

June 4, 2020

Pembroke Planning Board  
Town Hall  
100 Center Street  
Pembroke, MA 02359

ATTN: Matthew Heins, Planning Board Assistant

**RE: Site Plan Review  
50 Mattakeesett Street  
Pembroke, Massachusetts**

Dear Matthew and Board Members:

As requested, Merrill Engineers and Land Surveyors has performed a site inspection and reviewed the most recent submission for consistency with the Pembroke Zoning Bylaws and the Planning Board Rules and Regulations Governing the Issuance of Site Plan Approval for the above-referenced project. The information submitted to this office and reviewed is as follows:

TITLE:	Proposed Site Plan 50 Mattakeesett Street Pembroke, Massachusetts
APPLICANT:	Mike Bulman
OWNERS:	JPC/Pembroke Realty Trust
PLANS:	Proposed Site Plan 50 Mattakeesett Street Pembroke, Massachusetts Engineer: Morse Engineering Co. Inc. Dated: February 3, 2020 (4 Sheets) Revised: May 28, 2020 (5 Sheets)
STORMWATER CALCULATIONS:	Stormwater Calculations & Report 50 Mattakeesett Street Pembroke, Massachusetts Engineer: Morse Engineering Co. Inc. Dated: February 7, 2020 Revised: May 28, 2020

The site is located on the southerly side of Mattakeesett Street (Route 14) approximately 1,200 feet west of the intersection of Center Street and Mattakeesett Street. The property is located within the Center Protection District and the Residential A District as well as the Well Head Protection Zone III. It consists of approximately 65,390 square feet or 1.5 acres. Access to the site is provided by a single driveway from Mattakeesett Street. The site is currently occupied by a 4,968 square foot office building with associated paved parking and loading areas, septic system, underground utilities and stormwater leaching catch basins.

The project proposes to retain the existing building and to construct a 4,000 square foot warehouse at the southerly side of the existing parking area. The project also includes the construction of stormwater management facilities and the relocation of one of the existing septic system leaching trenches. The proposed stormwater management system for this project consists of a subsurface infiltration system for the roof runoff from the storage units and a stormwater rain garden located at the rear of the property.

The following report summarizes our review with respect to the Zoning Bylaws and the Planning Board Rules and Regulations Governing the Issuance of Site Plan Approval. The format of this report will follow the format and sections outlined in the Zoning Bylaw and the Planning Board Rules and Regulations Governing the Issuance of Site Plan Approval. The report does not include a review of the proposed septic system design.

Our original comments are presented below in normal text with our updated comments, if any, presented in ***bold and italic text***.

## **ZONING BYLAWS**

### **Section IV. Use and Dimensional Regulations**

- 7.A. The project proposes to construct a 4,000 square foot warehouse at the southerly side of the existing parking area. The Planning Board should determine whether this is an allowed use in the Center Protection District.
- 7.D.11. “Along any rear or side lot line that abuts a residential or municipal use there shall be planted a natural hedge greater than six (6) feet in height and located within ten (10) feet of said lot line except by special permit.” The limit of clearing associated with the construction of the proposed rain garden is approximately 20 feet from the side property line and adjacent residential uses on Grove Street. The Planning Board should determine if additional screening is necessary.

***The plan has been revised to provide a row of 5'-6' evergreen plantings along the westerly limit of work adjacent residential uses on Grove Street. The Planning Board should determine whether additional screening is necessary.***

### **Section V. Special Provisions, Standards and Procedures**

- 4.A. “All new or substantially altered uses or structures shall be provided with paved off-street automobile parking facilities...” The purpose of the 17 foot wide gravel drive adjacent to the storage units is unclear and the Planning Board should determine if the use of gravel instead of bituminous concrete pavement is acceptable.

Morse Engineering Co. Inc. (MEC) has stated that the 17 foot wide gravel drive is to provide emergency access to the rear of the proposed warehouse as well as access to the proposed rain garden. The Planning Board should determine if the use of gravel instead of bituminous concrete pavement is acceptable.

***The overhead door on the easterly side of the proposed building has been eliminated and normal vehicle access to the building from this drive is not anticipated and the drive will be used as emergency access. This access drive has been increased in width from 17 feet to 24 feet and the construction material has been revised from gravel to reclaimed asphalt. We recommend that the width be clearly specified on the plan. Morse Engineering Co. Inc.***

***(MEC) has stated that the use of reclaimed asphalt has been endorsed by the Fire Department. The Planning Board should determine if the use of reclaimed asphalt instead of bituminous concrete pavement is acceptable.***

- 7.F.9. An approved site plan shall be recorded with the Plymouth County Registry of Deeds and consequently needs to be prepared to Registry standards. There are a number of instances where this plan is not in compliance with the Registry Plan Regulations and should be revised as necessary.

***The plan has been revised to be in compliance with the Registry Plan Regulations. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

## **RULES AND REGULATIONS GOVERNING SITE PLAN APPROVAL**

### **Summary of Requested Waivers**

The following waivers have been requested from the Planning Board Rules & Regulations Governing the Issuance of Site Plan Approval.

#### **Section IV – Site Plan Content**

4.15 A Development Impact Statement.

4.22 Traffic Impact Study

#### **Section V – Requirements**

5.1.6 Requirement for a minimum 50 foot landscape buffer strip to protect neighboring residential properties.

#### **Section VI – Development Impact Statement**

We recommend that all waivers that are granted by the Planning Board be specified on the cover sheet of the approved Site Plans.

Based upon the March 2, 2020 response letter from Morse Engineering Co. Inc. (MEC) it appears that some additional waivers are being requested. We recommend that a comprehensive Letter of Waiver Requests be submitted for the Planning Board consideration. If the project is approved by the Planning Board, we recommend that all waivers that are granted by the Planning Board be specified on the cover sheet.

***A comprehensive Letter of Waiver Requests has been submitted for the Planning Board consideration and all waiver requests are specified on the cover sheet. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

### **Section IV. Site Plan Content**

- 4.7 No Landscaping Plan prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect has been provided as required by the Regulations.

A Landscape Plan has been added to the site plan; however, it has not been prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect as required. The plan presents a table listing the specific type of plant, size and number for the planting within the proposed rain garden.

---

We recommend that a table also be presented to include a listing the specific type of plant, size and number for the other proposed plantings.

***A table has been added to the plan to include a listing the specific type of plant, size and number for the other proposed plantings as recommended. The applicant has requested a waiver from the requirement that the Landscape Plan be prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect.***

- 4.8 The location of the electric service, water service and sanitary sewer for the proposed warehouse building should be shown on the plan. If no sanitary facilities are proposed, it should be stated on the plan.

***The plan has been revised to show the location of the proposed electric service and water service. In addition, a note has been added to the plan stating that no sanitary facilities are proposed for the proposed warehouse. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- 4.9 A Zoning Table is presented on sheet 3 of the plans as required.

- 4.10 Plans showing front, rear and side elevations of the proposed warehouse has been submitted. We recommend that building materials and colors also be specified.

A note has been added to sheet 3 of the plans stating that the "Front of warehouse shall be wooden façade and remainder of building shall be metal". MEC has also stated that the colors are yet to be decided. This information should be provided to the Planning as soon as it is available.

***Revised architectural plans have been submitted and MEC has stated that the building material will be wood and that the color scheme will match the existing building on the site. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- 4.11 The plans show the location of the existing dumpster at the easterly end of the parking area. It is assumed that this dumpster will be utilized by people using the warehouse if necessary. We recommend that the applicant address the method of trash removal.

***A note has been added to sheet 3 of the plans stating that the "Existing dumpster shall service trash removal for prop. warehouse if necessary. (Prop. warehouse is intended to generate minimal trash.)"***

- 4.13 A proposed gravel drive is shown on the easterly and southerly side of the proposed warehouse. It is not clear whether the gravel drive extends in front of the warehouse as well; however, the architectural plans show an overhead door and person door located in the front. The limit of the gravel drive should be clarified. In addition, the architectural plans show an overhead door on the easterly side of the building and the 15 foot wide gravel drive does not appear to provide area for any vehicle turning movements which would be required for entering or exiting in the building. We recommend that this area be reviewed and revised as necessary.

The plan has been revised to show a proposed paved area in front of the proposed warehouse and the limit of the proposed gravel area is has been clarified. MEC has stated that the overhead door on the easterly side of the proposed warehouse shall be

used for periodic access by employees but it is not clear whether access using trucks is being considered. This should be addressed by the applicant or the engineer.

***The overhead door on the easterly side of the proposed building has been eliminated and vehicle turning movements at this location is no longer an issue for access to the building. Access for emergency vehicles should be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department.***

- 4.15 A Development Impact Statement has not been submitted as required. The applicant has requested a waiver of this requirement.
- 4.16 The design plans have been stamped and signed by a registered Professional Engineer but not by a registered Professional Land Surveyor as required. A Professional Land Surveyor's certification as to the accuracy of the location of the buildings, etc. has not been presented on the plans as required and should be provided.

The design plans have now been stamped and signed by a registered Professional Land Surveyor as required; however, we were not able to find the Professional Land Surveyor's certification as to the accuracy of the location of the buildings, etc. and this should also be presented on the plans as required.

***A Professional Land Surveyor's certification has been added to the plan. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- 4.18 The dimensions and square footage of the proposed warehouse building should be presented on the plans as required. In addition, the floor plans should also be provided.

The dimensions and square footage of the proposed warehouse building have been added to the plans. MEC has stated that the floor plans will be submitted under separate cover. This information should be provided to the Planning as soon as it is available.

***Revised architectural plans have been submitted including the floor plans. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- 4.19 A proposed silt fence erosion control barrier is shown on sheet 4 of the plans. We recommend that this erosion control barrier consist of a silk sock and be extended around the easterly side of the proposed limit of work to include the relocated leaching trench for the septic system as well as the proposed 97 contour.

***The plan has been revised to specify a silt sock erosion control barrier extending to the limit recommended above. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- 4.21 Wall Pack lighting is proposed on three (3) corners of the building. A Photometric Plan as well as details of the proposed lighting should be provided.

MEC has stated that a waiver is now being requested from the requirement for a Photometric Plan. We recommend that a comprehensive Letter of Waiver Requests be submitted for the Planning Board consideration.

***A comprehensive Letter of Waiver Requests has been submitted for the Planning Board consideration and all waiver requests are specified on the cover sheet. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- 4.22 A Traffic Impact Study has not been submitted. The applicant has requested a waiver of this requirement. We recommend that, as a minimum, Vehicle Trip Generation Estimates using information from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual should be submitted for this project.

***MEC has stated that no new vehicle trips are expected as a result of the proposed warehouse. We recommend that this be discussed further at the Public Hearing.***

## **Section V. Requirements**

- 5.1 No Landscaping Plan prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect has been provided as required by the Regulations.

A Landscape Plan has been added to the site plan; however, it has not been prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect as required. The plan presents a table listing the specific type of plant, size and number for the planting within the proposed rain garden. We recommend that a table also be presented to include a listing the specific type of plant, size and number for the other proposed plantings.

***A table has been added to the plan to include a listing the specific type of plant, size and number for the other proposed plantings as recommended. The applicant has requested a waiver from the requirement that the Landscape Plan be prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect.***

- 5.1.2 The Regulations require a 3 foot wide landscaping strip along foundation walls. Some foundation plantings are shown on one of the architectural plans; however, the plantings do not appear on all architectural plans or on the site plan nor is any other information provided.

A Landscape Plan has been added to the site plan and no 3 foot wide landscaping strip along the foundation walls is shown. If no 3 foot wide landscaping strip along the foundation walls is proposed, the architectural plan should be revised and a waiver request for this requirement should be submitted. We recommend that a comprehensive letter of Waiver Requests be submitted for the Planning Board consideration.

***A 3 foot wide landscaping strip is now proposed for the front of the building and the applicant has requested a waiver from the requirement of a 3 foot wide landscaping strip along the sides and rear of the proposed building.***

- 5.1.6 A 50 foot landscape buffer to residential properties is not provided as required. The limit of clearing associated with the construction of the proposed rain garden is approximately 20 feet from the side property line and adjacent residential uses on Grove Street. The applicant has requested a waiver of this requirement.
- 5.2 Wall Pack lighting is proposed on sheet 3 of the plans; however, no photometric plan nor specific fixture details are provided as required. This information should be submitted.

MEC has stated that a waiver is now being requested from the requirement for a Photometric Plan. We recommend that a comprehensive letter of Waiver Requests be submitted for the Planning Board consideration.



***A comprehensive Letter of Waiver Requests has been submitted for the Planning Board consideration and all waiver requests are specified on the cover sheet. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- 5.3 A Stormwater Calculations & Report has been submitted in support of the proposed project as required. We offer the following comments regarding the drainage design and analysis:

- We recommend that the time of concentration (Tc) flow paths as well as the soil types be shown on the Watershed Plans.

***The Watershed Plans have been revised to show the time of concentration (Tc) flow paths as well as the soil types. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- The NRCS soil map indicate soils with both a Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) 'A' and HSG 'B' are located on the site. The HydroCAD analysis should be revised to reflect this condition.

***The HydroCAD analysis has been revised to reflect to appropriate Hydrologic Soil Groups. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- The Watershed Plans from the December 26, 2018 submittal for this site are still presented in the latest submittal of the Stormwater Calculations & Report and should be removed.

***The outdated Watershed Plans have been removed from the Stormwater Calculations & Report. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- A 50-foot setback is not provided from the proposed rain garden to the existing septic soil absorption system on the site. It appears that only one leaching trench of the system is being relocated. The Stormwater Management Regulations require a minimum setback of 50 feet and we recommend that the plans be revised to address this setback requirement.

***The plans have been revised to propose the relocation of a portion of the existing septic soil absorption system and provide the required minimum setback of 50 feet to the proposed rain garden. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- Soil testing has been performed at two (2) location on the site. We recommend that an additional soil test be performed within the limits of the rain garden and the roof drywell system to demonstrate that adequate soils are present for recharge and to confirm the Estimated Seasonal High Groundwater Elevation (ESHGW) used in the stormwater calculations.

***MEC has stated that additional soil testing will be performed at the time of construction and that the existing soil testing is in the immediate area of the proposed drainage system. We note that no soil testing is actually located within the limits of either the rain garden or the subsurface roof drywell system. If the Planning Board agrees that the additional soil testing can be performed at the time of construction, we recommend that the soil testing be performed immediately after the erosion control barrier has been***

---

***placed and that the results of the soil testing be submitted for review and approval before any other construction occurs. If this project is approved, we recommend that this be made a Condition of Approval.***

- Groundwater separation is less than four (4) feet at the proposed rain garden and the proposed roof drywell system based on the information provided. As specified in the Mass DEP Stormwater Handbook, in order to take credit for exfiltration during the storm for the 10 year and larger storm event, as done in the calculations, either four feet of separation is required or a mounding analysis should be performed.

***An acceptable mounding analysis has been included in the Stormwater Calculations & Report. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- Elevation information and a cross-sections/details for the proposed roof drywell system is shown on sheet 4 of the plans. The cross-sections/details should specify the elevations of each of the components of the systems as well as the peak water surface elevation for the various storm events. In addition, the Estimated Seasonal High Groundwater Elevation (ESHGW) at the systems should be shown.

***The recommended information has been added to the plan. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- The slope and invert information for the overflow pipe from the roof drywell system to the proposed rain garden should be specified on the plan.

***Slope and invert information for the overflow pipe from the roof drywell system to the proposed rain garden has been specified on the plan. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- The site plan shows a 6 inch ADS overflow pipe from the roof drywell system to the proposed rain garden. It does not appear that the HydroCAD model incorporates this overflow pipe into the analysis. This should be reviewed and revised as necessary. In addition, the HydroCAD analysis shows that the overflows will be directed to Design Point 1 (DP-10); however, based on the information shown on the plan these overflows will be directed into the rain garden. The HydroCAD analysis should be revised to take this into consideration.

***The plan has been revised to now propose a 4 inch ADS overflow pipe from the roof drywell system to the proposed rain garden and the HydroCAD analysis has been revised as recommended above. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- We recommend that the ADS overflow pipe discharging into the rain garden be equipped with a flared end section with a riprap erosion control pad. We recommend that this be graphically shown on the plan and that a detail of both the flared end section and rip-rap erosion control pad be provided. The detail should include the size and depth of the stone at the flared end section.

***A note has been added to the plan specifying that the ADS overflow pipe discharging into the rain garden shall be equipped with a flared end section***



***with a riprap erosion control pad as recommended. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- A detail/cross section of the proposed rip-rap spillway at the rain garden and the rain garden itself should be shown on the plan. We do recommend that the spillway be equipped with concrete weir to ensure that flow out of the rain gardens does not occur prior to the elevation specified in the design and stormwater calculations.

The plan has been revised to add a detail/cross section of the proposed rip-rap spillway at the rain garden and the rain garden. In addition, a concrete weir is now proposed as part of the spillway. The spillway elevation of 93.0 is specified and consequently additional proposed grading/contours at the spillway discharge point are required. The limits of the rip-rap at the spillway should also be shown on the detail/cross section as well as in the plan view. The width of the spillway shown on the detail/cross section and that used in the HydroCAD analysis do not agree. This should be reviewed and revised as necessary.

***Additional proposed grading/contours at the spillway discharge point have been added to the plan as required and the limits of the rip-rap at the spillway have been shown on the detail/cross section as well as in the plan view. In addition, the width of the spillway shown on the detail/cross section and that used in the HydroCAD analysis have been revised and now agree. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- We recommend that the design of the rain garden be reviewed and revised to provide a minimum of 1 foot of freeboard for the 100 year storm event and that the width of the berm be clearly specified. Spot grades of elevation are shown on the plan which indicated that the elevation 94 contour should be shown.

The design has been revised to provide a minimum of 1 foot of freeboard for the 100 year storm event as recommended. The width of the berm is clearly specified as 10 feet on the detail/cross section presented on sheet 4 of the plans; however, the proposed grading of the berm for the rain garden does not agree with the detail and should be revised as necessary.

***The plan and detail have been revised to clearly show a top of berm width of 6'-0". Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- The site is located in the Water Resource and Groundwater Protection District Zone III and consequently pre-treatment of 44% is required prior to discharge into the rain garden as specified in the Mass DEP Stormwater Regulations.

The proposed stormwater management system has been revised to provide the required pre-treatment of 44% with the use of a pea-stone diaphragm and sediment forebay. The grading of the proposed drive should be reviewed and revised to clearly demonstrate that all runoff from the drive will be directed to the sediment forebay. The dimensions, stone size and limits of the pea-stone diaphragm should also be added to the plan.

***The grading of the proposed drive has revised to clearly demonstrate that all runoff from the drive will be directed to the sediment forebay. A detail of***

***the pea-stone diaphragm has been added to the plan showing the dimensions and stone size. The limits of the pea-stone diaphragm have been added to the plan. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- We do not recommend the use of gravel for surface treatment since the proposed rain garden may become silted up over time with material from this area.

***The overhead door on the easterly side of the proposed building has been eliminated and normal vehicle access to the building from this drive is not anticipated and the drive will be used as emergency access. The surface treatment for this emergency access has been revised from gravel to reclaimed asphalt. The Planning Board should determine if the use of reclaimed asphalt instead of bituminous concrete pavement is acceptable.***

- A planting plan should be provided for the rain garden specifying plant number, size and species.

***As recommended, a planting plan has been provided for the rain garden specifying plant number, size and species. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- We recommend that additional spot grades be presented on the plan to clearly show the direction of the intended stormwater runoff flow paths.

Additional spot grades are now presented on the plan. As stated above, the grading of the proposed drive should be reviewed and revised to clearly demonstrate that all runoff from the drive will be directed to the sediment forebay.

***The grading of the proposed drive has revised to clearly demonstrate that all runoff from the drive will be directed to the sediment forebay. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

- We recommend that the Stormwater Calculations & Report contain a MassDEP "Checklist for Stormwater Report".

***A MassDEP "Checklist for Stormwater Report" is now presented in the Stormwater Calculations & Report. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

It is general practice to design sites to comply with Massachusetts DEP Stormwater Management Regulations. The following section describes the 10 Standards for compliance with Stormwater Management Regulations and the status of the submittal relative to each standard.

**Standard 1 – Untreated Stormwater**  
Additional Information required.

***Additional acceptable information has been submitted. This Standard has been met.***

---

Standard 2 – Post Development Peak Discharge Rates

Additional Information required.

***Additional acceptable information has been submitted. This Standard has been met.***

Standard 3 – Recharge to Groundwater

Additional Information required.

***Additional acceptable information has been submitted. This Standard has been met.***

Standard 4 – 80% Total Suspended Solids (TSS) Removal

Calculations have not been submitted demonstrating that a TSS removal of 80% is provided for the proposed stormwater system. The site is located in the Water Resource and Groundwater Protection District Zone III and consequently pre-treatment of 44% and is required prior to discharge into the rain garden as specified in the Mass DEP Stormwater Regulations. Also, the calculations use 0.5 inches of runoff for the calculation of the required Water Quality Treatment Volume; however, 1.0 inch of runoff should be used and the calculations should be revised as necessary. Additional information required.

***Additional acceptable information has been submitted. This Standard has been met.***

Standard 5 – Higher Potential Pollutant Loads

This project is not considered a source of higher pollutant loads. This standard is not applicable.

Standard 6 – Protection of Critical Areas

The site is located in the Water Resource and Groundwater Protection District Zone III and consequently additional treatment is required. See comments in other sections of this report. Additional information required.

***Additional acceptable information has been submitted. This Standard has been met.***

Standard 7 – Redevelopment Projects

This project is not considered a redevelopment project and consequently this standard is not applicable.

Standard 8 – Erosion/Sediment Control

A proposed silt fence erosion control barrier is shown on sheet 4 of the plans. We recommend that this erosion control barrier consist of a silk sock and be extended around the easterly side of the proposed limit of work to include the relocated leaching trench for the septic system as well as the proposed 97 contour. Additional Information required.

***The plan has been revised to specify a silt sock erosion control barrier extending to the limit recommended above. Additional acceptable information has been submitted. This Standard has been met.***

Standard 9 – Operation and Maintenance Plan

An Operation and Maintenance Plan has been provided as required. This Standard has been met.

**Standard 10 – Illicit Discharges**

In order to meet this standard, an “Illicit Discharge Compliance Statement” meeting the requirements specified in the Stormwater Management Regulations has been submitted. This Standard has been met.

- 5.6 The plan proposes a gravel drive along the easterly and southerly side of the proposed warehouse building and we recommend that the plan be revised to show that the drive be bituminous concrete. The use of a bituminous concrete berm may be appropriate at this location but would require a waiver. The Regulations require that curbing be placed at the edges of all paved surfaces and that the curbing not be bituminous concrete.

***The overhead door on the easterly side of the proposed building has been eliminated and normal vehicle access to the building from this drive is not anticipated and the drive will be used as emergency access. The surface treatment for this emergency access has been revised from gravel to reclaimed asphalt. The Planning Board should determine if the use of reclaimed asphalt instead of bituminous concrete pavement is acceptable.***

**Section VI. Development Impact Statement**

A Development Impact Statement has not been submitted as required. The applicant has requested a waiver of this requirement.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

1. We recommend that the proposed tree line be revised to account for the proposed relocated leaching trench for the subsurface sewage disposal system.

The proposed tree line has been revised to account for the proposed relocated leaching trench for the subsurface sewage disposal system as recommended. Due to the necessary additional proposed grading/contours revisions at the spillway discharge point for the rain garden, the limit of the proposed tree line may require additional revisions.

***The proposed tree line has been revised as necessary. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

2. The plan shows the proposed 97 contour in front of the warehouse building extending into the existing pavement. If this is case, we recommend that a saw cut line be shown on the plan to delineate the limit of construction within the existing pavement.

***The plan has been revised to eliminate work within the existing pavement. Comment satisfactorily addressed.***

3. The plans should be reviewed by the Pembroke Fire Department relative to access and fire protection.
4. The design of the proposed septic system will need to be reviewed and approved by the Pembroke Board of Health.

- 5. The surface treatment for the access drive along the easterly side and southerly side of the proposed warehouse is now specified as reclaimed asphalt and the stormwater calculations use a Runoff Curve (CN) number of 92. This material can become extremely compacted over time and we recommend that the design engineer provide documentation for the use of this CN number.**

We would be happy to discuss these comments with the MEC and or the applicant at their earliest convenience. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Very truly yours,

MERRILL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS



---

Peter G. Palmieri, P.E.  
Director of Engineering

cc:     Pembroke Fire Department  
        Morse Engineering Co. Inc.

H:19002\Documents\Site Plan Review, 6-04-20.doc