Cohasset Planning Board  
41 Highland Avenue  
Cohasset, MA 02025

Subject: 2 Pleasant Street / 8 James Lane – Site Plan Review

Dear Board Members:

This is to advise that we have reviewed the following documents contained in the Site Plan Application Packet for a new mixed-use building at 2 Pleasant Street:

- Layout Plan C3, Utility Plan C4, Grading Plan C5, and Construction Details CD-1, revised March 25, 2020, prepared by McKenzie Engineering Group, Inc. (MEG)
- Response to comments letter with attachments, dated June 18, 2020, prepared by MEG

The documents have been prepared to address comments contained in our February 28, 2020 letter to the Board. Below are our original comments in plain text followed by the current status of each in **bold text**.

1. Proposed erosion controls should be shown on the plan to ensure compliance with §300-12.6.B(3). **Addressed** – erosion controls consisting of silt sock, stabilized construction entrance and silt sacks for catch basins are specified on the revised Grading Plan C5.

2. An analysis of pre-development vs. post-development stormwater runoff is required to verify that the proposed development will not adversely impact downstream properties and adjoining streets – ZBL §300-12.6.B(4). **Addressed** – attached to the response to comments letter is pre- and post-development HydroCAD calculations which indicate that post-development rate and volume of runoff will not exceed existing conditions.

3. A detail for the proposed subsurface infiltration system should be provided. If the analysis of pre- vs. post-development runoff indicates that additional stormwater best management practices (BMP’s) are required, then details of those BMP’s should also be provided. **Addressed** – details of the proposed subsurface infiltration system have been included on the Construction Details CD-1. In accordance with the post-development calculations the size of the subsurface infiltration system has been increased to adequately mitigate the increase in impervious area.
4. ZBL §300-12.6.C requires two permanent survey monuments to be located on the subject property and shown on the plan. No permanent survey monuments are shown on the subject property. Two permanent survey monuments are shown on the revised Layout Plan C3. However, we note that one of the monuments, a stone bound is located across James Lane from the subject property.

5. ZBL §300-18.1.A(2) specifies that “the total residential gross floor area of a dwelling unit in the VB District shall be not less than 700 square feet nor more than 1,500 square feet.” Proposed residential dwelling unit 2 is 1,530 square feet. In the response letter MEG states that “the maximum square footage for any unit has been revised and neither residential unit will have a gross floor area greater than 1,500 square feet.” We are not in receipt of revised architectural plans so we cannot confirm that the residential gross floor areas are in compliance.

6. We note that the plans submitted by MEG not only show the improvements proposed under this modification but also show the improvements as originally proposed for the entire development. The original improvements included paved aprons for the individual driveways for the units with garages (Units 6, 8, 10, 12 & 14) and pervious paver parking spaces and turnarounds for Units 16, 18, 20 and 22. Based on review of Google Earth imagery from June 22, 2019 (attached) and our site visit today, the majority of the areas proposed to be pervious pavers have been paved with asphalt. We note that the sidewalk behind Units 8, 10, 12 and 14 is pavers and there is a paver border along the south side of the driveway serving Units 16, 18, 20 and 22. We were not involved in the peer review of the original proposal so we do not know if the pavers were proposed for stormwater mitigation or aesthetics. However, if the pavers were proposed to reduce impervious areas for stormwater mitigation then there is likely more runoff from this site than what was expected. Addressed – MEG provided the original pre-development HydroCAD calculations which indicate that the pervious pavers were modeled as impervious in the original design. Therefore, the site is in compliance with the original design and permit for a stormwater perspective.

Please give us a call should you have any question.

Very truly yours,

AMORY ENGINEERS, P.C.

By:

[Signature]

Patrick G. Brennan, P.E.