



Neil Perry
Mayor

City of Methuen, Massachusetts

Department of Public Works Engineering Division


The Searles Building, 41 Pleasant Street, Room 206

Methuen, Massachusetts 01844

Telephone (978) 983-8550 Fax (978) 983-8978

June 8, 2022

To: Community Development
City of Methuen

From: Stephen J. Gagnon, PWM 
Engineering Department Administrator

Subject: 46 Old Ferry Road
Site Plan Review

As requested, I have reviewed the revised plan set and letter responding to Kathleen Colwell's letter dated May 23, 2022, all dated June 1, 2022, prepared by Fieldstone Land Consultants, PLLC. Based on my review of the above I have the following comments to offer:

SITE

1. The intersection of Old Ferry Road and the site drive has been revised such that travel on Old Ferry Road will not be possible north of the site drive. Where Old Ferry Road is an accepted City street and the city is considering its use in support of two separate projects, I recommend the site drive intersection be redesigned to allow use of Old Ferry Road.
2. As stated in previous memo(s), the site drive should enter Old Ferry Road as close to 90° as possible. The plan should be revised accordingly.
3. The plan depicts several retaining walls on the site, as high as 32'. A design of the walls should be provided. The design should consider the effects of stormwater features proposed adjacent to the walls, particularly at the south end of the site. Further, the wall design should also consider the proposed guardrail.

OFF-SITE

1. Approximately 800' south of the site drive, Old Ferry Road has a pinch point where the pavement is less than 15', insufficient for truck traffic. The Applicant should be part of the resolution of this issue.

WATER

1. The revised plan set does not depict the proposed water system. The plan should be revised accordingly.
2. It is my understanding a fire flow study was completed in the project area. This data should be provided for review.

SEWER

1. The revised plan set does not depict the proposed sanitary sewer system. The plan should be revised accordingly.

DRAINAGE

1. A stormwater analysis was not provided.
2. Some of the drainage features lack pertinent data such as diameter, elevation, length, etc.
3. Several segments of the drainage system are depicted with a slope of 0.005. A pipe analysis should be provided to confirm minimum velocity is achieved.
4. At some locations drainpipes are less than 10" from the building, consequently in the jurisdiction of the Plumbing Code. The Engineer should confirm these features comply with the Plumbing Code.

The Project Engineer should address these issues in writing.