application at the next available agenda.

Sincerely,

LAND DESIGN COLLABORATIVE

Wayne M. Belec, Project Manager
Principal

cc: Mr. Greg Wands, Chair, Ashland Conservation Commission, c/o Becca Solomon
Mr. Michael J. Carter, P.E., GCG Associates, Inc.
Mr. Anthony Ma, P.E., GCG Associates, Inc.
Mr. David Farmer, Director of Facilities, Connect United (via email)

24-0281 Resp ltr 02.docx