

Ms. Karen Joseph
Town Planner
Town of Scituate
600 Chief Justice Cushing Highway
Scituate, Massachusetts 02066

March 21, 2024

Re: 817 Country Way
Civil/Stormwater Peer Review #7

Dear Ms. Joseph and Members of the Board:

On behalf of the Town of Scituate, TEC, Inc. (TEC) reviewed documents as part of a civil engineering peer review for the proposed multi-family residential development located at 817 Country Way in Scituate, Massachusetts. Option C Properties, LLC (the "Applicant") submitted the following documents which TEC reviewed for conformance with the Town of Scituate Zoning & Stormwater Bylaws, Massachusetts Stormwater Standards, and generally accepted industry standards:

- *Response to TEC Peer Review, prepared by Grady Consulting, L.L.C, dated March 6, 2024*
- *Country Way Estates Site Plans, prepared by Grady Consulting, L.L.C, revised March 7, 2024*

For consistency, the original comment numbers have been retained from the most recent TEC Peer Review letter dated February 16, 2023. Comments that have previously been noted as resolved have been removed from the list. The Applicant's responses to the comments are shown as **bold**; TEC's responses are shown as *italic*.

Upon review of the documents and plans, TEC has compiled the following comments for the Board's consideration:

Additional Comments 6/22/23

6. The Applicant should confirm that the proposed grading is fully in compliance with Architectural Access Board (AAB) regulations 521 CMR 20.00 and 521 CMR 22.00. Section 20.2 states that an accessible route shall be provided from accessible parking, accessible loading zones, and public streets or sidewalks to the accessible building entrance they serve. Section 22.3 states that walkways with a running slope greater than 5% shall comply with 521 CMR 24.00: Ramps.

Grady Consulting: It is our opinion that the accessible routes only need to be from the accessible spaces to the individual's residence. There does not need to be accessible routes between the buildings as there are no common areas to be shared within any of the buildings. Each building has accessible access to an amenity space via an accessible route. Private residences are not accessible elements.

TEC: TEC disagrees with this opinion. The development is considered a "multiple dwelling" with 3 or more dwelling units (521 CMR 5.00). Multiple dwellings are considered

public buildings, even if privately owned/operated. 521 CMR 10.00 states that public use and common use spaces of multiple dwellings shall comply with 521 CMR. Public and common use spaces include walks, sidewalks, parking lots, etc.

Additionally, Town of Scituate's Zoning Bylaw Section 760.8(F)(2) Parking Design Standards states "Pedestrian access from parking lots must lead directly to a public sidewalk and to the primary building". TEC's interpretation of the local Bylaw is that the pedestrian access is meant to be accessible, meaning that the slope requirements should be provided at 5% or less running slope, or should comply with the requirements of a ramp under 521 CMR 24.00.

TEC does not support the design of the drive aisle, parking spaces, and paved walkway at 9.23%.

Grady Consulting: Accessible routes with suitable slopes are now provided.

TEC: It appears that the accessible route is intended to run behind building 1 & 2. The Applicant should confirm that the 90-foot section of existing asphalt walkway behind building 1 meets ADA requirements. Additionally, the proposed ramp at the back of building 1 is designed with a ~9.67% slope. The maximum allowable running slope on a ramp is 8.33%, with level landings provided every 30-feet.

Grady Consulting: A note has been added to sheet 7 to place a new pavement course. The slope is 0.4%. The walkway meets ADA requirements. The ramp has been revised to meet min/max slopes. Each section of the ramp is 30 ft long or shorter. Level landing areas are provided. A 10-scale detail of the ramp has been added to sh 7. A note has been added to sheet 7 stating "Contractor is responsible to construct accessible routes in compliance with 521 CMR"

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.

TEC: It appears that the design of the accessible ramp requires additional detail. Handrails should be added to the plan to show that adequate width is provided. A level landing is required at the bottom of the ramp, prior to the crosswalk across the driveway.

Grady Consulting: The plans include notes that specify "Proposed Ramp with Railings". Sheet 32 includes details of for the railings. Due to the scale of the plans, additional lines for the location of the rails were not included. Railing lines have now been added (Sh 32 & 33) as requested.

TEC: Railings have been added to the plans on sheets 32 and 33. Comment addressed.

Additional Comments 10/17/23

73. There does not appear to be adequate cover on multiple roof drains. The roof drain at the northeast corner of Building 2 appears to be above grade.

Grady Consulting: Roof drain elevations have been adjusted to the new grading.

TEC: Roof drain with less than 1' of cover is located along the south side of Building 2.

TEC: This comment remains unaddressed.

Grady Consulting: We have revised the roof drain elevations as requested. The grade at the corner has been raised to el=36.0 and the pipe invert is at el=34.9.

TEC: The pipe invert at the corner of the building is 34.4, the top of pipe is 34.9, and proposed grade is 36.0. This provides approximately 1 foot of cover above the pipe. Comment addressed.

New Comments 1-18-2024:

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.

Grady Consulting: We agree and our preference is to retain the connection. We will retain the connection if the Town and DPW approve 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.

TEC: TEC understands that the Applicant is working with DPW to address this issue. TEC views this as a critical issue that must be resolved. The site plans have not been revised to show additional grading in this corner. The Applicant should indicate if any investigations of the existing drainage connections have been performed to confirm the condition/capacity of the existing pipe.

Grady Consulting: The project is no longer proposing to connect directly to the manhole. The project proposes a decrease in flow to the catch basin and therefore has reduced the burden on the outlet pipe.

TEC: Comment addressed. The project is proposing an at-grade discharge of stormwater that will convey runoff, via a rip rap swale, into the existing catch basin. TEC recommends that the Board include a condition of approval that requires a post-construction evaluation of the drainage discharge. If the presence of stormwater runoff at the ground surface presents a safety hazard within the Country Way public right-of-way, the Applicant shall be required to connect to the municipal system via an underground, piped connection.

95. *The proposed snow storage area covers approximately 20 parking spaces and impedes the fire truck turnaround area. Snow storage should be revised.*

Grady Consulting: 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.

TEC: Per the parking calculations on the site plans, 53 spaces are required and 61 are proposed. If 14 spaces are impacted by snow storage, that leaves 47 spaces for the building use. The design does not meet the parking requirements.

Grady Consulting: The snow storage areas have been revised to utilize 5 spaces. This results in a total of 53 spaces available when snow is stored on the property which equals the required parking capacity.

TEC: Comment addressed.

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.*

Grady Consulting: The plans have been revised to include a “dry sewer connection as requested.

TEC: No inverts have been provided for the dry sewer. One of the proposed sewer manholes directly conflicts with the proposed electrical conduit. The plans should provide inverts to confirm there are no conflicts with other stormwater/utilities.

Grady Consulting: The plan and profile were shown on Sh 8 as indicated on the sheet index on Sh 1.

TEC: Comment addressed.

Please do not hesitate to contact me directly if you have any questions concerning our peer review at 978-794-1792. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
TEC, Inc.
“The Engineering Corporation”



Peter F. Ellison, PE
Director of Strategic Land Planning