

4/28/08  
5

---

---

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

---

---

**TO:** STEVEN LEDOUX, TOWN MANAGER  
**FROM:** ROBERT C. CRAIG, FIRE CHIEF  
**SUBJECT:** 2008 CLASS I AND II LICNSE RENEWALS-56 & 60 POWDER MILL ROAD, SITE PLAN  
AMENDMENT REQUEST- 60 POWDER MILL ROAD (# 2/19/03-388)  
3/31/08 LETTER FROM MARK T. DONOHOE OF ACTON SURVEY & ENGINEERING ON  
BEHALF OF AUTOPLEX REALTY, LLC (BERTOLAMI)  
**DATE:** APRIL 24, 2008  
**CC:** ROLAND BARTL, AICP, PLANNING DIRECTOR

---

Similar to the Planning Director, I also reviewed the above named letter submitted by Mr. Mark Donohoe on 3/31/08. I would like to state that I fully concur with the Planning Directors letter of response of April 23, 2008. The letter was accurate as to the situation at hand regarding this particular site. Since the last Board of Selectmen meeting relative to this matter, I once again met with Mr. Bertolami's engineer to receive his preliminary submittal in the form of a plan and his explanation. This information was formally transmitted in the form of a written submittal and presentation of a possible resolution to the Board of Selectmen. At the time of my meeting with Mr. Donohoe, I told him that I would take his submittal under advisement and later telephoned him to verify that he would submit a formal proposal and I would most likely be asked to review and comment on that submittal at that time, which is the reason for this memo.

My brief response in this matter is that I would refer back to my opinion that was previously expressed in my memo of February 25, 2008. The offer to add a hydrant on the property, while being advantageous for any fire suppression operations on that property or nearby properties has no direct bearing on the issue of the ramp that is required by the site plan and which I commented on in my earlier memo. In addition, while Mr. Donohoe does address the turning and maneuvering of fire and emergency apparatus according to design standards and speaks of pavement striping for fire lane purposes, this scenario is still not as advantageous as a cross-connection and a second means of approach to the site. Certainly backing and turning apparatus, especially under emergency conditions is not as desirable. In summary then, while the addition of a fire hydrant would be advantageous and the delineation of a fire lane by striping would be beneficial, these possible resolutions do not fully address the maneuvering of apparatus and a second means of approach to the structures that the ramp as presently required would provide.