EXHIBIT 6

RECEIVED

AUG 8 2018

PLANNING BOARD
GRAFTON, MA

COPY

GRAVES ENGINEERING, Inc.
100 GROVE ST | WORCESTER, MA 01605
T 508-856-0321
F 508-856-0357
gravesengineering.com

August 8, 2018

Joseph Laydon
Town Planner
Grafton Municipal Center
30 Providence Road
Grafton, MA 01519

Subject: **15 Meadowbrook Road**
Preliminary Plan Review

Dear Joe:

We received the following documents in our office on July 23, 2018:

- Plans entitled Preliminary Plan, Sugar Reality Trust, 15 Meadowbrook Road, Grafton MA dated June 8, 2018 prepared by Summit Engineering & Surveying, Inc. for Robert Flynn. (4 sheets)
- Bound document entitled Application of Approval of a Preliminary Plan, 15 Meadowbrook Road, Grafton dated June 1, 2018, with attachments.

Graves Engineering, Inc. (GEI) has been requested to review and comment on the plans' conformance with applicable "Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land; Grafton, Massachusetts" revised through April 27, 2009; "Grafton Zoning By-Law" amended through May 14, 2018 and standard engineering practices.

Our comments follow:

Zoning By-Laws

1. The project is located in Low Density Residential (R-40) Zoning District. The zoning summary table provided on Sheet 1 shows the minimum frontage of a lot as 130 feet. The minimum frontage is 140 feet for this zoning district. (§3.2.3.2)

Subdivision Rules & Regulations

2. On Sheet 1 of the plans, the scale of 1"=40' noted at the bottom-right corner of the sheet needs to be corrected to 1"=60'. GEI has no issue with this preliminary plan being prepared at a scale of 1"=60' but any definitive plans will have to be at a scale of 1"=40'. (§3.2.2 & §3.3.2.1)

3. Sheet 2 (Concept Plan A With Waivers) does not contain proposed finished grades of the roadway. Cross-slope adjustments will need to be made to the existing pavement surface to direct stormwater runoff to the roadside swale. If acceptable to the Planning Board, this level of detail could be addressed at the definitive plan stage if the project is to be developed under this option. (§3.2.4.1.k)

4. Underground utilities were not included in the plans. (§3.2.4.1.k)

5. On Sheet 4, a vertical curve length or "K" value was not provided for Concept Plan A or Concept Plan B. A vertical curve is required when the change in grade exceeds one-half of one percent (0.5%). GEI is concerned about the potential for emergency vehicles to "bottom out" at the project entrance and/or at the change in grade at station 1+30+/-. (§4.1.5.3 & §4.12.1.5)

6. On Sheet 4, the Concept Plan B profile proposes a leveling zone (3% maximum road grade) for 76+/- feet as measured from the Meadowbrook Road right-of-way. A leveling zone of at least 100 feet is required. (§4.1.5.6.a)

7. GEI understands that the waiver requests pertain to the proposed subdivision as presented on Concept Plan A. Except for Waiver Request 7 (vertical curve requirements) and Waiver Request 8 (length of required leveling area) GEI does not have any engineering-related issues with the waiver requests. Relative to Waiver Requests 7 and 8, sufficient vertical curves and a leveling zone need to be provided to allow unimpeded emergency vehicle access to and from the site.

8. Whereas Concept Plan A includes waiver requests and the construction of a way essentially in accordance with common driveway requirements, the Planning Board should consider conditioning its decision such that the Town will not become responsible for ownership and maintenance of the road if it is constructed as a common driveway. Such construction would require road maintenance services that are more demanding than standard subdivision streets (e.g. maintenance of roadside swales, less maneuvering area for snow removal equipment at the turnaround).

General Engineering Comments

9. At the end of the road, both Concept Plan A and Concept Plan B need to provide a vehicle turnaround whereby the cross-slope of the vehicle is no greater than 4% throughout the turnaround maneuvers. This is typically accomplished by setting the road centerline grade to no more than 4% through a turnaround. The road centerline grades are up to approximately 7% through the turnarounds.

10. On Concept Plan A, it appears that the turnaround will accommodate the fire department's pumper trucks but not the ladder truck. The northwest leg of the turnaround may have to be lengthened. If not already done, the Planning Board may wish to solicit comments from the Fire Department.

General Comments

11. On Sheet 1, the typographic error in Plan Note 7 (Plan Book *42*) needs to be corrected. The plan recorded at Plan Book 42, Page 107 is property in another community.

We trust this letter addresses your review requirements. Feel free to contact this office if you have any questions or comments.

Very truly yours,
Graves Engineering, Inc.

Jeffrey M. Walsh, P.E.
Vice President

cc: Andrew Baum, P.E.; Summit Engineering & Survey, Inc.