



January 4, 2021

Attn: Mary F. Savage Dunham, AICP, CFM
Director of Community Planning
Town of Hingham
210 Central Street
Hingham, MA 02043
Phone (781) 741-1419

**RE: Site Plan Review
Chessia Consulting Services, LLC.
Proposed Warehouse – 60 Research Road**

Dear Ms. Savage and Members of the Board;

This letter is being submitted in response to the peer review comments provided by Chessia Consulting Services, LLC. (CCS) dated November 24, 2020, regarding the Proposed Warehouse Project at 60 Research Road in Hingham, Massachusetts. Crocker Design Group, LLC (CDG) has reviewed the letter and offers the following responses to each comment below. In addition, the following revised and supporting documents are enclosed:

- Site Plans with revision date of 1/4/2021
- Stormwater Report with revision date of 1/4/2021
- Existing Vs. Proposed Site Layout Exhibit

Original comments provided by CCS indicated below in standard text with CDG's response in **bold text**. Only comments perceived as needing a response were included, in order to simplify the response letter. Also, some comments were repeated throughout the review. In this case, the comments were responded to in the order they appeared in the letter, and the repeated comments were omitted.

Section I-I Site Plan Review

Comment 1: The Existing Conditions Plans and the Application for Zoning Hearing lists three owners for the parcels, although the Cover Sheet lists only Gill Research Drive LLC as the Owner/Applicant. The Application for Special Permit A-3 only lists two owners. This issue should be clarified.

Ms. Mary Savage Dunham
Director of Community Planning
January 4, 2021
Page 2

CDG Response: The word “owner” has been removed from the cover sheet of the plans. Please refer to the ANR Plan enclosed with the original submission. The existing facility is located on Lot A, Parcel 207-0-16 (Current owner is Gill Research Drive, LLC) and is approximately 6.7 acres. McCusker Gill (MG) is in the process of acquiring 5.236 acres to the south of their property from a portion of the vacant Parcel 213-0-30 (current Owner is Perry South Shore LLC), and is denoted as Lot B on the ANR Plan. A portion of the facility expansion is proposed to extend onto Parcel B. Parcel 211-0-1 (current owner is MDC Properties- Abington St. LLC) to the Southeast of Lot A is being acquired by MG in its entirety, but there are no plans at this time for permanent development on this site. MG is proposing to construct temporary construction access for construction vehicles and equipment to access Parcel A.

Comment 2: It is unclear if existing spaces associated with the existing building are to remain, how many there are and where they are all located. Some data is on the Existing Conditions Plans but existing loading bays are not indicated.

CDG Response: It was determined that the majority of the existing parking spaces to remain did not comply with one or more dimensional requirements. As such, the plans now incorporate seal coating and restriping of the existing parking lot to bring the existing parking spaces into compliance.

The loading bays are to remain and dimensions are shown on Drawing No. C-2.2.

Comment 3: It does not appear that the entire stormwater system has been indicated on the plans as there is not a Grading and Drainage Plan that encompasses the entire site. There are various drainage systems including a recently approved rain garden at the entrance off Research Road and what appear to be two existing systems that outlet either in or near the Zone A of a surface water supply to the east side of the site.

CDG Response: The grading and drainage plans have been revised to encompass the entire site. Please refer to Sheets C-3.1 and C-3.2 in the revised Site Plans, enclosed.

Comment 4: The Landscape Plan also only indicates the portion of the lot proposed for the new building. The plans indicate proposed planting locations. In some cases, the size and type are indicated but not in all locations and some areas are listed as “or similar” or have no specificity.

CDG Response: The Landscape Plan has been revised to include the entire site, including the existing building and eastern parking area/drive. The plan has also been revised to clarify the proposed plantings.

Ms. Mary Savage Dunham
Director of Community Planning
January 4, 2021
Page 3

Comment 5: The grading plan indicates that a dam would be created by proposed grading along the northerly part of the proposed development area. An easement to store water on the abutting property or a redesign to convey this runoff into or through the site would be required.

CDG Response: The grading has been revised along the northerly part of the proposed development area. Grading is proposed to extend onto 80 Research Road to ensure positive drainage onto MG's property. A proposed construction easement is shown on the abutting property accordingly.

The grading design was revised along 70 Research Road to allow the runoff to be collected off the southwestern corner of 70 Research Road on MG's site. In addition, the grading allows for the runoff along the southeastern portion of 70 Research Road to continue to drain onto MG's site.

Comment 6: Abutting septic systems should be indicated on the plans to confirm required setbacks have been met. I note that there appear to be septic systems at #70 and #80 Research Road near the property line. As a site tributary to a surface water supply there are requirements for setbacks from drains to septic systems in both Title 5 and the Hingham Supplementary Rules and Regulations for the Disposal of Sanitary Sewage that should be indicated on the plans to demonstrate compliance

CDG Response: Abutting septic system information was obtained from the Board of Health for both 70 and 80 Research Rd and are now shown on the enclosed plans. The setbacks of the drainage system at 60 Research Rd to the septic systems located at 70 and 80, has been designed to comply with the Title 5 as well as the Hingham Supplementary Rules and Regulations for the Disposal of Sanitary Sewage which requires 50' separation between septic and drain when the drain is lower than the septic. We note the more restrictive 175' separation criteria does not apply in this case as the drainage system has been designed to discharge to the wetland system and not via the direct discharge connection to the tributary stream. The setbacks from drains to the septic systems are shown on Drawing No. C-3.1.

Comment 7: I was not able to find the required estimated earthwork volumes in the submittal. This data should be provided.

CDG Response: This is anticipated to be a net-import fill site with approximately 15,000 to 20,000 cubic yards of total fill import.

Comment 8: I note that the plans indicate that there is an existing stormwater system at the proposed building location that reportedly was flooded at the time of the survey (July 2020). Data on this system should be provided based on record data if available. It is likely that an application was filed with the Town to perform this work at some point. The reason for the

Ms. Mary Savage Dunham
Director of Community Planning
January 4, 2021
Page 4

system to be flooded in the summer during typically low groundwater periods should be determined. It is particularly important to understand the system performance as the proposed plan includes what appear to be a similar system to the system that appears to have failed. I noted some catch basins appeared to be holding water from 1-2 feet below surface grades, but it was unclear if this was the normal sump level or they were backed up with water due to downstream conditions.

CDG Response: John Hoadley & Sons performed a video inspection of the existing drainage system. They observed the various catch basins and drain manholes are all connected together with piping to convey the runoff into only three pre-cast concrete subsurface infiltration chambers. The system was found to have no outlet. Based on our observations, we conclude the existing system appears to be drastically undersized for the catchment area it collects, is located within seasonal high groundwater conditions, lacks a formal outlet which leads the system to back up essentially in any/all rain events.

We note that the existing hydrology model accounts for the overall catchment area associated with this system to be “woods”. This approach essentially accounts for that area in its prior undeveloped state which would result in conservative (low) existing peak rates of runoff from which to compare the proposed improvements to.

Comment 9: It is proposed to install a tight tank for floor drainage in the new warehouse building. Since the site is connected to sanitary sewer, it is typically not allowed to install a holding tank. Refer to 314 CMR 18.05.

CDG Response: The tight tank has been removed from the design, and replaced with an oil/gas separator accordingly.

Comment 10: New lighting is proposed and a photogrammetric plan has been provided. The existing building and parking also has some lighting and these systems should also be indicated on this plan. The Applicant should address this issue. The Board should review the plan.

CDG Response: The photometric characteristics of the lights at the existing building and at the eastern parking lot are unknown. The locations of the existing walpacks and lights have been noted on the photometrics plan, enclosed with the revised Site Plans.

Stormwater Management Regulations/Erosion and Sediment Control:

Standard 1 – Untreated Stormwater

Comment 10: I recommend that the plans identify the location and condition of all existing systems.

CDG Response: Please refer to the Existing BMP's Exhibit included as Figure 8 in the revised Stormwater Report, enclosed. The exhibit identifies and discusses the condition of all the existing stormwater systems on site. As you'll see, the revised plans propose to incorporate drainage improvements to the existing drainage systems in front of the building.

Comment 11: Proposed outlets have been sized in the Report and a detail provided. The plan detail does not actually specify the dimensions and the calculations should have a detail coding the various parameters. The data may be acceptable if it is clearly presented in the Report and on the plans.

CDG Response: The proposed dimensions of the outlets are shown on Detail Sheet C-8.2, and the calculations are provided in the revised Stormwater Report, Section 4.4. In all cases, the outlets are proposed to be 6.5'x6.5', which is greater than the required minimum of 5'x6'.

Standard 2 – Post Development Peak Discharge Rates

Comment 12: The calculations should use the same "dt" (time step) for both pre and post conditions. This impacts the reported peak rates. A smaller dt results in more accurate determination of the peak rate of runoff. A larger dt was used in the existing case than the proposed case, which makes the proposed peak larger and may be conservative but it should be corrected to be equal for areas that have not been altered.

CDG Response: The HydroCAD model has been revised to have the same "dt" (time step) of 0.01 hours for both pre and post conditions. Please see the revised HydroCAD models, enclosed in the revised Stormwater Report.

Comment 13: The plans should properly identify offsite areas that would flow into the site. Although it is not required to control this runoff it is required to assess the impact on proposed systems and to allow this existing flow to be conveyed through the site.

CDG Response: Please refer to the Existing Conditions Watershed Map (EH-1). E1-CB1 and E2 both include land from adjacent properties at 70 and 80 Research Rd that currently shed stormwater in the direction of the proposed development. These areas are also included in the Proposed Conditions Watershed Map (PH-1) in watersheds P1-CB1 and P-2B.

Comment 14: The eastern side of E-2 and P-2U appears to be arbitrary and not based on contours. The rest of the area is analyzed to the wetland buffer zone, but this portion is an arbitrary rectangular area.

Ms. Mary Savage Dunham
Director of Community Planning
January 4, 2021
Page 6

CDG Response: E-2 and P-2U were extended to include runoff from adjacent properties based on contours. Please refer to the Existing Conditions Watershed Map (EH-1) and Proposed Conditions Watershed Map (PH-1) enclosed in the revised plan set and the revised Stormwater Report.

Comment 15: The proposed design should include dimensions for the outlet structures. It appears that the UG 2 outlet has one two stage outlet weir not two separate weirs as modeled. The outlet structures are double counted as “retain it” units available for storage during the storms, this would not be the case. In addition, the outlets in the parking lot should have a sealed hatch not an inlet grate as designed.

CDG Response: UG-2 has been revised to consist of (400) 36” Cultec R-360HD Chambers. There is one outlet structure proposed, OCS-2 and the dimensions an inverts are provided on the plans. A Detail is also provided for OCS-2 on Sheet C-8.2. The outlet calls for a standard manhole cover.

Comment 16: Exfiltration is overestimated only the bottom area should be counted not the “wetted area” as used in the calculations according to DEP.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. UG-2 has been modified to only claim exfiltration for the “surface area.”

Standard 3: Recharge to Groundwater

Comment 17: The design would increase the impervious area by 78,270 square feet according to the Report. It is not feasible to check this as there is not a plan that shows the new impervious as compared to the existing impervious area.

CDG Response: Please refer to the enclosed Existing Vs. Proposed Site Layout Exhibit which gives a comparison of the new impervious to the existing impervious area.

Standard 4: 80% TSS Removal

Comment 18: I recommend that TSS calculations include all of the site. Although it is not required to meet the TSS in existing areas it is required to improve conditions. I also recommend that a breakdown of what is on site and the treatment level of existing and proposed systems be provided. Where no improvement is proposed for an existing area, a description of why it is not feasible be provided.

CDG Response: Please refer to the Existing BMP Map and Proposed BMP Map, Figures 8 and 9 in the revised Stormwater Report. These exhibits provide an overview of what is existing for

stormwater treatment on site, and what is proposed to improve both within the limit of work and in the areas to remain as existing. Please also refer to Section 1.10, Improvement to Existing Impervious Area, of the Stormwater Report which discusses the impervious area to the east of the existing building in detail.

Comment 19: One of the units, a CDS 2015, is proposed as a catch basin inlet but the detail and data on the website for Contech (the manufacturer) does not indicate an inlet grate and appears to require an inlet pipe to create the flow regime to remove sediment. The other unit is a CDS 2020. The TSS calculations credit these units with 56% TSS removal. The unit proposed only provides pretreatment and 56% overestimates the removal in my opinion. I recommend that the Board allow a credit of 30% for on-line swirl type separators as proposed consistent with other projects in Town.

CDG Response: The detail for the CDS 2015 from the manufacturer's website is enclosed in section 4.3 of the Revised Stormwater Report. The detail shows the standard configuration of the water quality treatment device, which has an inlet and an outlet pipe, but also lists alternate configurations, one being an inlet grate and an outlet pipe. The revised drainage design proposes three (3) CDS2015-4-C water quality units, all with the alternate configuration (also listed on the detail) of a grated inlet with no inlet pipe, and an outlet pipe. These units are only proposed in the eastern portion of the site, where the pavement is existing to remain and the drainage is being improved where feasible.

Comment 20: The submittal credits the subsurface detention system with 80% TSS removal. This has not been fully documented and as a proprietary system is only credited with a removal rate acceptable to the Board. In addition, there are other requirements for these systems in LUHPPL's and Critical Areas. A detention system, as proposed would not provide any TSS removal according to the DEP Handbook.

CDG Response: The TSS treatment train for the detention system has been revised and is enclosed within the revised Stormwater Report. The TSS treatment train now includes deep sump catch basins, Oil-Grit Separators (which provide 25% TSS removal each, achieving the required 44% pretreatment) and a detention system composed of an ADS Isolator Row Plus chamber system (which provides 80% removal with the required 44% pretreatment).

Standard 5: Higher Potential Pollutant Load

Comment 21: Catch basins – Catch basins are acceptable for pretreatment in a LUHPPL if properly designed. As noted under Standard 4 no TSS removal credit has been proposed for catch basins.

CDG Response: The deep sump catch basins weren't originally included in the TSS treatment calculations because some had contributory catchments with impervious areas greater than

0.25 acres, and therefore pretreatment could not be claimed. The Proposed Conditions Subcatchments Map (PH-2) has been revised and all catchment areas to deep sump catch basins now have contributory impervious areas of less than 0.25 acres. TSS treatment trains have been revised to include the deep sump catch basins, and 25% TSS pretreatment is claimed.

Comment 22: Proprietary Units (Swirl Chamber CDS Units) – It is proposed to use four different models of Contech CDS stormwater treatment units. Proprietary devices must be certified through either the STEP process (discontinued by DEP) or the TARP process for use in a LUHPPL. The submittal will need to supply data to demonstrate approval through the TARP or Step process and the system design will need to conform to approval requirements. These systems would only provide pretreatment.

CDG Response: CDS Stormwater Treatment Units are no longer proposed to treat runoff within the areas of new pavement. As described in the response to Comment 19, three (3) CDS units are proposed in the Eastern portion of the site, where the existing pavement is to remain, and the stormwater runoff from the existing area is to be improved to the extent feasible.

Comment 22: Proprietary Units (Retain it chambers) – It is proposed to use these units for detention in both cases and infiltration in UG 2. Proprietary devices must be certified through either the STEP process (discontinued by DEP) or the TARP process and only the system proposed for infiltration would be acceptable in this case, subject to providing adequate data. The submittal will need to supply data to demonstrate approval through the TARP or Step process and the system design will need to conform to approval requirements of these programs.

CDG Response: Retain it chambers are no longer proposed for both detention and infiltration systems.

UG-1 (Detention)- Contributory runoff directed to UG-1 is first pretreated with Deep Sump Catch basins (each only receiving 0.25 acres or less of runoff from impervious cover), and then is routed through an offline oil-grit separator, before entering the detention system, which is comprised of an ADS Isolator Row Plus Chamber System. Per the MA DEP Stormwater Standards, the deep sump catch basins and oil-grit separators are both credited with 25% TSS removal, which equates to the required 44% pretreatment for LUHPPL's. The ADS Isolator Row Plus Chamber System is credited with 80% TSS removal (when 44% pretreatment is first achieved). Please refer to the revised TSS Treatment Train calculations. The technical information including the approvals for the Stormtech Isolator Row are enclosed with this submission. An approval worth noting is that by the New Jersey Corporation for Advanced Testing (NJCAT).

UG-2 (Infiltration)- Although the original design complied with water quality and TSS requirements, it was altered due to value engineering efforts. Contributory runoff directed to

UG-2 is first pretreated with Deep Sump Catch basins (each only receiving 0.25 acres of runoff from impervious cover), and then is routed through an offline oil-grit separator, before entering the infiltration system, which is comprised of a Cultec R-360HD Chamber System. Per the MA DEP Stormwater Standards, the deep sump catch basins and oil-grit separators are both credited with 25% TSS removal, which equates to the required 44% pretreatment for LUHPPL's. The Cultec Chamber System (ultimately an infiltration basin) is credited with 80% TSS removal (when 44% pretreatment is first achieved). Please refer to the revised TSS Treatment Train calculations.

Standard 6: Protection of Critical Areas

Comment 23: The portion of the site that is already developed can have stormwater improvements within the Zone A. New construction projects prohibit BMP's in the Zone A... I have listed the proposed BMP's with their acceptability for use in a Critical Area. [Comments mimic what was written in Standard 5)

CDG Response: According to Table CA 2: Standard 6 of Volume 1 Chapter 1 of the MA Stormwater Standards, deep sump catch basins, oil grit separators, proprietary units (the ADS Isolator Row Plus System) and infiltration basins (Cultec R-360HD Chamber System) are all acceptable for use in a critical area.

Standard 7: Redevelopment Projects

Comment 24: I recommend that an assessment of existing conditions relative to runoff collection and treatment be provided. The permitted impervious area should be determined as part of this effort. Any previously paved but not permitted work should not be considered part of the existing condition.

CDG Response: Please refer to the Existing Conditions Watershed Plan. The limits of pavement, woods and landscape shown on this plan are based on existing conditions in place as of the time that the Applicant purchased the property in 2016. Any/all areas of site use beyond those developed limits were analyzed per their in their pre-developedstate. We also note the plans incorporate the restoration of the areas beyond the developed footprint outside of the proposed development footprint. Please also refer to the Existing BMP Map, Figures 8 in the revised Stormwater Report. This exhibit provides an overview of what is existing for stormwater treatment on site.

Comment 25: The assessment of existing conditions should also include data on proposed and potential improvement to the existing stormwater system for the portion of the site to remain. Based on my observations some areas have no controls with pavement directly discharging into the Zone A of a surface water supply or to the associated tributary area.

CDG Response: Please refer to the Proposed BMP Map, Figure 9 in the revised Stormwater Report. This exhibit provides an overview of what is proposed to improve both within the limit of work and in the areas to remain as existing. Please also refer to Section 1.10, Improvement to Existing Impervious Area, of the Stormwater Report which discusses the impervious area to the east of the existing building in detail.

Standard 8: Erosion/Sediment Control

Comment 26: This standard requires that the submittal include a plan, as outlined in the Checklist and DEP Handbook, to prevent erosion and sedimentation into wetland resource areas. For this site, as it is over 1 acre in size an EPA SWPPP, would be required.

CDG Response: A draft SWPPP was submitted to the Hingham Planning Board on 10/21/2020.

Comment 27: A Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been provided. In addition, there is a plan proposing access through 73 Abington Street for construction purposes. This area would also serve as a staging area after completion of the warehouse building. It is unclear why staging would be necessary after completion of the warehouse.

CDG Response: This note i was revised to say “Existing staging area to be utilized during construction of new warehouse facility on 60 Research Road property and for water main extension.”

Comment 28: I recommend a more comprehensive overall Erosion and Sedimentation Plan be provided that includes the entire proposed work area. The Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan appears to be somewhat generic as the notes do not necessarily represent the proposed project in some cases. Since a comprehensive SWPPP will be required, I recommend that review of this aspect of the work be deferred to a later phase of the approval process.

CDG Response: The Soil Erosion Control and Sedimentation Plan has been revised and now includes the entire proposed work area as well as the existing building and the area surrounding it.

Comment 29: I recommend that the plans be carefully reviewed for applicability of certain sections and that references to hay or straw bales be removed from the plans as these are typically not allowed in Hingham.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. All references to hay or straw bales have been removed from the plans.

Standard 9: Long Term Pollution Prevention Plan

Comment 30: The O&M should include all BMP's whether existing or proposed. There was an earlier approved O&M for the minor work at the entrance and nearby loading bay that should be referenced for this aspect of the project.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. The O&M plan has been revised to include all BMPs, existing and proposed. We are not aware of an approved O&M for the work at the entrance , so we have incorporated the raingarden into the overall O&M plan we have prepared for the overall site.

Comment 31: The O&M does not list all of the BMP's as identified on the plans.

CDG Response: The O&M Plan has been revised to include all of the BMP's throughout the proposed and existing site.

Comment 32: Since there appear to be issues with some of the stormwater components on the site, I recommend that copies of inspection reports be provided to demonstrate compliance with the existing permit for the site that was issued for the work associated with the rain garden.

CDG Response: The rain garden is routinely maintained by MG's landscape contractor. As such, no specific documentation exists. However, the rain garden appears to be in good, operating condition. MG will maintain records moving forward through their landscape contractor.

Comment 33: It is proposed to install an infiltration system and a detention system. Although the basic structures for each of these systems is essentially the same, the function is quite different. I recommend that the requirements be listed separately as restoring infiltration is much more involved than just cleaning for detention. The detention only system has a liner to prevent infiltration.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. The infiltration chambers and detention chambers are now listed separately in the O&M Manual. Please refer to the revised Stormwater Report.

Comment 34: BMP matrix should only have the actual BMP's on site.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. The BMP matrix has been revised and is enclosed within the revised Stormwater Report.

Comment 35: I recommend that the Commission consider a condition, should the submittal be approved, that these items be prepared as a standalone document together with a plan

Ms. Mary Savage Dunham
Director of Community Planning
January 4, 2021
Page 12

indicating the location of various BMP's. A partial plan has been provided but it does not encompass the entire site and does not identify snow storage areas as required.

CDG Response: The O&M Plan has been revised to encompass the entire site, and all BMPs. Snow storage is now included in the O&M Plan.

Standard 10: No Illicit Discharges

Comment 36: A signed statement is included in the Report; however, for a project of this type a more rigorous investigation into where all interior pipes discharge is required.

CDG Response: Hoadley & Sons was engaged to conduct an evaluation of the existing building floor drains to confirm there are no illicit discharges. The dye testing on the interior pipes was performed on 12/22/2020 and confirmed that there are no illicit discharges and that all floor drains are appropriately connected to the sewer system.

Section V-A Off Site Street Parking Requirements

Comment 37: I recommend that the plans provide more dimensions, etc. on existing spaces to remain. It appears that at least one of the spaces to the east of the existing warehouse portion of the building would not meet dimensional requirements for length.

CDG Response: The existing parking areas that are to remain will now be seal coated and restriped to bring all parking spaces and drive aisles into compliance with the Town of Hingham Zoning Bylaws. This change is reflected in the plan set dated 1/4/2020.

Comment 38: It is unclear what is currently permitted for parking on the site but it is likely that they are far in excess of the required. The approved site plan should be compared to the current plan relative to the final approval of the number of existing parking spaces.

CDG Response: The parking analysis provided on Overall Layout Plan C-2 shows the number of parking spaces required per the Zoning Bylaws for the existing building in comparison to what currently exists. Per the Zoning Bylaws, there are 132 spaces required, and there are 155 spaces provided. This is consistent with the recent Site Plan Approval issued by the Planning Board in 2019

Comment 39: The proposed parking spaces on the north side of the building would overhang the sidewalk. Depending on the extent of overhang this may not be met in this location. The depth from the building to the berm gutter is 5 feet. A typical space without overhang is 20 feet based on the Bylaws, which infers a 2-foot overhang, which would not comply with clear width requirements.

Ms. Mary Savage Dunham
Director of Community Planning
January 4, 2021
Page 13

CDG Response: The existing parking areas will be seal coated and restriped. All parking spaces abutting walkways or the building are 20' long. Where a 2' overhang complies with clear width requirements, the parking spaces are 18' long.

Comment 40: Some of the existing parking does not have a curb or other vehicular stop. It is unclear if this was required at the time of construction.

CDG Response: Acknowledged. The majority of the existing eastern pavement edge does not have curbing today. In an effort to improve the existing drainage system along this front section of existing parking lot, the plans have been updated to reduce the amount of pavement and straighten out the edging in order to bring the parking into compliance with the current dimensional criteria. Curbing is not proposed, but instead a stone filter strip is proposed to help promote stormwater recharge and provide some additional treatment of the runoff prior to overland discharge of the site. There are also boulders proposed to be placed every 30' along the trench to prevent trailer parking and expansion of the parking lot.

Comment 41: The plans do not indicate any snow storage areas. Snow storage areas should be identified.

CDG Response: Snow storage areas are now indicated on the Overall Layout Plan, C-2.

Comment 42: The overall site would have 170 spaces and require 17 parking lot trees. I recommend that the Landscape Plan call out which specific trees, with species and size listed, are proposed to comply with this section of the Bylaw.

CDG Response: The revised parking space count is 157. As such, 16 trees are required and 44 trees and 110 arborvitaes are proposed on the Landscape Plan, satisfying this requirement. This information is also noted in the zoning table on Layout Plan C-2.

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