



March 6, 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) & 1 copy of the stormwater report for the above referenced project. The plans will/have been revised in response to Peer Review comments from TEC dated January 16, 2024 (received 2024-02-20), DPW comments dated 2024-02-15 (received 2024-02-20), Emailed comments from Town Planner, Karen Joseph dated 2024-02-07.

Response to TEC comments are in *italics*. Applicant responses are in **bold underline** type. We are only responding to comments that are requesting response or plan revisions. The comments within the TEC review letter listed as “comment addressed” have been omitted. Plan revisions and responses to comments are as follows:

**TEC Review Comments Dated January 16, 2024:**

General Comments:

*General Comments*

*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.*

**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.**

*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.*

**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.**

92. *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.*

**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.**

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.*

**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.**

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.*

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

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?*

*Grady Consulting: 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.*

*TEC: TEC recommends a condition of approval that requires submission of a detailed construction sequence prior to the start of work.*

**The applicant agrees to this condition.**

**Response to Karen Joseph email February 7, 2024:**

- Note says proposed ramp with railings – graphically railings should be shown on both sides everywhere where a railing is needed. *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) as requested*
- Tactile warning devices should be shown on the plan where there is a handicap ramp. Any tactile devise in the ROW must be the cast iron per DPW standards. **Tactile warning panels have been added to the plan (SH 32) and a detail/specification has been provided by DPW and included on (SH 33).**
- Confirming now that there are two accessible routes – the front route and the back route I will clarify. **There is just 1 main one route along the front of the buildings adjacent to the main driveway. There is also accessibility to the rear of Bld #2.**
- Walks must be 48” wide exclusive of curbing. **All walks are a minimum of 48 inches wide exclusive of curbing.**
- Need a clarification of curbing by handicap parking spaces and walkways. Bituminous berm is not acceptable. **There are details in the top left corner of the site plan. There are no berms to navigate at the accessible aisle.**
- Would be nice not to have double catch basins at end of handicap parking spaces. Is there a way to change that. **There is a double catch is necessary due to rate of runoff. It is our opinion that the basin has been located in an area that does not conflict with accessibility**

Additionally, I have several comments on the latest plan set:

- Are the numbers in the original application for impervious area and clearing still the same? **The impervious area has changed. The total impervious area =49,042 SF. The impervious coverage in the front 30 ft setback is 1102 SF.**
- Where are the affordable units located? Has the monitoring agent been chosen? Is a waiver being requested for some of the information requested in Section 754 of the bylaw being requested at this time? **No waivers are proposed at this time that we are aware of. If there are waivers that you think are needed please advise. The affordable unit's designations have been added to the plan on Sheet 2. A total of 5 units are proposed.**

AFFORDABLE UNIT DESIGNATION

<u>BLD</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u># OF BR</u>
2	1	2
2	6	1
3	2	1
3	8	2
3	13	3

- The rear setback on Sheet 2 does not match the table

**The table on sheet 2 & 3 has been revised.**

- The handicap parking by Building 1 is not 5' behind the front façade per Section 750.8D 1. Are you seeking a waiver for that?

**The Handicap space has been relocated to the east parking lot**

- Are EV charging stations going to be located on the plans? The Board would like some. What would you like to do here? **An EV charging station is proposed, as requested, in the northwest corner of the parking lot.**
- Why is the proposed dry sewer connection shown on the Existing Conditions Plan Sheet 4 of 32 when it is a proposed condition? **The dry sewer has been removed from the existing conditions sheets.**
- The swale/condensers/fence/planting bed/walkway behind Building 2 – does this all work together? Trying to make sure the drainage is not impacted by the other amenities. DRC wants a fence for the condensers here and by Building 3. Planning will agree with DRC. **A privacy fence matching the perimeter fence is proposed to shield the condensers (see SH 30). The condensers sit on an elevated frame and will not interfere with stormwater runoff.**

Response to DPW Memo Dated February 15, 2024

- Existing block catch basin shall be replaced with precast concrete deep sump catch basin.

The site was discharging to this basin along the roadway gutter line in the pre-development.

**The applicant is proposing an overland connection and no longer wishes to connect a pipe to the Catch basin.**

- Existing 12” pipe shall be evaluated; material, pipe condition and capacity  
**We opened the catch basin. There appears to be a 10-inch RCP heading toward Bound Brook. We were unable to locate the end of the outlet pipe. It may connect to a structure that is buried and inaccessible. We did not find an outlet at the bank of the Brook.**
- Evaluate the existing outlet for capacity (existing & proposed conditions)  
**We have reduced the flow to the catch basin. We have reduced the impact to the existing outlet. This outlet is the towns responsibility.**
- What is the disposition on the sump pump pipe at the catch basin.  
**There is an 18” X 18” X 18”+/- sump pit in the northeast corner of the building that exits the building on the north wall.**
- Outlet location of existing pipe shall be shown on plans.  
**We opened the catch basin. There appears to be a 10-inch RCP heading toward Bound Brook. We were unable to locate the end of the outlet pipe. It may connect to a structure that is buried and inaccessible. We did not find an outlet at the bank of the Brook.**
- What is the disposition of the existing dry well.  
**There is no drywell. That is a small manhole that was mis-labeled. The label has been revised.**

Response to DPW Memo Dated February 20, 2024

- Entrance crosswalk to be installed to ADA & MUTCD standards and to be painted with thermoplastic paint  
**A note has been added “Entrance crosswalk to be installed to ADA & MUTCD standards and to be painted with thermoplastic paint” as requested Sh 7 & Sh 32.**
- Vertical granite curb to be installed for the entrance radii.  
**The plan has been revised to use vertical granite curb at the entrance as requested.**
- Concrete handicap ramps to be installed to MassDOT standards on both sides of the entrance including landing pad.  
**The plan has been revised to install concrete ramps as requested.**
- Handicap ramps to include cast iron detectable warning panels.  
**The plan has been revised to propose cast iron detectable warning panels as requested.**

Response to Karen Joseph email February 20, 2024

Additionally, there are several other items which will come up at the meeting this week

including:

- Please supply a full list of waivers and special permits
  - **None Requested**
- The Board will require surety
  - **The amount can be discussed and be a condition of approval**
- Design Review Committee recommendations
  - **Axiom architects has updated the architectural plans in response. The site plans now include condenser locations with fencing as DRC has requested.**
- Sight distance
  - **The driveway has been shifted 10 ft North as requested.**
- Pedestrian circulation
  - **Pedestrian circulation has been provided.**
- Is the Board in agreement with site amenities offered
  - **TBD**
- Treatment of front yards – Sec 751.3E – please verify no more than 25% impervious in front yard
  - **The impervious coverage in the front yard (30' setback = 1102/ 7161 = 15.3%. The front yard has less than 25% impervious coverage.**
- Rendering is misleading as it shows a light-colored sidewalk when sidewalks are proposed to be bituminous concrete.
  - **The plan proposes a mix of concrete ramps and bit conc. Sidewalks.**
- Don't think we have Building 2 roof pitches.
  - **They are shown on sheet A102 of the architectural plan dated 12/2023.**
- Verify trash truck movements
  - **Trash truck movements has been added to sheet 30 as requested.**

#### TEC Review Comments Dated January 20, 2024:

- Sight distance  
**The driveway has been shifted 10 ft North as requested.**

#### Response to water department email dated 1/3/24:

1. Mueller hydrants to be used. No 90-degree mechanical bends  
**The specifications on sh 19 propose mueller hydrants. A note has been added to the hydrant detail that no 90 degree bends are allowed use 2-45 degree bends as requested. The plan is utilizing the detail from the Town of Scituate Water division Specifications dated March 15, 2022 that is posted on the web page.**
2. All water components shall meet the Town of Scituate Water Specification. See hydrant color specification attached.  
**The specifications has been added to sheet 19 as requested.**

#### Response to water department email dated 2/6/24:

Sewer offers the following additional comments:

- All sewer mains and structures to be designed and constructed using TR16 guidelines for sanitary sewers and wastewater collection.
- 6" Sewer pipe fittings shall be limited to maximum 22 degrees angle change with a minimum of 3 feet between fittings.
- Manhole structures must be fitted with gasketed water tight bolt down covers or approved equal.
- All structures and mains to be pressure and vacuum tested.
- Owner responsible for ensuring pipes and structures installed and maintained on site remain free from inflows and infiltration.
- Location, elevation, and type of potential future sewer in road to be determined, the Town makes no guarantee that sewer will be available, nor can the Town guarantee what the depth or type of collection piping might exist in the future.

**The above notes and sewer manhole detail have been added to SH 34 of the site plan.**

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