

January 30, 2024

Scituate Planning Board
600 Chief Justice Cushing Highway
Scituate, MA 02066

RE: Response to TEC Peer Review
817 Country Way, Assessors Map 12 Lot 2-38-F
Applicant – Option C Properties, LLC

Dear Board Members:

On behalf of the applicant, we hereby submit 9 sets of revised plans (13 will be required for major adjustments) for the above referenced project. The plans will/have been revised in response to Peer Review comments from TEC dated January 18, 2024. The peer review is 18 pages long with the majority of the comments noted as addressed by TEC. There are just a handful of outstanding items, most of which are in a new section at the end of the review in a section titled “New Comments 1-18-24”. We are only including responses to action items in this letter in order to focus on the action items.

TEC comments are in *italics*. Applicant responses are in **bold** type. Plan revisions and responses to comments are as follows:

General Comments:

General Comments

6. *TEC: The Town of Scituate Building Commissioner has made several comments (in a separate correspondence) related to the location, design, and compliance of the provided accessible route. TEC ultimately defers to the Building Commissioner on this issue.*

Responses to the building Commissioner comments are as follows:

A. *Grady set - general*

1. *Title each sheet in lower right corner to correspond with sheet index on Sheet 1.*
 - a. **The plan has been updated.**
2. *Each sheet should have a north arrow.*
 - a. **North arrows are shown on all plan views**

B. *Grady set - barrier-free (wheelchair) site access (as shown on Sheet 7 Grading)*

Most pedestrians and wheelchair users will exit and enter the site to and from the village and/or train station. This path would be safer if Building 2

1. *the road crossing were made on site, not at the Site Road/Country Way (SR/CW) intersection. Suggest route cross from north to south of SR at contour line 24 and proceed down south side to SR to CW. Rework or delete path on north side as needed between HC parking and CW.*

- a. **If a sidewalk is built along Country Way, then pedestrians entering and exiting the site from the village or the train station will cross at least 6 other driveway access points along Country Way. It is not uncommon to have crosswalks across driveways. There are numerous examples throughout the village. Building commissioner agreed this is not required.**

2. *Per code, barrier-free entrance must be main entrance to building. This appears not to be the case for Building B – must be corrected. Unacceptable to run HC access route around back of building, creating several hundred feet of unnecessary travel distance. Remedy could be achieved by the following.*
 - a. **The plans have been revised. Building commissioner agreed that the revised plans comply via email 2024-01-29 (forwarded to town planner).**
3. *In front of Building B, “Proposed Paved Walkway” between contour lines 24 and 28 should incorporate HC accessible ramp. Will need to be switchback to achieve 1:12 with landing max every 30’. Ramp would lead directly to entry patio of Building B at el. 36. Then HC path could proceed toward Building C from there. Ramp would be inboard and separate from sidewalk which would remain as shown for pedestrian traffic.*
 - a. **The plans have been revised. Building commissioner agreed that the revised plans comply via email 2024-01-29 (forwarded to town planner).**
4. *Main accessible route to Building 3 should continue straight to edge of parking lot and cross parking lot via well marked pedestrian crosswalk. Could also bend to south and cross lot at narrower point aligned with main building entrance.*
 - a. **A crosswalk has been added to the plan at the narrowest location that connects to the main building entrance.**
5. *Suggest all crosswalks be done in contrasting materials (brick or cobblestones). Also, may want to introduce speed bumps to control vehicle speed.*
 - a. **This is not a requirement of 521 CMR. Typical crosswalk paint is proposed.**

42. The following comments are regarding the HydroCAD design:

- a. The time of concentration and drainage area for subcatchment 9 is not consistent between sheet 25 and the post HydroCAD.
- b. CB5, CB6, CB9, DMH7, DMH11, and CB13 rim and invert elevations are not consistent between the site plans and HydroCAD. The Applicant should review and revise all structure elevations in HydroCAD.

Grady Consulting: Structure elevations have been revised.

TEC: Comment 43.a. thru 43.r. have been addressed. TEC identified the following data differs between the HydroCAD and the callouts on the Subsurface Drainage BMP Plan.

- a) *Daylight outlet invert from DMH5*
- b) *Primary DMH1 invert at SDA 3*
- c) *Both DMH2 inverts at SDA 1*
- d) *Both DMH6 inverts at SDA 2*
- a. **The Plan has been revised as requested.**

43. The Applicant should update invert data in the Cultec Recharger Data Table.

Grady Consulting: The Cultec Recharger Data Table has been updated.

TEC: The following inconsistencies are present in the Cultec Recharger Table:

- a. *SSD1 outlet size*
- b. *SSD2 outlet size*
- c. *SSD3 outlet elevation and size*

Grady Consulting: The Cultec Recharger Data Table has been updated.

TEC: The following inconsistencies remain present between the Cultec Recharger Table and plan callouts:

- a. *SSD1 outlet elevation*
 - b. *SSD3 outlet elevation and size*
 - c. *SSD4 outlet sizes*
- a. **The Plan has been revised as requested.**

New Comments 1-18-2024:

92. *As currently drawn, the water main conflicts with DMH3 and is located within 4-feet of the northerly property line. TEC is concerned about the feasibility of constructing the water main in this location without impacting trees, vegetation, and the abutting property. Based on the changes to the stormwater system, it appears that running the water main under the site driveway would be feasible. The Applicant should consider relocating the water main under the site driveway.*
- a. **The plans have been revised as requested.**
93. *The discharge point from SSD3 and DMH5 warrants further review. TEC does not recommend daylighting these discharge pipes at the corner of the property in this manner. The Applicant should review if re-use of the existing drain pipe connection to the municipal system is feasible at this location. Additional grading information is needed in this corner of the site.*
- a. **We agree and our preference is to retain the connection. We will retain the connection if the Town and DPW approve of the connection. We have contacted Kevin Cafferty via email and CC'd Town Planner. We are waiting for a response. We request the board approve the plans with a condition that the SSD3 connect to the existing CB via subsurface piping if allowed by DPW.**
94. *A playground structure and gazebo are proposed over SDA#1. Structure foundation details should be added to the plan set to confirm feasibility.*
- a. **The plans have been revised to relocate the gazebo away from the SDA#1 Area. The play structure can be placed without a foundation.**
95. *The proposed snow storage area covers approximately 20 parking spaces and impedes the fire truck turnaround area. Snow storage should be revised.*
- a. **The snow storage has been moved as requested. It no longer conflicts with the fire truck turnaround. A maximum of 14 spaces will be impacted under the current locations. Snow will be removed from the premises if parking is not available for residents.**

96. *The Applicant should confirm if they intend to construct a “dry” sewer connection (for future use) that would connect all 3 buildings to Country Way. It does not appear that this has been included on the plans, though it has been discussed in previous meetings.*

a. **The plans have been revised to include a “dry sewer connection as requested.**

97. *“Sheet 25 – Erosion Control Plan” includes a note that states to retain existing parking for exist building during construction of Building 2, 3 & 4. This note should be updated as building 4 has been eliminated from the project.*

a. **The note has been/will be revised as requested.**

98. *The Applicant should provide a narrative and plan to describe the construction sequencing proposed for the project. Will the entire project be constructed in one phase? Will the tenants of building 1 remain in the building during construction of the other two buildings? Or will the entire site be closed during construction?*

a. **A construction sequence is included on sheet 25. It is difficult to prepare a construction sequence during the permitting phase of a project as the applicant does not know what is going to be approved. A construction sequence should be a construction phase action item that is prepared with the site contractor. We have provided the sequencing based on the available information and forecasted approval.**

Water department comments:

1. Hydrant paint specification has been added to sh 19 as requested.
2. Hydrant detail has been revised. Detail from Town of Scituate specifications is shown on sh 19.
3. Water specifications have been updated and are taken directly from Town of Scituate Specifications.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

GRADY CONSULTING, L.L.C.



Kevin Grady, P.E.,
Principal

Cc: Option C Properties, LLC
Chris Bruce, Manager
P.O. Box 263, Weymouth MA 02190