



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

December 9, 2020

Newbury Planning Board
Town Hall, 12 Kent Way
Byfield, MA. 01922

Attn: Martha Taylor, Town Planner

Re: Response to Design Review Comments prepared by Town Planner October 3, 2020

Members of Board,

The following provides our response to review comments provided by the Planning Department. We have included the review comment and our response to facilitate the Board's review.

No.		Comment / Response
Sheet 2 of 8, Existing Conditions		
1.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>The plan should state whether the wetland delineations have been reviewed and approved by the Newbury Conservation Commission, as would be typical.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	The plan has been reviewed by the Conservation Commission and no comments regarding the wetland delineation have been received.
2.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>A headwall is depicted at the southwest corner of the lot, but no pipes or flow lines are provided. The engineer should address the function of this headwall.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	Based on field conditions and record plans, there do not appear to be any pipes connecting the headwall.
3.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>Any existing pavement on the lots should be identified, as would be typical.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	The existing pavement has been labeled.
Sheet 3 of 8, Site Plan		
1.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>The entire site design appears to be dependent upon the applicant being able to grade, install light poles, and install landscaping on land which does not belong to them, that is, the Newburyport Turnpike layout. The proposed site curbing and pavement begin at the front property line, forcing all grading, lighting and landscaping to be depicted offsite, within the Newburyport Turnpike layout. The board may want the applicant/engineer to obtain a grading/landscaping/utility easement from the appropriate owners of the Turnpike prior to rendering a decision.</i>



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

	Response:	The site layout has been revised to allow for the majority of the grading to be located on-site. The lighting and landscape have also been relocated on-site.
2.	Comment:	<i>The engineer should provide the angle, width and length of the angled parking spaces, as would be typical.</i>
	Response:	The angled parking has been removed.
3.	Comment:	<i>Parallel parking spaces are typically 22 feet long, whereas the plan shows 20 foot parking spaces. The board may want the parallel spaces revised to be 22 feet long.</i>
	Response:	Parallel parking has been removed.
4.	Comment:	<i>The building plans show two doors on the rear of the retail building. The board may want a sidewalk, or other access way, shown on the plan to the doors.</i>
	Response:	
5.	Comment:	<i>Twenty four of the thirty three proposed parking spaces are for residential use. The board may want the engineer to address whether each use will be designated specific parking spaces. The spaces along the front of the building may be designated for retail customer use only, for instance. The board may also want to know how the 5 covered parking spaces (under the building) will be allocated to the 12 residential units.</i>
	Response:	We are not proposing to reserve parking spaces for each use. The parking under the building has been removed.
6.	Comment:	<i>The proposed stairway location should be depicted under the proposed building.</i>
	Response:	Parking is no longer proposed below the building. The stairway will be located within the building footprint.
7.	Comment:	<i>A stabilized construction entrance should be depicted on the plan, as would be typical.</i>
	Response:	A stabilized construction entrance has been added to the plan.
Sheet 4 of 8, Grading Plan		
1.	Comment:	<i>The two proposed Contech CDS units, with rim elevations of 21.1 feet, are located in areas with grades of approximately 19.5-20.0 feet. Unless the proposed grading is revised, the units will be sticking out of the ground by a foot or more. The engineer should address this.</i>
	Response:	The grades at the two Contech CDS units have been revised to show grades above 21.
2.	Comment:	<i>The type of drainpipe (i.e. plastic, concrete) should be specified on the plan, as would be typical.</i>
	Response:	The drainage pipes have been shown on the plans as ADS HDPE pipes.
3.	Comment:	<i>A detail should be provided for the slotted drain, as would be typical.</i>
	Response:	A detail is provided on Sheet 6 of 8.



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

4.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>A gutter down spout detail with underground pipe is provided on sheet 7, but no down spouts or pipes are shown on the plan. The engineer should address this.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	Downspouts and roof drain locations have been added to the plans.
5.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>Proposed grading to construct the site is shown within Newburyport Turnpike. As this is not customary, the board may want the applicant to obtain the necessary easements to accomplish this work.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	The grading in the Newburyport Turnpike layout has been revised. Minor grading is proposed. This will be submitted to MassDOT for approval.
6.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>Five test pits are depicted on the plan, and the logs indicate fill overlying medium/coarse sand. The temporary solution statement indicates that there was substantial soil removal on the site, and that "deeper clay" was present in the monitoring wells. The concern is that the soils encountered in the test pits could be fill material, not naturally occurring soils. The engineer should provide data indicating where the soil removal occurred, and to what depth(s), in order to verify the correct parent material. It would also be helpful to review monitoring well data relative to groundwater observations.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	It is our opinion that since the soil logs show fill over a "Bw" layer, the sand material found in the "c" layer is naturally occurring. Figure 2 in the Temporary Solution Statement shows groundwater contours based on the Monitoring Well data. A copy of this plan is included with this letter.
Sheet 5 of 8, Utilities Plan		
1.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>The plan appears to show an existing 6" watermain, but 8" tapping sleeves are proposed. The engineer should correct this.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	Based on a new plan provided by Newburyport DPS, It appears the existing water main is 12" DI. The plan has been revised to show the correct water main size.
2.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>The E-One sewer pump, by itself, does not support being installed in a sidewalk, as shown. The engineer should revise the detail to show how it will be installed in a sidewalk.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	The pump has been relocated to within the pavement outside of the sidewalk.
3.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>A proposed sewer connection is depicted in Newburyport. The rim/invert information provided show that the sewer will have only a foot of cover. I realize the sewer connection may be in Newburyport, but any problems associated with the shallow depth will affect a site in Newbury. The board may want the engineer to discuss this issue.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	The invert out of the proposed sewer manhole is the existing invert of the sewer main in Newburyport. We cannot provide any additional cover or lower the invert into the manhole.



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

4.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>The architectural and site plans do not address where the mechanicals (air condensers, etc) will be located for the various uses. The board may want these shown on the plans.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	A mechanical room is shown on the Architectural plans.
5.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>The plan labels "tapping sleeve" for the water connections and hydrant, but inline gate valves are drawn. The engineer should address this.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	The tapping sleeve has been removed and the water connections have been revised based on comments received from Newburyport DPS.
6.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>The board may want the issue of mailbox locations addressed or shown on the plans.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	No response required.
Site Lighting Layout		
1.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>Site lighting for this project is depicted on abutting land (i.e. Newburyport Turnpike), which is not customary. As noted previously, the board may want the applicant to procure any necessary easements for work on land of others.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	All lighting has been removed from the Right of Way.
Landscape Plan		
1.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>One-third of the site landscaping is depicted on land not owned by the applicant (i.e. Newburyport Turnpike), which is not customary. As noted previously, the board may want the applicant to procure any necessary easements for the proposed work.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	A revised Landscape plan has been submitted showing the landscaping shown on the project property.
2.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>The plan shows 15 Dwarf Fothergilla shrubs under the proposed building, in the parking area. The board may want the applicant to address these shrubs will receive water, sunlight, etc.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	The plantings have been removed from under the building.
3.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>Proposed shrubs and a tree are depicted on the mechanical separator on the south side of the building. The engineer should address this.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	The plantings have been removed from the area around the CDS unit.
4.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>The board may want areas of proposed lawn to be shown on the plan.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	No response required.
Stormwater Management Report		
1.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>Post development subcatchment area 1S assumes the underbuilding parking area produces runoff, rather than the roof above it. The engineer should address how this assumption was made.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	The underbuilding parking has been removed and the calculations have been revised.



MILLENNIUM ENGINEERING, INC.
Land Surveyors and Civil Engineers

2.	<i>Comment:</i>	<i>Test pits 03-05, located in the proposed infiltration basin, also appear to be located where the previous industrial building stood, or very close to it. As noted in the temporary Solution Statement, substantial soil removal occurred on the site, and deeper clay was noted in the monitoring wells. As all the test pits were not advanced much past four feet, and exhibited 1-2+ feet of fill, the concern is whether the soils encountered in the C layer were natural, or part of the site remediation. As noted above, the engineer should provide data as to where, and how much, soil removal/fill occurred. It would also be prudent to conduct additional test pits and advance them to 8-10 feet, as would be typical.</i>
	<i>Response:</i>	It is our opinion that since the soil logs show fill over a "Bw" layer, the sand material found in the "c" layer is naturally occurring. The Temporary Solution statement also states that approximately 1-2' of soil was removed which would be consistent with the fill shown on the soil logs.

In addition to the above responses, the following revisions have been made to the project:

1. The under-building parking has been removed.
2. 14 residential units are now proposed.

We trust this response letter provides the necessary information for the Board's consideration of the request for completeness. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact our office at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Millennium Engineering, Inc.


James Melvin, P.E.
Project Manager

w/ Attachments

Cc: J. Bavaro
M. Griffin