



January 29, 2021

Attn: Loni Fournier
Senior Planner
CC: Heather Charles Lis
Town of Hingham
210 Central Street
Hingham, MA 02043
Phone (781) 741-1419

**RE: Conservation Commission Review
Proposed Warehouse – 60 Research Road**

Dear Ms. Fournier, Ms. Charles Lis and Members of the Board;

This letter is being submitted in response to the comments provided by Ms. Charles Lis of the Hingham Conservation Commission (HCC) via email on January 21, 2021, regarding the Proposed Warehouse Project at 60 Research Road in Hingham, Massachusetts. Crocker Design Group, LLC (CDG) has reviewed the comments and offers the following responses to each comment below. In addition, the following revised and supporting documents are enclosed:

Attachment 1: Site Plans with revision date of 1/29/2021

Attachment 2: Site Plan Peer Review Response Letter to Chessia Consultants, dated 1/29/2021

Original comments provided by HCC indicated below in standard text with CDG's response in **bold text**.

NOI Application

Comment 1: The response letter references attached deeds for both 60 Research Rd. and the AW Perry portion now owned by Gill Research Drive LLC, however I couldn't find these attachments. Could you please resend or upload?

CDG Response: The current deeds for all three (3) properties, now owned by Gill Research Drive LLC, are enclosed with the response to the Planning Board, which is enclosed with this letter as Attachment 2.

Comment 2: Thank you very much for marking up which sections of the Stormwater Report were revised/added – this is really helpful. The response letter notes that the water main extension and temporary construction access work have been added to the Stormwater Report. I do see that this work is briefly mentioned, but could not find any new information beyond what was in the initial report. Please add additional details as appropriate.

CDG Response: The changes to the water main work include moving the main outside of the 100-ft buffer when feasible, due to the existing stub being within the 100-ft buffer. Please also note that there are two (2) 50ft and 100ft buffers shown on Sheet W-1. The wetland boundary shown in bold has been approved through the open Order of Conditions. The water main extension is proposed to connect just outside of the 50-ft buffer, and within the previously disturbed area, and then is proposed to divert outside the 100-ft buffer before leaving the 73 Abington Street Parcel.

Riverfront Area & Buffer Zone Impacts

Comment 3: Note that the table of impervious area in Riverfront Area is incorrect in the response letter. It appears the Buffer Zone numbers were used instead, based on the two tables in the Stormwater Report, but please clarify if not.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. The Table of Impervious area in the Riverfront Area is incorrect in the response letter, however the correct table is provided below.

Riparian Zone	Total Riparian Area		Existing Impervious		Proposed Impervious		Change in Impervious	
	(SF)	(AC)	(SF)	(AC)	(SF)	(AC)	(SF)	(AC)
200-100Ft	86,976	2.00	33,578	0.77	32,813	0.75	-765	-0.02
100-0Ft	64,305	1.48	14,623	0.34	14,610	0.34	-13	0.00

Comment 4: The Riverfront Area performance standards were still not directly addressed. Typically and ideally this is a separate narrative from the Stormwater Report since it involves regulations beyond stormwater, however as long as standards are met it may not be necessary to add a narrative at this point. My opinion is that the proposed work in RA would qualify as redevelopment, and as such it needs to meet the standards at 310 CMR 10.58 (5). I previously suggested that I thought restoration of the portion of the RA that had dumping and unpermitted alteration would also be a good opportunity to meet the requirement for an improvement to the RA (310 CMR 10.58 (5)(a), which is separate from stormwater management requirements (310 CMR 10.58 (5)(b). See also prior comment #30. The prior response seems to indicate this has been addressed and I do see some relevant plan updates, however the main RA area that I was referring to does not appear to be included. I am referring to an area directly off the southeast corner of the existing pavement, within the inner 100ft Riverfront Area, and just north of the

existing drainage pipe to the existing outfall at the perennial stream channel. No removal of equipment/debris/gravel is noted on the plans from this area, and no loaming (if needed), plantings and seeding is noted on the landscape plan. There are specific requirements when restoring degraded RA at 310 CMR 10.58 (5)(f) and this should be followed. I suggest planting some native shrubs and only a small number of trees. Please feel free to reach out if the location isn't clear or if you'd like photos of the area. Regarding the remaining RA performance standards, in my opinion you have addressed or met them or they aren't relevant.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. The plans now call for the "Removal of unpermitted dumping and material storage" on the Demolition Plan C-1 for this area. The Landscape Plan (Sheet C-6.1) has also been updated in this location to call for loam and an erosion control seed mix, and herbaceous and woody plantings, per 310 CMR 10.58 (5)(f). The Landscape Plan has also now been prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect as requested.

Stormwater Management

Comment 5: I will mostly defer to the peer review engineer for additional comments at this time, and will provide additional follow up comments if needed following this review. In particular, I am concerned with the issues raised regarding peak runoff rates and TSS removal.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. CDG's response to the peer review engineer's comments is enclosed with this letter in Attachment 2.

The stormwater design redirected as much of the existing paved impervious area as possible behind the existing building that was discharging directly into the perennial stream, to now discharge through the new proposed drainage outfall outside the Zone A. The design redirects this stormwater and provides for additional treatment via deep sump catch basins and oil/grit separators before discharging toward the wetland, outside the Zone A and Riverfront limits, before ultimately coming back together in the perennial stream.

Regarding TSS removal, the peer review engineer asked CDG to verify that the Isolator Row treatment system is properly sized per the New Jersey or TARP member state and the associated documentation be provided. This documentation is enclosed with the response to the peer review in Attachment 2.

The peer review engineer also asked that data on sizing per New Jersey or TARP member state be provided given their use within a LUHPPL. These units are only proposed in the area to the East of the limit of work, and outside the limits of the redevelopment, where the design has incorporated additional stormwater treatment measures to the maximum extent feasible, and where in the existing condition, the TSS removal is currently 0%. Per the first round of peer

review comments, the reviewer credits the proprietary units proposed with 30% TSS removal, which is an improvement over the existing condition.

Comment 6: The area proposed for the infiltration system (UG-2) should be protected during construction as feasible to avoid soil compaction and ensure the new system functions as intended.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. A note that “the location of the infiltration system shall be protected during construction as feasible to avoid soil compaction” and the area of the proposed infiltration system has been added to Demolition Plan C-1.

Comment 7: Thank you very much for incorporating improvements to the drainage along the eastern/northeastern side of the property. I understand your point that work in this area may not need to meet Stormwater Standards due to the very limited scope of work that is also outside the main project scope, however work is within the buffer zone, including the 50ft buffer, so it would be helpful to first know if it’s feasible to change the angle or configuration of the new FES outlet to pull it further out of the 50ft, and also to have scour hole calculations for that outlet. I know there is an existing outlet in the vicinity, but would any trees or shrubs need to be removed for this work?

CDG Response: The design was modified to now include deep sump hooded catch basins and a separate water quality manhole (CDS Unit) as well as a control structure to mimic the existing 6” pipe discharge that exists today. As part of that improvement, the pipe outlet has been pulled back as far as possible away from the wetland, a new flared end section proposed as well as a rip rap splash pad to help minimize and prevent scour. Scour hole calculations are not included for this location, rather the rip rap pad size is proposed to be the same configuration as the others proposed within the project, which all handle much larger flows than this one will experience.

Operation & Maintenance Plan

Comment 8: I think the “Conservation Area – No Snow Dumping” sign is an excellent idea, and should help avoid some of the issues I observed on site as well. Could you please also add another of these signs in the 50/100 ft buffer zone in the vicinity of the proposed retaining wall?

CDG Response: Acknowledged. These signs have been added to the Overall Layout Plan, C-2 as well as Sheets C-2.1 and C-2.2.

Comment 9: I will recommend that the Commission condition that this plan be revised prior to construction, to include the specific language from the Order regarding any chemical prohibitions related to landscaping and de-icing.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. The specific language from the anticipated draft conditions have been added to the O&M Plan accordingly

Comment 10: The Commission typically conditions that areas to be seeded within the buffer zone or resource areas, or planted with mitigation plantings, should not be mowed or maintained as landscaped beds (This does not refer to landscape islands.) This should ideally be noted in the O&M plan.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. This note has been added to the O&M plan as well as the Landscape Plan.

Comment 11: New sealcoating is proposed on a portion of the site. Although this type of work is not typically jurisdictional as it does not involve land disturbance and is also mostly outside jurisdictional areas, I recommend that the applicant consider specifying that an asphalt-based sealcoat be utilized on the site as opposed to a coal tar-based sealcoat. Coal tar-based products have documented significantly more negative environmental impacts, including to aquatic life, due to PAHs and other chemicals that runoff or volatilize as the product ages and abrades, as well as negative human health impacts.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. An asphalt-based sealcoat is acceptable to us and this has been noted on Sheet C.2– Layout Plan. (See Note #11)

Mitigation Plantings & Landscaping

Comment 12: Thank you again for staking the limit of work and buffer zone on site, and for incorporating replacements for the trees that we identified. I understand that given the proposed work and the space available for plantings, it is not possible to plant all replacements in the buffer zone and plantings are generally proposed as close as possible to resource areas. However, it's not clear to me whether or not the proposed trees will be negatively impacted by the tree spacing and steep slopes in some areas. Input from a landscape architect or other similar professional would potentially be really helpful in this regard.

CDG Response: We have coordinated with Nick Schwartz, Landscape Architect for CHA, who has updated the plan to include more detail, specifically on materials, sizing of plants and material specifications. Mr. Schwartz is comfortable with the proposed planting configuration of the trees on the 3:1 slope.

Comment 13: Given the relatively steep slope along the southern portion of the site, I'm wondering if some additional stabilization prior to seeding and planting may be appropriate, specifically a biodegradable product, such as a coconut mat for example.

Conservation Commission
Town of Hingham
January 29, 2021
Page 6

CDG Response: The Landscape Plan (Sheet C-6.1) has been revised to call for a stabilizing coconut mat has been added to the slope at the southern portion of the site prior to seeding.

Comment 14: Please also specify that disturbed areas along the eastern side of the site, for example where pavement is being pulled back and a new outlet is being added, shall be seeded with a conservation/wildlife seed mix at a minimum and planting if applicable. I noticed that the narrative in the Stormwater Report mentioned vegetation and tree planting along the edge of pavement/stone trench (section 1.10) so perhaps this was intended to be included.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. The Landscape Plan (Sheet C-6.1) has been revised to include seeding at the areas along the stone trench and where the pavement has been moved back to restore this area.

Comment 15: I will likely recommend that the Commission condition that a plant list with scientific names and details be provided prior to planting if not submitted earlier.

CDG Response: The Landscape Plan has been revised to include a plant list with scientific names.

Should you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact Gabe Crocker, P.E. at gabecrocker@crockerdesigngroup.com or 781-919-0808.

Sincerely,
Crocker Design Group LLC



Gabe Crocker P.E.
President