352 Turnpike Road
Southborough, MA 01772
508.480.9900

November 2, 2022

Mr. Jim Young, Land Use Administrator
Southfield Redevelopment Authority
223 Shea Drive
South Weymouth, MA 02190

Re: Proposed Hotel Development – Development Plan & Site Plan Approval

Dear Mr. Young:

Bohler Engineering is in receipt of a comment letter from Amory Engineers, P.C., dated September 9, 2022. On behalf of Applicant CP Endeavor Holdings 18 LLC., Bohler offers the following responses. For clarity, the original comments are in **italics,** while our responses are directly below in **bold** type.

General:

Comment 1. *Vehicular access around the building is limited. If all spaces are occupied there is no way for a vehicle to turn around, which will require someone to back up all the way around the building. Additionally, a trash truck will need to either back in or back out around the building to get to the dumpster.*

Response: **These conditions will be managed by the hotel operator in such situations. In discussions with the hotel operator, these types of situations where traffic must be managed is not uncommon and hotel staff is trained to address these situations.**

Comment 2. *Consideration should be given to relocating some of the handicap parking spaces to the north side of the building so that they are closer to the primary building entrance.*

Response: **The accessible parking spaces have been located so they are closest to the entrance that serves the elevators.**

Comment 3. *The exterior lighting as proposed would require waivers from R&R §3.5.D(3)(a) and §3.5. D(3)(c)(i); which limits light intensity at property lines to no more than 0.5 foot candles. Light intensities along the southern property line proximate to the hotel will be up to 1.4 foot candles and up to 2.1 foot candles at the property line right behind the hotel (adjacent to the primary entrance).*

Response: **The Lighting Plan has been updated accordingly.**

Comment 4. *Light fixture and pole specifications (cut-sheets) should be included in the plans.*

Response: **Light fixture and pole specifications have been added to Sheet C-703.**

Comment 5. *The plans should show the center island and pavement markings in Shea Drive to demonstrate their relationship with the proposed driveway.*

Response: **The Site Plans have been revised accordingly. Please also refer to the "Proposed Hotel Development, Site Circulation" plan prepared by Ron Muller & Associates for the proposed pavement striping improvements within Shea Drive.**

Comment 6. *In the Joint Application, under the Site Plan Review Standards discussion, ZBL §12.5.B (page 10), the narrative states that 6,975 s.f. of the existing SVCD district land will be open space post-development. This area should be identified on the plans.*

Response: **This portion of the narrative is referring to the amount of pervious area within the SVCD. It appears there was a minor miscalculation at the time the narrative was proposed as the total open space (landscaped area) within the SVCD is 6,255 sf. Please refer to the SVCD Open Space Exhibit included in this submission.**

Comment 7. *In the Joint Application, under the discussion about compliance with the AUDS §5.3.2.2 (page 19), it is stated that the facades facing Route 18 and Shea Drive will have windows encompassing 15% of wall area and that the actual window area on the facades is indicated on the building elevation sheets A3.01 and A3.02. However, those drawings do not list the actual window areas of the facades.*

Response: **This information has been added to Sheets A3.01 and A3.02.**

Comment 8. *The hotel will be receiving deliveries and a loading space should be identified.*

Response: **The Site Layout Plan (Sheet C-301) has been revised to show a loading area. It is anticipated that box trucks will be the primary delivery truck for the hotel and the loading area has been sized accordingly.**

Comment 9. *We question what the Driveway Construction detail on Sheet C9.01 is meant to depict. Will the onsite driveway have a cement concrete base?*

Response: **The Driveway Construction detail has been revised to further clarify it's intent.**

Comment 10. *In accordance with R&R §3.4.S(1), all granite curb should be specified to be Type VA4.*

Response: **The Site Plans have been revised accordingly.**

BOHLER

Comment 11. *General Notes 6 and 13 and General Grading & Utility Plan Notes 10 and 11 on Sheet C-102, and Erosion & Sediment Control Notes on Sheet C-602 reference a geotechnical report (also). The geotechnical report should be submitted.*

Response: **The Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by McArdle Gannon Associates, Inc. has been included in this submission.**

Comment 12. *There should be a detail for the stone dust path. We note that the stone dust path will pass through the compensatory flood storage area which may make it impassable at times.*

Response: **A stone dust path detail has been added to Sheet C-903.**

Comment 13. *The proposed siltation barrier should be extended to Main Street and Shea Drive to delineate the limit of work.*

Response: **The proposed siltation barrier has been revised accordingly.**

Utilities and Stormwater:

Comment 1. *We concur with all of the stormwater related comments contained in the BETA Group peer review letter, especially in reference to seasonal high groundwater. With adjacent wetlands at about elevation 152, seasonal high groundwater would be expected to be at about that elevation on site. Bottoms of the proposed subsurface infiltration systems are at El. 147, which are likely seven feet below where they are required to be (minimum two feet of separation to seasonal high groundwater).*

Response: **Test pit and soil boring have been conducted and are included within the Geotechnical Engineering Report included in this submission and the proposed drainage design has been revised accordingly.**

Comment 2. *SMS does not allow infiltration systems to be within fifty feet of surface waters and wetlands are considered surface waters. As noted in the BETA letter, proposed replicated wetlands would be within eighteen feet of the subsurface infiltration system and the existing wetlands are within thirty-five feet.*

Response: **The proposed drainage design has been revised to locate the underground infiltration systems to be at least fifty feet away from surface waters.**

Comment 3. *Energy dissipaters should be proposed at all outlets from the drainage system to prevent scour and erosion.*

Response: **Rip-rap aprons have been added at the proposed drainage system outlets.**

Comment 4. *The locations of inspection ports for the subsurface infiltration systems should be shown in plan. We recommend at least one inspection port for each row of chambers.*

Response: **Inspection ports have been added to the underground infiltration systems accordingly.**

Comment 5. *The HydroCAD model indicates that catch basin CB-I will be the emergency overflow from subsurface infiltration system I and the Grading and Drainage Plan (sheet C-401) appears to show no curb behind the catch basin. However, it is not clear on the Site Layout Plan (sheet C-301) whether there will be a curb there or not. There should not be a curb, but perhaps a paved weir, so that overflow from the system may flow off the parking lot toward the wetlands. A stabilized channel to convey the flow should be considered.*

Response: **There will be curbing along the entirety of the driveways and parking areas, including around CB-1. The top of curb elevation at CB-1 is 151.50 and the adjacent wetlands elevation is approximately 152.00. This means that during large storm events, there may be some minor ponding around CB-1 up to around elevation 152.00 prior to stormwater overflowing towards the adjacent wetlands.**

Comment 6. *R&R §3.6.J(l) requires three feet of minimum cover over drain lines. Drain lines at all proposed catch basins are proposed to have three feet of vertical distance from the grate to the invert of the pipe. With 12-inch HDPE pipe, this will leave 1.8 feet of cover.*

Response: **All drainage pipe will be updated to provide a minimum of 3 feet of cover.**

Comment 7. *There is existing drainage infrastructure that conveys stormwater from Shea Drive, through the subject site to the wetlands. This infrastructure is proposed to remain. However, there is no information on the plans related to the sizes or elevations of the piping. This should be shown on the plans to confirm that proposed design elements will not create conflicts with the existing infrastructure.*

Response: **Further investigation will be conducted on the existing drainage infrastructure to confirm there are no conflicts with the proposed design. If conflicts exist, design revisions will be made accordingly.**

Comment 8. *The plans show one water line to service the building. Separate water lines for fire protection and domestic use are required. Documentation should also be provided to demonstrate that there will be adequate water supply for fire flow and domestic use*

.

Response: **Per past experience in the City of Weymouth, the City typically allows one tap off the water main that then provides a tee that splits the domestic service off the sire service just outside the building. This condition is proposed on the Utility Plan (Sheet C-501).**

We trust the above as well as the attached information are sufficient for your continued review of the project. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (508) 480-9900.

Sincerely,

Bohler

Nick Dewhurst

cc. Amory Engineering, P. C.