

April 21, 2021

Town of Hingham
Planning Board
210 Central Street
Hingham, MA 02043

RE: Civil and Traffic Peer Review Response to Comments
Derby Street Shops, minor addition to former RiteAide

Dear Members of the Board:

BSC Group has completed reviews on behalf of W/S/M Hingham Properties LLC (“the Applicant”) of civil engineering peer review comments by Patrick G. Brennan, P.E. of Amory Engineers, P.C. in a letter dated April 7, 2021, and of traffic engineering peer review comments by Jeffrey S. Dirk, P.E. of Vanasse & Associates, Inc. in a letter dated April 13, 2021. These reviews were conducted based upon the proposed building addition and associated site improvements at Derby Street Shops in the Town of Hingham, MA.

On behalf of the Applicant, BSC Group is pleased to offer the following responses to comments (original review comments are *in italics*):

Civil Engineering Peer Review by Amory Engineers, P.C. (April 7, 2021):

Comment 1.a. We note the following discrepancies in the Coverage Information table on Sheet C-103 that need to be addressed: The proposal calls for a 2,400 s.f. addition yet the Building Footprints information lists the total existing building footprints to be 404,644 s.f. and the total proposed building footprints to be 405,975 s.f., which is only 1,331 s.f. more than existing.

Response: Included tables have been corrected on Sheet C-103 of the attached plans to reflect the proposed 2,400 s.f. building footprint addition.

Comment 1.b The Impervious Area information lists existing impervious area to be 1,034,330 s.f. and the proposed impervious area to be reduced by 279 s.f. (1,034,051s.f.). The 279 s.f. is also mentioned as an increase of landscaped area in the BSC Group letter. However, under the Open Space information (grass, landscaped, undeveloped), existing open space is listed at 527,389 s.f. and proposed open space is listed at 511,283 s.f., which is a reduction of 16,106 s.f.

Response: Included tables have been corrected on Sheet C-103 of the attached plans to reflect the proposed 279 s.f. reduction in impervious area. Please note, the reduction of impervious area from existing to proposed in the table is 2,679 s.f., but does not include the 2,400 s.f. building footprint addition. Further subtracting this building footprint yields a total impervious reduction of 279 s.f., matching the increase in open space.

803 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02127

Tel: 617-896-4300
800-288-8123

www.bscgroup.com

Engineers

Environmental
Scientists

Custom Software
Developers

Landscape
Architects

Planners

Surveyors



Comment 2. There is a raised cross walk proposed across the access road in front of the building (in the location of an existing crosswalk). Additional spot grades should be shown on the plans to verify that the raised cross walk will not block stormwater runoff and create puddles against the crosswalk.

Response: Additional spot grades around the proposed raised crosswalk have been added to Sheet C-104 of the attached plans. The location of this pedestrian crosswalk is located at a high point within the pavement, where stormwater runoff sheds in either direction away from the crosswalk.

Comment 3. The Standard Painted Parking Markings detail on Sheet C-201 shows a nine foot wide by eighteen foot long parking space up against a curb. This is correct for spaces against a curb due to space for an overhang. However, standard back-to-back spaces should be shown to be twenty feet long in compliance with ZBL §V-A.3 since there is no overhang. We note that the eight proposed new spaces are all against a curb. The detail should note that it is only for spaces with an overhang.

Response: The detail on Sheet C-201 of the attached plans has been revised to show that this dimension only applies to spaces abutting a curb.

Comment 4. We are also in receipt of an April 4, 2021 email from Mr. Jeffrey Dirk, P.E. of Vanasse & Associates. We concur with Mr. Dirk's recommendation to eliminate at least the two parking spaces located closest to the access driveway behind (west) of the building. If these two spaces are eliminated, the catch basin proposed in the western most parking space should be moved directly north/northeast so that it is located along the south side of the access drive as shown on the attached sketch and not within a parking space.

Response: The indicated spaces have been removed, and the catch basin has been relocated.

Traffic Engineering Peer Review by Vanasse & Associates, Inc. (April 13, 2021):

Comment: The inclusion of a fast-casual restaurant as a part of the current development program will result in higher traffic volumes and increased parking demands than a comparable size retail use. We expect that any increase in traffic and parking that may be associated with the change in use will be off-set by the reduction in the size of the expansion and, therefore, the findings of the May 2017 TIAS, which concluded adequate capacity on the transportation infrastructure to accommodate the then proposed modification, remain valid for the current development proposal.

Response: The applicant agrees that adequate capacity within the property exists to accommodate the current development proposal.

Access and Circulation comments:

Comment 1: The Applicant should confirm with the Fire Department that the design vehicle that was used in the fire truck turning analysis reflects the current design vehicle. It appears that the template reflects a smaller design vehicle.

Response: Up-to-date design vehicle information has been obtained from the Fire



Department, and a revised fire truck turning analysis is attached with this letter. Two simulations have been included, representing turning movements of the truck body at grade and of the truck with ladder overhanging the front bumper by approximately 5 feet, roughly 12 feet above grade. Both simulations result in a clean pass through the site, with only minimal overhang swing beyond the curb line.

Comment 2: The Applicant should verify that loading and delivery activities for both the retail store and the restaurant will occur from the designated loading area in the southwest corner of Building 5; loading and deliveries should not occur curbside.

Response: All deliveries to the tenants will occur to the loading area at the back of the building. No deliveries are to be made at the curb.

Comment 3: The Applicant should confirm that the sight distance improvements have been completed at the Old Derby Street intersection with the internal drive. These improvements were identified as a part of the prior review of the Building 5 modifications.

Response: The site distance improvements have been completed, and the no-left-turn island identified during the prior Building 5 permitting will be completed in late May based on availability of the selected contractor, Lawrence Lynch.

Comment 4: Pedestrian crossing warning signs should be added for the raised crossing so that motorists are aware of the change in vertical profile. In addition, the vehicle ramps to the flush crossing should be detailed and should be designed to meet MassDOT and Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) standards for a raised crosswalk, and include the required pavement markings. The current ramps appear to be shorter than required to provide an appropriate transition to and from the crossing, and should be reviewed.

Response: Pedestrian crossing warning signs were added to this area during the Building 5 permit process and will remain with the new raised crossing. A photograph of the signs is attached. These signs are located on both sides of the driveway.

The proposed raised crosswalk has been designed to meet MassDOT and ITE standards. Approach ramps are 6 ft. in length and are below maximum slope. MassDOT pavement markings and details have been added to Sheets C-103 and C-201 of the attached plans.

Please do not hesitate to contact our office with any inquiries you may have.

Very truly yours,

BSC Group, Inc.

Taylor Dowdy, P.E.
Senior Project Manager/Senior Associate
cc: Victoria Maguire