



November 03, 2020

Tabitha Harkin, *City Planner*
City of New Bedford
Dept. of Planning, Housing &
Community Development
133 William Street, Room 303
New Bedford, MA 02740

**RE: Response Letter
Parallel Products – Transfer Station
100 Duchaine Boulevard – New Bedford, Massachusetts**

Dear Tabitha,

We have enclosed a response letter and revised Site Plans in response to the staff recommendations dated October 27, 2020 and Department of Public Infrastructure comments dated October 28, 2020 regarding review of the Planning Board Submittal.

We trust the attachments noted above and included herewith will provide the necessary documentation to address their comments. If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Very Truly Yours,

FARLAND CORPORATION, INC.

Christian A. Farland

Christian A. Farland, P.E., LEED AP
Principal Engineer and President

cc: File, Client

Planning Department Staff Recommendations

Comment #1

Staff acknowledges the applicant has removed phasing labels and elements of other phases within the plans set though note, the cover sheet still reads “Phase I and Phase II”.

Farland Corp. (FC) has revised the Cover Sheet as requested.

Comment #2

The planning board requested, and staff reiterated at the October 14 meeting that the board wished to have any potential noise impacts quantified. The information provided explains mitigation measures but does not provide a measure of the noise that is to be mitigated. The board may wish to seek further information.

The applicant has revised the operation to bring the loading of the rail cars inside to mitigate any noise that the abutting properties owners and board were concerned with.

Comment #3

As noted above the applicant submitted a revision to the Traffic Impact Report on Monday, October 26, 2020. The late submission of this material limits City staff’s ability to provide a timely review and comment. It is at the discretion of the board whether to review this item at the hearing.

The traffic engineer is working collaboratively with the Department of Public Infrastructure and the City’s Peer Review Consultant.

Comment #4

The applicant has updated the parking layout to include six handicapped parking spaces in the southeastern parking lot under the existing solar canopy. The measurements are difficult to confirm. The board may wish to confirm the dimensions of these spaces and ADA access aisles.

Further, the applicant has added a paved pedestrian pathway from the southeast parking lot to connect along the front of the bunker building and then run between the bunkers building and main building to the employee entrance doors. A pedestrian pathway has not been provided from the northeast parking lot.

The northeast parking lot layout is missing the existing parking lot landscape islands. These islands are not noted as being removed on the demolition plan so the board may wish to inquire further.

The applicant has revised the parking calculations; however, staff are still confused by the revised numbers. Staff counted 199 spaces on the revised plans, the cover sheet notes 195 spaces, and the application (not revised) states 152 spaces. The board may wish to have the applicant revise.

Further, the board may wish to have the applicant provide more clarity about the vehicles used in the site operation base on the parking calculations information. The parking calculations are based on the following formula:

*“One (1) space per 1,500 sq. ft. of gross floor area up to 15,000 sq. ft. Thereafter, one (1) additional space for each 5,000 sq. ft. or portion thereof in excess of 15,000 sq. ft., **plus one (1) space for each vehicle utilized in the business**”*

The applicant’s calculation notes: “47 standard spaces + fleet vehicles”. This would mean there are 146 vehicles utilized in the business.

The board may wish to seek more information about the number of vehicles utilized in the business.

FC has revised the plan that calls out the dimensions of the handicap spaces for clarity (See Sheet 7 & 8).

A 5’ wide walkway has also been included from the northeast lot for pedestrian access to the main building (See Sheet 7 & 8).

The existing interior landscape islands have also been called out per the board’s recommendation (See Sheet 3).

The parking spaces have been re-counted and the table has been revised to show 199 spaces on the cover sheet.

Comment #5

The circulation plan has been updated to include the missing northeast parking lot. Staff still recommend the applicant provide clarification on the circulation plan. Specifically, the turning radius for vehicles exiting the bunker building and turning right in the internal roadway on the east side of the site.

FC has updated the traffic circulation plan to include the turn radius exiting the bunker building (See Sheet 10).

Comment #6

The applicant response letter indicates a note was added to the plans that “Inbound and Outbound project generated truck traffic serving the site must utilize Theodore Rice Boulevard to Duchaine Boulevard inbound and vice versa outbound”.

Staff were unable to locate this note. The board may wish to have the applicant indicate where the note is on the plan set.

FC has revised Sheet #25 to include Note #18 under General Construction Notes: Traffic Signs shall be installed on the ring road and on Duchaine Blvd that states “TRAVEL PROHIBITED ON PHILLIPS ROAD; USE THEODORE RICE BLVD FOR ACCESS TO ROUTE 140”.

Comment #7

The applicant indicates “the existing 25 mile per hours speed limit signs posted have been added to the plan set” and “No idling and no queuing signage is also to be added along internal roadway on the east side of the site. The signage is to be shown and labeled on the plan set.”

Staff acknowledges the sign locations are shown on the plan. However, they are not labeled nor has their symbology been added to the legend. The board may wish to have these signs labeled and clarified as to which are speed limit versus no idling and no queuing signage.

FC has revised the Traffic Circulation Plan that calls out the existing speed limit signs and call out the proposed locations of the “No Idling and No queuing” signs (See Sheet 10).

Comment #8

The applicant disagrees a full photometric plan is required for the site. Staff defer to the board in regard to this requirement. However, staff recommend the board request the applicant add all existing light fixtures locations to the plan set. Further, the lights fixtures missing on the light poles in the northeast parking lot as observed by staff as missing be replaced with operable fixtures.

The applicant agrees to replace all inoperable fixtures throughout the site.

Comment #9

The applicant indicates there is no outside storage for the recycling operation. The board may wish to clarify if any materials will be stored in the rail cars in the open air. Further, if there is any need to secure the material in the rail cars. The board may wish to have the applicant further explain if this material is loose material or is bundled in packaging.

The rail cars for glass are covered cars with hatches. The hatch is opened for loading, once loaded the hatch is closed for shipping.

Comment #10

A dumpster enclosure has been added to the plans in the gravel parking lot on the west side of the building. The enclosure is proposed in the southwest corner of the lot.

No detail has been provided for the enclosure or the base. The board may wish to have the applicant add the detail for the enclosure and require a concrete base. The board may wish to confirm this enclosure is proposed for the office and general employee generated waste not the recycling operational waste.

FC has provided a detail of the dumpster enclosure which is for the proposed office and general employee generated waste and not the recycling operation waste.

Department of Public Infrastructure (DPI) Comments

Comment #1

Clarification of project phasing has been addressed. Cover Sheet of the plan set is still - p--labeled as Phase I and II. Please revise to reflect submittal of Phase I only.

FC has revised the Cover Sheet as requested.

Comment #2

Developer must conduct test pits regarding utility exploration for clarification on conflicts with water and sewer mains in the project area. Test pits to verify depth, diameter and location of existing mains to address conflicts. Coordinate with DP! for required test pit locations.

The applicant is OK with making this a condition of approval.

Comment #3

Engineer to confirm impacts of filling existing drainage channel at rail line spur station 11 +00. This fill appears to impact flow in an existing drainage swale where no outlet is provided. This could cause flooding.

The impact of the existing detention drainage area was reviewed by the City's peer review consultant and Conservation Commission during the Notice of Intent permitting process. Results indicated that since the area will be converted to grass the drainage areas are no longer needed, therefore the filling has no impacts to the area and will not cause any flooding.

Comment #4

Refer to Sheet 11 of 25. Rear Photovoltaic Canopy - Open Sided Roof #1 is to be constructed under Phase I; however, previous submittals show this canopy to be installed under Phase II. Was this canopy included in the approval from the Conservation Commission for Phase I work?

This work was approved by the Conservation Commission under Phase I.

Comment #5

Refer to Sheet 11 of 25. A sampling manhole is shown. The manhole is shown and labeled as proposed with "existing" inverts shown. It is also called out as "Existing SMH". Please clarify that this manhole has been installed and is existing.

This is an existing sampling manhole which was inspected and approved by the City.

Comment #6

Refer to Sheet 14 of 25. Sedimentation and erosion controls shown to the east of proposed Side Bunker Building conflict with water main work shown on Sheets 11 of 25 and 13 of 25.

The plans have been revised accordingly.

Comment #7

Refer to Sheets 11 and 14 of 25. There appears to be a conflict of existing water mains west of the Existing Glass Recycling Building. Previously proposed re-route of the water main under Phase II, which has been eliminated from this plan set. This water main is labeled as existing on Sheet 14 of 25.

The plans have been revised accordingly.

Comment #8

Details for hydrant, thrust block/restrained joints, and oil/water separator were not provided. Please provide these details to the DPI

Details have been included as requested.

Comment #9

DPI has conducted a review of the submitted plans, Developer/engineer to request markups from DPI to incorporate detailed edits into site design.

The plans have been revised as requested in the markups provided.

Comment #10

Coordinate site plan changes with Conservation Commission for field Notice of Intent. Several utility relocations appear to have direct impacts on wetland resource areas.

FC will coordinate with Conservation Commission as needed.

Comment #11

Permits for utilities must be obtained from the DPI, Engineering Division.

The applicant agrees with DPI's comment.

Comment #12

Existing water and sewer services to be capped at the main in accordance with the City Construction Standards.

The applicant agrees with DPI's comment.

Comment #13

Developer to contact DP I's IPP /FOG Engineer for sampling manhole maintenance and inspection permits/requirements.

The applicant agrees with DPI's comment.

Comment #14

Area of impact is greater than one acre. Owner must file a NPDES permit and supply a copy to DPI's Engineering Division. Coordinate sedimentation and erosion control site inspections with DP! Engineering Division.

The applicant agrees with DPI's comment.

Comment #15

Proposed fire hydrants, located on private property must be maintained in accordance with New Bedford Fire Department standards.

The applicant agrees with DPI's comment.

Comment #16

The DPI requires a final plan set to be submitted that reflects all revisions made prior to the start of construction.

The applicant agrees with DPI's comment.

Comment #17

Developer and site contractor must schedule and attend a pre-construction meeting with the DP I's Assistant City Engineer prior to the start of construction.

The applicant agrees with DPI's comment.

Comment #18

Upon completion of work, Engineer and Developer must submit As-built Drawings prior to Certificate of Occupancy being issued.

The applicant agrees with DPI's comment.