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Town of Wareham Planning Board

Memorial Town Hall

54 Marion Road

Wareham, MA 02571 Re: Site Plan Review Report

 246 Marion Road, LLC

Attention: Michael King, Chairman

Dear Chairman King:

 I have completed a review of a set of site plans and stormwater calculations for the above referenced project by JC Engineering, Inc. dated February 11, 2022. The following comments are with respect the materials contained in those documents.

General Comments

1. The project consists of the expansion and relocation of the parking arrangement for an existing restaurant located in an MR-30 zoning district. The current number of delineated parking spaces is 20 with an area noted as “existing parking area” but with no number of spaces listed. A potential additional 7 spaces is noted in the parking table.
2. The MR-30 does not allow restaurants, indicating that the use may be non-conforming. The expansion of the parking area may be considered the expansion of a non-conforming use. The total number of proposed and delineated parking spaces is 32.
3. It is recommended that the applicant get an opinion from the Building Commissioner as to whether a variance from the ZBA is necessary.
4. The site plan indicates that there are 75 seats. It is assumed that the future outside seating is not included in this count.

Parking

1. The project is subject to the requirement of Article 9, Parking of the Zoning By-Law.
2. The restaurant parking requirements are one space for every 5 seats. If 75 seats are the current occupancy, then the total number of spaces required is 15. Section 910 of the Zoning By-Law indicates relief from the parking requirements may be obtained by applying to the Board of Appeals for a Special Permit.
3. Section 931, Egress requires that egress cannot be within 100 feet of the centerline of the intersection of the adjacent street. The most northerly egress point on Brown Street is not compliant with this requirement and should be closed. The Route 6 entry and the northeasterly egress onto Brown Street are in compliance with the requirement.
4. Section 970, Standing and Loading, requires that these features be shown on the site plan. See Section 972 which deals with blocking of parking spaces or parking lot aisle. None of these details are shown.
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Landscaping

1. The project does not appear to fall under Article 10, Landscaping because there is no proposed expansion of the existing building.
2. There is a voluntary 20-foot wide landscape area consisting of existing vegetation and new plantings for the south and east sides of the project area that abut residential uses and a small area along Brown Street.

Article 12 (Section 1240) Lighting

1. A determination should be made as to whether this portion of the By-Law applies to the project. The immediate area for the Route 6 driveway egress and the easterly Brown Street egress are most important and no lighting is shown for the parking area itself.

Stormwater Calculations

1. The design is based on a test pit location that shows sandy loam soils above fine sand to a depth of 36 inches and with mottling at 32 inches below ground level. No testing has been done in the vicinity of the subsurface infiltration system that is proposed.
2. The design calls for the removal of all soils under the sediment basin and infiltration basin shown on the plan to reach the “C” layer of sand indicated in the test hole observation. It is to be replaced with loam sand which has a Rawls infiltration rate of 2.41 inches per hour. This replacement soil would need to be tested after placement according to the DEP Stormwater Handbook. This should be made a requirement of site plan approval for the project.
3. Unsuitable soil also needs to be removed and replaced under the proposed subsurface infiltration and storage system and for a distance of five feet around the perimeter. This material also should be tested for infiltration capacity.
4. The stormwater calculations are using an infiltration rate of 8.27 inches per hour, the Rawls rate for sand in the case of the subsurface infiltration area. Any fill used around and under this system would need to have that rate in order for the calculations to be acceptable. A determination of the rate prior to the placement of structures should be made a requirement.
5. The calculations include a small drainage area that includes pavement and roof runoff going to Brown Street. This runoff should be separated from the rest of the drainage sub-catchment that goes overland.

Plans

1. In the stormwater calculations noted above it is noted that a portion of runoff goes to Brown Street. From the existing conditions at Brown Street, it appears that some ponding may occur near the end of the existing sidewalk. This should be checked with appropriate adjustment to grading so that the sidewalk area will be safe from ponding and icing conditions.
2. The detail sheet calls for 12 inches of base material in two 6-inch layers with 3 inches of bituminous asphalt paving over it. There is not enough elevation above the subsurface infiltration area to maintain this depth of base and pavement.

Site Plan Review Report

246 Marion Road, LLC

Page three

1. The Outlet Structure Detail should show how the frame and cover are to be secured.
2. The spillway cross section should be detailed for top and base dimension, width and with filter fabric separating soil and stone.
3. The stone riprap at the southeast corner of the pavement should be dimensioned for depth, width and cross section shape. Filter fabric should be placed under the stone and with 6 inches of fabric secured to the binder course of pavement with bituminous tack. The wearing surface should then cover the end of the filter fabric.
4. The site plan should indicate the total number of seats to be within the future outdoor seating area.
5. It appears that reconstruction of the entrance at Brown Street may require an adjustment of the existing sidewalk and removal of curing. This should be detailed.
6. The existing curb cut for Route 6 appears not to be changed in any appreciable way. However, the Brown Street egress does. It is recommended that this egress be approved by the Municipal Maintenance Department.
7. There is no turning radius or route travel plan for fire apparatus in the plan set. The Fire Department should be consulted and with notice sent to the Planning Board of its findings.
8. The Conservation Commission should be contacted by the applicant regarding notice that there are no wetlands within 100 feet of the project area.

This concludes the review of the project documents as received. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Charles L. Rowley

Charles L. Rowley, PE, PLS

Cc Planning Board members

 Ken Buckland, Town Planner

 Aaron Shaheen, Ass’t Planner

 David Pichette, Conservation Agent

 John Churchill, PE, JC Engineering, Inc.