AMORY ENGINEERS, P.C.

WATER WORKS • WATER RESOURCES • CIVIL WORKS

25 DEPOT STREET, P.O. BOX 1768
DUXBURY, MASSACHUSETTS 02331-1768

TEL.: 781-934-0178 • FAX: 781-934-6499
WWW.AMORYENGINEERS.COM

April 14, 2021

Cohasset Planning Board
Cohasset Zoning Board of Appeals
41 Highland Avenue
Cohasset, MA 02025

Subject: **147 South Main Street – Special Permits and Site Plan Review**

Dear Planning and Zoning Board Members:

This is to advise that we have reviewed the following documents in support of the applications for Special Permits and Site Plan Review for a new mixed-use building at 147 South Main Street:

- Site Plan – Proposed Redevelopment, 147 South Main Street (7 sheets), revised April 12, 2021, prepared by Morse Engineering Company, Inc. (Morse)
- Architectural drawings - ZBA Set – 4/12/21 (5 sheets) prepared by Rockwood Design, Inc.
- Stormwater Permit Application Package, revised April 12, 2021, prepared by Morse
- Letter – Response to Peer Review Comments, dated April 13, 2021, prepared by Morse

The documents have been prepared to address comments contained in our April 8, 2021 letter to the Boards as well as comments provided at the Zoning Board of Appeals hearing on April 6, 2021. Below are our original comments in plain text, followed by the current status of each in **bold text**.

1. The proposed retail/office space area needs to be clarified. It is listed as 2,700 s.f. on the Site Plan and in footnotes in both of Attorney Brodsky's letters; 2,031 s.f. in the body of both of Attorney Brodsky's letters and the original architectural plans, and the 'revised' architectural plans have incorrect areas and are not to scale. This area is necessary in order to accurately calculate the required parking spaces. **Addressed – the Site Plan and Architectural plans have been revised to be consistent noting that the proposed office/retail space is 2,149 square feet (s.f.).**

2. The Site Plan and 'revised' architectural plans are inconsistent. The Site Plan shows landscaped areas in front of some of the entrance doors and decks, which are not shown on the architectural plans, off the rear of the building. Updated sets of both plans should be provided. **Addressed – the Site Plan has been revised to show walks in locations consistent with the revised Architectural plans. Decks are not proposed off the rear of the building.**

3. The flood zone boundaries should be shown on the Site Plan and the flood map reference should be updated to reflect the Letters of Map Revision that have been issued for this

area (16-01-063P effective March 21, 2017 and 18-01-0234P effective January 19, 2018). **Addressed – the flood zone boundary is shown on the revised Site Plan and the references to the Letters of Map Revision are noted on the plan.**

4. We note that essentially the entire site will be filled and the elevation raised by one to two feet. In accordance with ZBL §300-9.7.H(3) the Applicant's engineer should provide documentation that the filling in the flood zone will not adversely affect the adjacent properties and that compensatory flood storage is not required. **In the response, Morse notes that the proposed fill has been reduced and the project will not adversely impact adjacent properties because post-development runoff will be reduced due to a reduction in the impervious area on site and the implementation of stormwater BMP's. Morse also notes that the property is "considered land subject to coastal storm flowage because there is a hydraulic connection to Cohasset Harbor, and therefore compensatory storage is not required." We agree that compensatory storage is not required in land subject to coastal storm flowage due to the ocean being the source of flooding.**

5. Proposed erosion controls should be shown and detailed on the plan to ensure compliance with §300-12.6.B(3). The Construction Phase Operation & Maintenance Plan references an erosion control barrier and stabilized construction entrance. Silt sacks should also be installed in nearby catch basins that could collect runoff from the site. **Addressed – an Erosion Control Plan (Sheet 3) has been added to the Site Plan which details and specifies the erosion controls consistent with the Construction Phase Operation & Maintenance Plan. The plan also specifies installation of a silt sack in the nearby catch basin on South main Street.**

6. There are four test pit logs and locations shown on the site plan which indicate that seasonal high groundwater is between El. 3 and 5.6[1]. The MassDEP Stormwater Standards require a minimum of two feet of separation between the bottom of infiltration best management practices (BMP's) and seasonal high groundwater. Test Pit 1 is within the footprint of the rain garden, seasonal high groundwater was found to be at El. 5.1 and the bottom of the rain garden is at El. 4.5, which is within the seasonal high groundwater. The bottom of the proposed porous asphalt storage layers is 27-inches (2.25 feet) below the pavement surface, which would require that seasonal high groundwater be at least 4.25 feet below the surface. With seasonal high groundwater at El. 5, porous asphalt with a finish grade below El. 9.25 would not have the required minimum separation to groundwater. Except for a small area in the middle of the eight northern parking spaces, the entire finish grade of the driveway/parking areas is less than 9.25. **In the response, Morse notes that "the bottom of the porous asphalt storage layers and the rain garden are above seasonal high groundwater. Two feet of separation is no longer required because the calculations do not take credit for infiltration." We believe this to be acceptable and note that stormwater that does infiltrate through the porous asphalt and rain garden would receive treatment in the porous asphalt layers and the bioretention soil in the rain garden.**

[1] In our April 8th letter we inadvertently noted groundwater at El. 5.6, it should have been noted at El. 5.1.

7. The MassDEP Stormwater Standards also require that infiltration systems be set back from slab foundations and property lines a minimum of ten feet. Some of the porous pavement is within ten feet of the building slab foundation and property lines. The proposed subsurface infiltration system is also about nine feet from the slab foundation. **The proposed subsurface infiltration system has be moved to be ten feet from the slab foundation and Morse notes that the setback does not apply to the porous pavement because they are not taking credit for infiltration through the porous pavement. We also note that any infiltration that may occur through the porous pavement would be lower than the slab and would not impact the building.**

8. Locations of inspection ports on the subsurface infiltration system should be shown on the Site Plan. **Addressed – the inspection port is shown on the Site Plan.**

9. The proposed light fixtures should be dark-sky compliant and equipped with shields to prevent light trespass/spillover onto adjacent residential properties. The photometric plan indicates that there will be light spillover onto 62 Spring Street and minor spillover onto 143 South Main Street. **Addressed – the revised Site Plan includes a new Photometric Plan (Sheet 7) which shows that there will be no light spillover onto adjacent properties.**

10. Areas for snow storage should be shown on the Site Plan. **Snow storage areas are shown on the revised Site Plan. However, there is not a lot of area for snow storage and hauling of snow offsite will likely be required during larger storms.**

11. A detail and/or specifications for the dumpster enclosure should be included on the Site Plan. **Addressed – a note has been added to Sheet 4 specifying a six foot tall stockade vinyl fence around the dumpster pad.**

Please give us a call should you have any question.

Very truly yours,

AMORY ENGINEERS, P.C.

By:

Patrick G. Brennan, P.E.

PGB