

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

October 19, 2021

Hingham Planning Board
210 Central Street
Hingham, MA 02043

Subject: 193 Whiting Street, Site Plan

Dear Planning Board Members:

This is to advise that we have reviewed the following documents pertaining to the proposed redevelopment project at the subject site:

- Site Development Plans (8 sheets), dated September 17, 2021, prepared by Crocker Design Group, LLC (CDG)
- Landscape Permit Submission Set (4 sheets), dated September 20, 2021, prepared by Hawk Design, Inc.
- Existing Conditions Plan, revised May 19, 2021, prepared by CHA
- Stormwater Management Report, dated September 17, 2021, prepared by CDG

The purpose of our review has been to evaluate conformance with Hingham Zoning By-Laws (ZBL), and good engineering practice.

Background

The project site consists of a 17,512 square foot (s.f.) parcel at 193 Whiting Street, which is at the intersection of Whiting, Gardner and Derby Streets. It is located within the Business B zoning district. The property is currently developed with a 1,480 s.f. single-story commercial building which was formally used as a gas station and automotive repair shop. The majority of the parcel is impervious with asphalt and concrete paving. The existing building is nonconforming with respect to the rear yard setback (4.8 ft. existing vs. 25 ft. required). The existing site is also nonconforming with respect to open space (less than 15%) and the absence of a fifteen foot landscaped strip along the street frontage. There are four existing curb cuts serving the property, two off Whiting Street and two off Gardner Street.

The proposal calls for rehabilitation and reuse of the existing building for general retail and the construction of a stand-alone drive-up ATM. Existing concrete and asphalt pavement would be removed, the site regraded and new asphalt pavement and concrete walks, patio and dumpster pad installed. Thirteen parking spaces are proposed. The open space area on site would be increased from about 14.5% to about 36.2% with extensive landscaping proposed. Two of the existing curb cuts would be eliminated such that there would be two curb cuts remaining, one off

Whiting Street and one off Gardner Street. Roof runoff from the existing building is proposed to be collected in drains which discharge to a subsurface infiltration system consisting of plastic chambers surrounded by crushed stone. No other drainage improvements are proposed. An existing septic system would serve the retail building. Proposed erosion controls will consist of a silt sock with silt fence around the perimeter of the work area. A stabilized construction entrance is proposed off Whiting Street.

Comments

1. We understand that because the proposed site will reduce the amount of impervious surfaces, proposed stormwater runoff will be less than existing and additional mitigation is not required. As noted above, some mitigation will be provided by recharging the roof runoff. Notes in the Stormwater Management Report indicate that because of “the proximity to the on-site septic system and extensive site remediation history, the design limited the recharge system to clean roof runoff only.” The Applicant should explain the remediation constraints further. Otherwise, we believe this could be an opportunity to provide additional mitigation to enhance the quality and lessen the amount of runoff that flows onto Gardner Street.
2. There should be cleanouts in the underground roof drain piping to allow for maintenance.
3. We recommend a second inspection port on the inlet end of the subsurface infiltration system to allow for easier maintenance.
4. A note on the MC-3500 Cross Section Detail on Sheet C-5.2 directs the contractor to notify CDG “if naturally occurring clay is not identified at El. = 140.0±.” We believe this is supposed to refer to “loamy sand” and not clay.
5. The Typical Roof Drain detail on Sheet C-5.2 specifies PVC pipe but the pipe is specified to be HDPE in plan on Sheet C-3.
6. The proposed slope behind the building, adjacent to the dumpster pad, is proposed to be about 1.5:1 (H:V). Demolition Note 3 on Sheet C-1 indicates that slopes may not exceed 2:1. The note also specifies erosion control blankets on all 2:1 slopes. The 1.5:1 slope should be protected with an erosion control blanket and the note modified accordingly.
7. The Construction Entrance detail on Sheet C-1 specifies a minimum length of fifty feet, yet the construction entrance is only thirty-five feet long. Due to the small site, the detail should be modified. A second construction entrance off Gardner Street should also be considered.
8. The silt sock/silt fence erosion control barrier is not shown along Whiting and Gardner Streets where work is proposed at curb cuts and sidewalks within the right-of-way. We understand that this is due to the erosion controls being in the way of the work. However, temporary erosion controls, which can be easily moved should be specified so that the areas can be protected when work is not actively being performed in those areas.

9. If gas service is present and/or proposed, it should be shown on the plans.
10. There is a 20-ft. by 24-ft. concrete patio proposed off the west side of the building. The purpose of this patio should be identified.

Please give us a call should you have any question.

Very truly yours,

AMORY ENGINEERS, P.C.

By:



Patrick G. Brennan, P.E.



PGB