

May 15th, 2023

Ms. Emily Wentworth
Community Planning Director
Hingham Planning Board
210 Central Street
Hingham, MA 02043

**RE: Response to Review Comments
Proposed Raze and Rebuild
5 Woodbine Lane
Hingham, MA 02043**

Dear Ms. Wentworth:

The purpose of this correspondence is to respond to outstanding review comments from Michael Silveira, Senior Planner and review comments from Patrick Brennan, P.E. of PGB Engineers regarding the above referenced project.

The following responses in bold follow each comment related to the proposed raze and rebuild is offered for your review and consideration:

Comments by Senior Planner Michael Silveira, dated 5/02/23

1. Is the light post existing or proposed? If it is proposed, what is the height?

Response: The light post is existing and will be removed.

2. While a waiver was requested of a utility plan, utilities should be shown on the plan. Electrical/communication connections should be placed underground if not already.

Response: Approximate utility connections have been added to the site plan.

3. Mitigation trees should be in tree yard.

Response: The proposed mitigation trees have been moved inside the tree yard.

4. The silt sock is not proposed to encompass the entire area of work, so the limit of work should be notated separately if a silt sock is not proposed to surround it entirely.

Response: A line denoting the entire area of work is now shown on the site plan.



HANOVER OFFICE:
427 Columbia Road
Hanover, MA 02339
781-826-9200

PLYMOUTH OFFICE:
40 Court Street, Ste 2A
Plymouth, MA 02360
508-746-6060

MARINE DIVISION:
26 Union Street
Plymouth, MA 02360
508-746-6060

FALMOUTH OFFICE:
448 N. Falmouth Highway Unit A
North Falmouth, MA 02556
508-563-2183

merrillinc.com



1. The drainage analysis is based on the assumption that 634 s.f. of the garage roof would be directed into the stormwater system. Roof lines and gutter locations on the Architectural plans will make it difficult to ensure that 634 s.f. is actually directed into the stormwater system. The piping for the roof drains should be shown on the plan and coordinated with the Architectural plans so that at least 634 s.f. of roof area will be directed into the stormwater system.

Response: The design has been modified to capture runoff from the overhang instead of the garage to ensure complete collection of roof runoff. This roof runoff will be sent straight to the infiltration system in contrast to the previous design. These changes allowed for the infiltration system to be reduced from 8 to 6 chambers.

2. We recommend filter fabric horizontally over the crushed stone trench, approximately three inches from the top. This will make future maintenance easier as only the top three inches of the crushed stone would need to be cleaned and/or replaced when it clogs, rather than the entire trench. Maintenance of the crushed stone trench should also be added to the Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan.

Response: A note to add filter fabric 3 inches below the top of the crushed stone trench has been added to the detail on the site plan. A note regarding the maintenance of the infiltration trench has been added to the subsurface infiltration systems section of the Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan.

3. We note that ledge will need to be removed for installation of the crushed stone trench and construction of the driveway. The presence of the ledge may limit the infiltration capacity of the trench which could result in greater runoff rates and volumes than calculated.

Response: The area in which ledge overlaps with the proposed infiltration trench has been subtracted from the overall surface area of the trench model to reflect how the ledge may impact the infiltration capacity.

4. Electric and communication utilities serving the new dwelling should be installed underground in accordance with ZBL §I-1.6.h.

Response: An approximate underground electric and communication connection is now shown on the site plan. The exact location of this connection will be determined in the field by the contractor.

5. Existing/proposed water and natural gas (if present/proposed) service lines should be shown on the plan.

Response: A water connection is now shown on the site plan. The exact location of this connection will be determined in the field by the contractor.

6. The Zoning Requirements table on the Site Plan should include existing and proposed information (setbacks, building height, etc.).

Response: Existing and proposed zoning information has been added to the site plan.

7. The Tree Yard is shown on the Site Plan along with the one protected tree to be removed and two mitigation trees to be planted. However, there is nothing on the plan related to tree protection as required by ZBL §I-1.5.h. Installation of the subsurface infiltration system and components of the septic system will be near protected trees. We also note that neither of the proposed mitigation trees would be located within the Tree Yard.

Response: Both the septic system and infiltration system are now outside of the critical root zones of protected trees, and the proposed mitigation trees have been moved inside the tree yard. A note to add temporary protection fencing around critical root zones was also added.

8. The north and south elevations on the Architectural plans are reversed.

Response: The architectural plans will be revised to fix this issue.

9. Attachments 4 and 5 to the Application for Major Site Plan Review indicates that exterior lighting will be typical for residential building lighting and will be mounted no higher than fifteen feet above grade. Should the Board approve the project, we recommend this be a condition of approval.

Response: No Comment.

We appreciate these comments and look forward to presenting these revised plans at the June 5th planning board meeting.

Sincerely,

Merrill Engineers and Land Surveyors



Brendan P. Sullivan, P.E., P.L.S
Project Engineer

Enclosures
cc: P. Blair
File 22.431

