

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

November 9, 2022

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

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

Dear Mr. Young:

This is to advise that we have reviewed the following documents in support of the proposed hotel development located at the corner of Main Street (Route 18) and Shea Drive:

- Proposed Site Plan (20 sheets), revised November 4, 2022, prepared by Bohler
- SVCD Open Space Exhibit, dated October 25, 2022, prepared by Bohler
- Site Circulation plan, dated October 18, 2022, prepared by Ron Muller & Associates
- Drainage Report, revised October 25, 2022, prepared by Bohler
- Architectural Plans (A1.01, A1.02, A3.01 and A3.02), issued October 26, 2022, prepared by Opechee Construction Corporation
- Geotechnical Engineering Report, dated September 13, 2022, prepared by McArdle Gannon Associates, Inc.
- Response to comments letter (Amory review), dated November 2, 2022, prepared by Bohler
- Response to comments letter (BETA review), dated November 4, 2022, prepared by Bohler

The documents have been prepared to address comments contained in our September 9, 2022 letter to you and BETA's August 26, 2022 letter to the Authority. Below are our original comments in plain text, followed by the current status of each in **bold text**.

Comments:

General

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. **No change. In the response, Bohler states that "these situations will be managed by the hotel operator" and "these types of situations where traffic must be managed is not uncommon and hotel staff is trained to address these situations."**

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. **No change. In the response, Bohler states that “the accessible parking spaces have been located so they are closest to the entrance that serves the elevators.”**
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). **Addressed – the revised photometric plan (Sheet C-703) shows conformance with the 0.5 foot candle limit.**
4. Light fixture and pole specifications (cut-sheets) should be included in the plans. **Addressed – light fixture and pole specifications are included on Sheet C-703.**
5. The plans should show the center island and pavement markings in Shea Drive to demonstrate their relationship with the proposed driveway. **Addressed – the center island and pavement markings are included in the revised plans and the Ron Muller & Associates Site Circulation plan.**
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. **In the response, Bohler states that “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 s.f.” The SVCD Open Space Exhibit shows the square footage of each of the landscaped areas in the SVCD portion of the property. We note that the open space is mainly the areas between 1) the parking area and the building, 2) the parking area and property lines, and 3) the patio area and the building/property lines.**
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. **Addressed – the architectural drawings have been revised to include the percent of windows/glazing on each side of the proposed building. According to the plans, the side facing Shea Drive has 25% glazing and the side facing Main Street (Route 18) has 47% glazing.**
8. The hotel will be receiving deliveries and a loading space should be identified. **Addressed – a 16-ft. by 35-ft. loading space is shown off the northeast corner of the building, near the main entrance. The Applicant should confirm that the canopies will not conflict with trucks in the loading space.**

9. We question what the Driveway Construction detail on Sheet C-901 is meant to depict. Will the onsite driveway have a cement concrete base? **Addressed – the detail has been revised and no longer shows a concrete base.**
10. In accordance with R&R §3.4.S(1), all granite curb should be specified to be Type VA4. **A note specifying Type VA4 curb has been added to the Vertical Granite Curb detail on Sheet C-901. However, the note pointing to the curb in the detail specifies Type V curb.**
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. **Addressed – the geotechnical report has been provided with this submission.**
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. **A detail of the stone dust path has been added to Sheet C-903 but the proposed location of the path has not changed and it will still pass through the compensatory flood storage area.**
13. The proposed siltation barrier should be extended to Main Street and Shea Drive to delineate the limit of work. **In the response, Bohler states that “the proposed siltation barrier has been revised accordingly. However, the limits of the barrier are not clearly shown on Sheet C-601, the Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan.**

Utilities and Stormwater

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). **The Geotechnical Engineering Report includes test pit logs which appear to indicate that the required separation to seasonal high groundwater may be provided at the subsurface infiltration systems. However, we defer to BETA Group as they are reviewing the stormwater design.**
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. **The subsurface infiltration system parallel to Shea Drive has been relocated to be fifty feet from the proposed replicated wetland. The subsurface infiltration system parallel to Main Street would be installed within an existing wetland. Again, we defer to BETA Group for additional comment.**

3. Energy dissipaters should be proposed at all outlets from the drainage system to prevent scour and erosion. **Addressed – riprap flow dissipaters are shown at each of the discharge points.**
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. **Addressed – inspection port locations are shown on plan Sheet C-401.**
5. The HydroCAD model indicates that catch basin CB-1 will be the emergency overflow from subsurface infiltration system 1 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. **In the response, Bohler states that “there will be curbing along the entirety of the driveways and parking areas, including around CB-1. The top of curb 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.” We note that the rim of CB-1 is proposed to be at El. 151.0, so the minor ponding would be a foot deep at the catch basin.**
6. R&R §3.6.J(1) 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. **In the response, Bohler states that “all drainage pipe will be updated to provide a minimum of 3 feet of cover.” However, the revised plans show 2.6 feet of cover at one catch basin (CB-2); 1.8 feet of cover at three catch basins (CB-1, CB-3 and CB-7); 1.3 feet of cover at one catch basin (CB-6) and 0.85 feet of cover at two catch basins (CB-4 and CB-5). We question how three feet of cover will be provided.**
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. **In the response, Bohler states that “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.”**
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. **In the response, Bohler states that “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**

Mr. Jim Young
November 7, 2022
Page 5

the domestic service off the fire service just outside the building.” We defer to the Weymouth Water Department. No information on adequacy of water supply was included in the response and we note that the August 26, 2022 letter from Mayor Hedlund indicates that Weymouth would not provide water to the project at this time.

Please give us a call should you have any question.

Very truly yours,

AMORY ENGINEERS, P.C.

By:



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Patrick G. Brennan".

Patrick G. Brennan, P.E.

PGB