



July 30, 2021

Ms. Kathleen Colwell  
Planning Division Director  
Department of Economic and Community Development  
41 Pleasant Street  
Methuen, MA 01844

115 GLASTONBURY BLVD  
GLASTONBURY CT 06033  
860.659.1416

120 MIDDLESEX AVENUE  
SUITE 20  
SOMERVILLE, MA 02145  
617.776.3350

6 CHESTNUT ST  
AMESBURY MA 01913  
978.388.2157

197 LOUDON RD  
SUITE 310  
CONCORD NH 03301  
603.856.7854

317 IRON HORSE WAY  
SUITE 100  
PROVIDENCE RI 02908  
401.383.6530

**Re: 33 Danton Drive Methuen, MA**  
**Site Plan Review Response (TEC)**

Dear Ms. Colwell:

This intent of this letter is to respond to the July 10, 2021, review letter from the from Peter Ellison, P.E., at TEC.

The original comment from TEC is shown in normal font. ***DCI's response to these comments is shown in a bold and italic rust color.***

1. The Site Plans display several mistakes, typos, and clerical errors making it difficult for TEC to understand the intent and purpose of the plan. TEC will be required to perform a 2nd in-depth review of the plans after resubmission and correction of the plan errors.  
***Acknowledged and corrected.***
2. The Applicant's name is misspelled on the Cover Sheet.  
***The typo has been corrected.***
3. The Zoning Table on the Cover Sheet is not updated and does not accurately reflect the proposed development.  
***The Zoning Table on the Cover Sheet has been updated.***
4. The Sheet List Table on the Cover Sheet does not accurately reflect the sheets that have been submitted in the plan set.  
***The Sheet List Table on the Cover Sheet has been updated.***
5. Several Zoning Variances will be required including but not limited to side yard setback, maximum building height, and lot coverage.

***An application for relief of the requirements of the zoning ordinance was filed and granted by the ZBA on 7/28/21.***

6. The building square footage is listed as 60,200 SF on the Cover Sheet, 58,300 SF on sheet C-101, and 58,740 SF in the submission's cover letter. The dimensions on the plan are 132' x 442' (58,344 SF).

***The inconsistencies have been corrected. The proposed building is 132' x 442', equaling 58,344 sf.***

7. The plans show an existing stormwater swale being directed into the corner of the proposed building at the northeast corner. It is unclear if the swale will be redirected, removed, or replaced as part of the project.

***The swale is fed by an existing catch basin and surface run-off from paved areas. The catch basin will be abandoned, and the surface areas will be re-graded to the new system.***

8. The Applicant should confirm that the Landscape buffer at rear of lot remains unchanged from the previous proposal.

***The Landscape buffer at the rear of the lot has increased compared to the previous proposal.***

9. There are several dimensions and notes at the parking area in the southwest corner of the building that appear to be incorrect.

***All parking dimensions and notes for parking areas have been reviewed and corrected where required.***

10. A note should be added to clarify the circle in each parking space. Is this meant to be a bollard?

***The circles in the parking spaces have been removed.***

11. TEC does not recommend parking directly adjacent to building in the southwest corner of the building. The door entry opens into the drive aisle.

***The parking directly adjacent to the building in the southwest corner of the building has been revised to eliminate conflict with the door entry.***

12. The Zoning table on sheet C-101 shows the proposed parking is 54 spaces however the plans only show 51 spaces.

***The Zoning table on sheet C-101 has been removed and the Zoning table on the Cover Sheet has been updated to reflect the correct number of parking spaces as 53.***

13. No accessible parking is shown – a minimum of 3 spaces must be provided with a minimum of 1 van accessible space.

***The accessible parking spaces have been identified.***

14. The Methuen Fire Department should review plan for emergency access.

***Acknowledged. The plans have been submitted for review.***

15. Additional grading information is required near the proposed loading docks. The trench drain does not appear to be connected to the closed drainage system.

***Additional grading information has been added near the proposed loading docks. The trench drains now connect to the drainage system.***

16. The tractor trailers should be removed from the Grading Plan.

***The tractor trailers have been removed from the Grading Plan.***

17. TEC recommends a condition requiring the pavement removal and grading on the adjacent property (31 Danton Drive) prior to certificate of occupancy.

***A note has been added to the plan calling for pavement removal and grading to be performed in coordination with the abutting property owner.***

18. TEC does not recommend directing stormwater toward the building with the use of a French drain directly adjacent to the west side of the building. The Applicant should consider use of catch basins and manholes in the center of the drive aisle.

***This area has been redesigned directing stormwater away from the building and to catch basin #6. Minimum surface grades have been maintained directing the surface sheet flow. The catch basin is adequate to handle this catchment area.***

19. TEC recommends shifting the trench drain to be about 13-feet away from the edge of the building. It will be easier to maintain and will eliminate potential freeze/thaw damage directly adjacent to the building foundation.

***Adjusting the trench drain locations would create a significant grading issue for grading of the loading dock. The proposed condition providing trench drain 2 feet off the foundation wall is common with the designed loading dock application. The grade at foundation wall will be 3" above rime to ensure water will not pool at interface with the foundation wall.***

20. The rim and invert information on the Grading Plan does not correspond with the rim and invert information on the Utility Plan (Catch Basin 4, Drain Manhole 1).

***Rim and invert information has been updated to eliminate inconsistencies in proposed utility information.***

21. There are two structures labeled Drain Manhole 1 on the Utility Plan. Also, several catch basins are not labeled. Each structure should be labeled with a unique numbering system.

***All structures have been labeled with unique numbers.***

22. The catch basin in the southeast corner of the site is labeled "Catch Basin X, Rim=XXX.XX', Inv 12"=XXX.XX'". The information for this structure should be provided. All rim and invert should be reviewed and revised as required.

***All rim and invert information has been provided and revised as required.***

23. The Utility Plan shows a drain coming out of the southwest corner of the building which is unlabeled and shows a 90-degree change in direction with no drain structure. The purpose of this drain line is not clear.

***The Utility Plan has been revised with labels identifying all components.***

24. The project proposes a cut of approximately 7-feet in proximity to two existing sewer manhole structures. The Applicant should coordinate this work with the Department of Public Works.

***The existing sewer has approximately 20 feet of cover. Removing 7 feet will not impact this sewer. All work to this pipe is being coordinated with the Methuen Department of Public Works.***

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (617)776-3350.

Sincerely,  
Design Consultants, Inc.

Stephen Sawyer P.E.  
Senior Project Manager

*Letter to J. Doe, 00/00/0000*