



September 23, 2021

Hingham Planning Board
Attn: Emily Wentworth, Senior Planner
210 Central Street
Hingham, MA 02043

RE: 213-215 Cushing Street, Preliminary Flexible Development Plan
Interim Response to Amory Engineers Peer Review Letter

Dear Emily and Members of the Board;

This letter is being submitted in response to the supplemental peer review comments provided by Amory Engineers, P.C. via email on September 21, 2021, regarding the Proposed address at 213-215 Cushing Street in Hingham, Massachusetts. Crocker Design Group, LLC (CDG) offers the following responses to each comment below.

Original comments provided by Amory Engineers, P.C. indicated below in standard text with CDG's response in **bold text**. **Please note our goal was to quickly address the comments associated with the Conventional Yield Plan (Comments 1.a through 1.c) and to clarify the open space computations (Comment 2). We note a comprehensive resubmittal package will be provided to respond to the balance of the peer review comments associated with the Flexible Residential Plan design (Comments 3 through 8) following the initial hearing with the Planning Board, completion of the test pits/soil evaluations and tree locations.**

COMMENTS

1. The Conceptual Subdivision Plan (Sheet FRD-4), or yield plan, shows six residential lots accessed from a 475 foot long dead-end cul-de-sac roadway layout. We have the following concerns about the yield plan:

- a. The roadway geometry in front of Lot 5 is incorrect. The radius shown to be 244 feet should be 223 feet, the length of that curve should be 44.63 feet, the length of the tangent to the west should be 86.18 feet and the tangent to the east should be 0.02 feet. The frontage of Lot 5 should be 150.09 feet total. **Agreed. The radius of the curve is revised from 244 feet to 223 feet accordingly. We recalculated the length of the curve to be 44.55 feet with an additional 0.08 feet extending east past the easterly side lot line. The resulting tangent to the west would be 86.16 feet. These updates result in a revised frontage for Lot 5 of 150.00 feet.**

- b. We calculate the frontage of Lots 2 and 3 to be 149.94 feet and 149.97 feet respectively. Please see the red geometry shown on the attached mark-up of Sheet FRD-4. **The radius and length along the Right-of-Way in front of Lot 3 was originally set to 65.01 feet and 84.75 feet respectively. This geometry been corrected to a radius of 65.00 feet and a length 84.78 feet resulting in a frontage measurement at the front setback line of 150.00 feet in length with a radius of 115.00 feet.**
 - c. The area of the FEMA flood zone should be listed for each lot (3, 4 & 5). ZBL §IVB.13.d does not allow flood zone to be counted toward the required 40,000 s.f. of upland area. **Agreed. The Conventional Yield Plan has been revised to provide the Total Lot Area, area of combined wetlands and floodplain (since there is some overlap between the two) and the resulting “effective” lot area. Also note that the plan identifies both the current FEMA Map as well as the Preliminary Map. The Preliminary Map encroached further into the property based on elevations and as a result, the Preliminary Map to conservatively compute the effective lot area.**
2. The open space calculation shown on the Preliminary Flexible Development Plan (Sheet FRD-3) needs to be corrected. The calculation notes that there is 147,966 s.f. of green space and 11,172 s.f. of basins, the sum of these is 159,138 s.f. but the plan indicates that the sum is 169,692 s.f. The 147,966 s.f. of green space is 45.38% of the total site area and it meets the minimum 40% open space without including wetlands and basins. When basins and wetlands are included, the total open space would be 199,841 s.f., which is about 61.3% of the total site area. **Agreed. The corrected total Open Space area is 168,595 SF, which includes 157,423 SF of green space and 11,172 SF of basins and excludes wetlands. The 157,423 SF of green space equates to 48.3% of the total site area and with the basins and wetlands included equates to approximately 64.2% of the total site area.**
3. ZBL §IV-D.9.d requires an open space buffer along the perimeter of the site, and it is to be a minimum of 100-feet wide along abutting properties. The proposed perimeter open space buffer is only fifty feet wide along some of the north, south and east abutting properties. **Responses to be provided in a comprehensive response package following the initial hearing with the Planning Board.**
4. ZBL §IV-D.5.a.ii requires trees with a caliper of 6 inches or greater to be shown on the Preliminary Flexible Development Plan. **The trees will be added to the plans in a comprehensive submittal package following the initial hearing with the Planning Board.**
5. ZBL §IV-D.5.a.iii requires the Preliminary Flexible Development Plan to comply with the requirements of Planning Board Rules and Regulations §3.B(1) and (2), which require percolation tests in accordance with Board of Health (BOH) regulations. We understand that the Applicant is coordinating percolation testing with the BOH. **The Applicant is currently scheduling test pits with**

the Board of Health and will incorporate the results of those test pits in a comprehensive submittal package following the initial hearing with the Planning Board.

6. The driveway for proposed Unit 1 on the Preliminary Flexible Development Plan is only fifteen feet long between the structure and the sidewalk. A vehicle parked in this driveway would block the sidewalk. Additionally, ZBL §IV-D.9.c requires a minimum of twenty-three feet from the edge of Sidewalk (or road when no sidewalk) to a structure when parking in the driveway is proposed. We Note that the twenty-three feet is also not provided at Units 2 and 6. **Responses to be provided in a comprehensive submittal package following the initial hearing with the Planning Board.**

7. ZBL §IV-O.9.c also requires dedicated guest parking to be provided when building layouts or street design does not provide for adequate on-street or off-street parking. At twenty feet wide, parking along the street should be prohibited and dedicated guest parking spaces should be considered. **Responses to be provided in a comprehensive submittal package following the initial hearing with the Planning Board.**

8. The proposed sidewalk is shown to be immediately adjacent to the back of the Cape Cod berm. There should be a grass strip between the berm and sidewalk to provide a visual separation between vehicular and pedestrian traffic. We recommend a minimum width of four feet for the grass strip. If there is not sufficient room for a grass strip a vertical curb should be provided to protect pedestrians from vehicular traffic. **Responses to be provided in a comprehensive submittal package following the initial hearing with the Planning Board.**

We appreciate the Should you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact Gabe Crocker, P.E. at gabecrocker@crockerdesigngroup.com or 781-919-0808. We look forward to presenting to the Board at the upcoming initial hearing on September 27th, 2021.

Sincerely,
Crocker Design Group LLC



Gabe Crocker P.E.
President