andover consultants inc.

1 East River Place
Methuen, Massachusetts 01844
Tel. (978) 687-3828
www.andoverconsultants.com

November 27, 2023

Methuen Community Development Department
c/o Kathleen Colwell, Planning Division Director
41 Pleasant Street
Methuen, MA 01844

RE: Special Permit and Site Plan Review
Aroma Joes Drive-Through
79 Haverhill Street
Response to Peer Review

Dear Ms. Colwell And Members of the Board:

We are in receipt of a review letter for the above referenced project dated October 5, 2023 prepared by the Board's Peer Reviewer, TEC. We have reproduced TEC's comments below in *italics* with our response noted below in **bold**.

The comments listed under TEC's *Traffic Impact and Access Study Review* comment section will be responded to under separate cover prepared by the Project's Traffic Engineer, Bayside Engineering.

Traffic Impact and Access Study Review

Comment 12 – TEC recommends the Applicant coordinate with the Town of Methuen Fire Department to review site emergency access considerations. The Applicant's engineer should provide a truck turning analysis using a City of Methuen fire apparatus to ensure that emergency vehicles are able to navigate in and out of the site.
Response – An AutoTurn truck turning simulation using the City of Methuen's fire apparatus has been completed by Bayside Engineering and is provided in their response materials.

Comment 13 – The Applicant should specify the types of delivery trucks permitted on-site. Since there is no formal loading zone identified on the site, a narrative should be provided indicating how loading/deliveries and trash/recycling will be managed off-hours.
Response – Sysco is the main distribution and delivery company utilized by Aroma Joe franchises. Most locations will receive deliveries twice a week, depending on sales. The delivery times and days will be the scheduled by the franchisee and the supplier based on the traffic of the location. The suppliers will also choose which vehicle is the most appropriate to use for the given area, which will most likely be a box truck with lift gates for delivery typical for smaller sites, such as this one.

Comment 14 – A marked stop line should be provided for vehicles exiting the site driveway approaches to Haverhill Street. The Applicant should confirm the sight line characteristics from the proposed stop line location and adjust signage, if necessary.
Response – The placement of a painted stop line with sight line characteristics has been noted on the revised plan set.

Comment 15 – The sight triangle areas for the site driveway intersections with Haverhill Street should be shown on the Site Plans along with a note to indicate: "Signs, landscaping and other features located within sight triangle areas shall be designed, installed, and maintained so as not to exceed 2.5- feet in height. Snow windrows located within sight triangle

areas that exceed 3.5-feet in height or that would otherwise inhibit sight lines shall be promptly removed."
Response – The site triangles for the site driveway intersections with Haverhill Street have been added to the revised plans along with the suggested note.

Comment 16 – A note should be added stating: "All Signs and pavement markings to be installed within the Project site shall conform to the applicable specifications of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
Response – A note stating the above has been added to the revised plan set.

Comment 17 – Based on Car Queuing Detail map (Sheet 4 of the Site Plan), access to the drive-thru bypass lane is partially obstructed by vehicle queuing. This can get elevated when loading and delivery trucks are behind the queue and cannot access the site. TEC recommends widening the full access driveway to extend the bypass lane to Haverhill Street.
Response – Widening the driveway to extend the bypass lane to Haverhil Street has been made on the revised plan set.

Comment 18 – The car queuing detail map should be revised to account for a more realistic spacing between queued vehicles. TEC typically uses 22 to 25 feet for a vehicle length, including the buffer between vehicles.
Response – The car queuing detail has been revised to provide for a minimum of 22' bumper to bumper between queued vehicles as suggested.

Comment 19 - Bicycle parking should be provided at an appropriate location that is accessible to employees and customers.
Response – A 7'x7' concrete pad has been added to the revised plans for bicycle parking as suggested.

Civil Engineering Site Plan Review

Comment 20 – According to Article XII, Section 12.3.A.3: "Whenever outside lighting is proposed, every application shall be accompanied by a lighting plan…". The Applicant should include a photometric plan.
Response: A photometric plan has been provided in the revised plan set.

Comment 21 – The Applicant has stated that the proposed drive-through is to be a maximum building height of one story. TEC recommends including an Architectural Plan to show that the Applicant meets the zoning requirement of a maximum building height of forty (40) feet as well as revising the Zoning Table provided on the Cover Sheet of the Site Plans.
Response – Architectural plans have been provided with the revised submittal materials and the Zoning Table on the cover sheet has been revised as noted.

Comment 22 – TEC acknowledges that the Applicant has provided at least 20' of a drive aisle for the ninety- degree parking along the western perimeter of the site. However, the vehicle queuing detail provided in the Site Details sheet, results in a drive aisle less than 20'.
Response – As noted, the parking aisle does comply with zoning requirements, often cars will be located within drive aisles of shopping plazas, grocery store parking lots, etc and vehicles are able to navigate out of spots when there is a break in traffic or by staying with the 12' half of the drive aisle.

Comment 23 – The Applicant should confirm that the current proposed location for the dumpster will not result in any traffic congestion issues with the current drive through layout.
Response – As noted in our response to the Engineering Department comments, the applicant is agreeable to a condition of approval requiring deliveries and dumpster service being scheduled to avoid hours of operation in the event these operations become an issue.

Comment 24 – TEC recommends adding a wheelchair ramp along the western curb line of the parking lot connecting to

the proposed sidewalk.
Response – A wheelchair ramp has been added to the western curb line as suggested on the revised plan set.

Comment 25 – The Applicant includes a "Deep Sump Catch Basin" as well as a "Shallow Catch Basin" within the Site Details sheets. TEC recommends clarifying where the two types of catch basins are being proposed.
Response – The "Shallow Catch Basin" detail has been removed from the plans as it is not necessary.

Comment 26 – TEC recommends adding spot grades to the Grading & Utility Plan for each wheelchair ramp and along walkways to clarify the design satisfies ADA and MAAB regulations and matches the provided details.
Response – Additional spot grades have been added to the Grading & Utility Plan as suggested on the revised plan set.

Comment 27 – TEC recommends calling out the connection between proposed curbing and existing curbing as well as proposed pavement tie ins to the existing pavement within the Grading & Utility Plan to clarify the connection between the proposed construction and Haverhill Street.
Response – The connections between proposed and existing curbing, sidewalk and pavement has been noted on the revised plans.

Comment 28 – The Applicant proposed a "Top of Curb" elevation of 140' near the southwest corner of the proposed parking lot. The Applicant also proposed a 140' contour that runs adjacent to the curb within the parking lot. TEC recommends adding Top of Curb as well as Bottom of Curb elevations throughout the Grading & Utility Plan to clarify the elevations of the proposed curbing.
Response – Top and bottom of curb elevations have been added to the revised plan set and the 140.0 TOC has been corrected to 140.5.

Comment 29 – TEC recommends adding the material, diameter, length, and slope of each proposed pipe throughout the project.
Response – All proposed pipes have had material, diameter, length, and slope added to the revised plan set.

Comment 30 – The Applicant is proposing a Roof Drain connecting to DMH-2. TEC recommends calling out the Roof Drain within the Grading & Utility Plan.
Response – The roof drain connecting to DMH-2 has been called out on the revised plan set.

Comment 31 – The Applicant is proposing a pipe connection from DMH-2 to the underground storage chamber. TEC recommends adding an invert elevation to this pipe going into the underground storage chamber.
Response – The invert for this pipe connecting DMH-2 to the underground storage chamber has been added to the revised plan set.

Comment 32 – It appears OCS-1 was designed in the Site Details Sheet with an orifice elevation that is inconsistent with the Grading & Utility Plan. The Applicant should revise the plans to be consistent with what is being proposed.
Response – All orifice elevations have been revised for consistency on the revised plan set.

Comment 33 – The Applicant includes a dumpster pad enclosure detail within the Site Details sheets. TEC recommends revising the plans and/or details so that the dimensions shown on the Site Details are consistent with what is proposed on the Site Plans.
Response – The plan set has been revised to show details and consistent dimensions for the dumpster pad enclosure on the revised plan set.

Stormwater Management Review

Comment 1 – 1. Standard 1 states that no new stormwater conveyances (e.g., outfalls) may discharge untreated stormwater directly to or cause erosion in wetlands or waters of the Commonwealth.
The Applicant appears to be compliant with Standard 1.
Response – Standard met; no response required.

Comment 2 - 2. Standard 2 requires that stormwater management systems must be designed so that post- development peak discharge rates and volumes do not exceed pre-development peak discharge rates and volume.
The Applicant includes a Stormwater Discharge Summary Table comparing the pre and post development discharge rates for Design Point 1. Within the Regulatory Compliance narrative, the Applicant states that the post development discharge rate increases at Design Point 2. TEC recommends revising the narrative and/or HyrdoCAD Report as there is no Design Point 2.
Response – The narrative has been corrected to reflect no increase in post design runoff rates.

Comment 3 - Standard 3 requires that the annual recharge from the post-development site should approximate the annual recharge rate from pre-development or existing site conditions, based on soil types.
The Applicant has provided Recharge Volume Calculations and appears to be compliant with Standard 3.
Response – Standard met; no response required.

Comment 4 - Standard 4 requires that the stormwater system must be designed to remove 80% of the average annual load of Total Suspended Solids (TSS).
The Applicant has provided treatment train TSS calculations sheets. It appears the Applicant has designed a stormwater management system that removes at least 86% of the TSS and therefore compliant with Standard 4.
Response – Standard met; no response required.

Comment 5 - Standard 5 is related to projects with a Land Use of Higher Potential Pollutant Loads (LUHPPL).
The proposed project is not considered a LUHPPL; therefore Standard 5 is not applicable.
Response – Standard not applicable; no response required.

Comment 6 - Standard 6 is related to projects with stormwater discharging into a critical area, a Zone II or an Interim Wellhead Protection Area of a public water supply.
The Applicant stated that the proposed project will not discharge into a critical area, Zone II, or an Interim Wellhead Protection Area of a public water supply. Standard 6 is not applicable.
Response – Standard not applicable; no response required.

Comment 7 - Standard 7 is related to projects considered Redevelopment. A redevelopment project is required to meet the following Stormwater Management Standards only to the maximum extent practicable: Standard 2, Standard 3, and the pretreatment and structural best management practice requirements of Standards 4, 5, and 6. Existing stormwater discharges shall comply with Standard 1 only to the maximum extent practicable. A redevelopment project shall also comply with all other requirements of the Stormwater Management Standards and improve existing conditions.
The proposed project is not considered a redevelopment.
Response – As stated, the project is not considered a redevelopment and standard 7 is not applicable.

Comment 8 - Standard 8 requires a Construction Period Pollution Prevention Plan (CPPP) and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan to be implemented to prevent impacts during disturbance and construction activities.

The Applicant stated that the proposed project is not required to obtain coverage under the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit. A construction period pollution prevention and erosion and sedimentation controls are included in the report in compliance with Standard 8.
Response – As stated, a CPPP and ESC Plans are included in the stormwater report.

Comment 9 – Standard 9 requires an Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Plan to be provided.
The Applicant has provided an Operation and Maintenance Plan included in the Long Term Pollution Prevention Plan in compliance with Standard 9.
Response – As stated, an O&M Plan has been provided.

Comment 10 – Standard 10 Prohibits all illicit discharges to the stormwater management system.
No Illicit Discharge Statement has been provided to satisfy Standard 10. However, the Applicant stated there are no known illicit discharges generated by the property owner and no illicit discharges are proposed. TEC recommends an illicit discharge statement to be provided prior to issuance of a building permit.
Response – Prior to stormwater discharge and/or prior to the issuance of a building permit, an Illicit Discharge Statement will be provided by the Owner.

If you have any questions concerning these latest revisions, or require anything further, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Andover Consultants Inc.

Dennis A. Griecci

Dennis A. Griecci, P.E., LEED AP
Enclosures