

Robert E. Puff, Jr. P.E.  
Consulting Civil Engineer  
53 Cutts Island Lane  
Kittery Point, ME 03905

March 09, 2022  
VIA EMAIL

Ipswich Planning Board  
Town Hall  
25 Green Street  
Ipswich, MA 01938

RE: 50-56 Market Street - Site Plan Review & Special Permit Applications  
Fourth Engineering Review - Task 3

Mr. Ethan Parsons and Planning Board Members:

As requested, I have continued an engineering review of the above referenced project with respect to drainage and stormwater management, parking, loading, and vehicular circulation. In response to the third (Task 2A) review, I have received the following pertinent revised and/or supplemental plans and documents as prepared by the Morin-Cameron Group, Inc., of Danvers, MA (unless otherwise noted).

- Copy of correspondence to the Ipswich Planning Board, dated March 4, 2022 regarding ‘Response to Third Engineering Review – Task 2A ...’
- “Site Improvement Plans for Market Street Station located at 50-56 Market Street...” consisting of plan sheets 4, 5, 7, and 9, all dated September 22, 2021 and revised to March 4, 2022.

At this time, the following remaining comments and opinions are offered for your consideration. Note that reference to the ‘Task 2A review’ refers to the third engineering review dated February 23, 2022.

### **Remaining Discussion**

1. Previous concern in the Task 2A review regarding proximity of Infiltration System 2 to the existing building foundation has been satisfactorily resolved by the addition of an HDPE barrier membrane placed vertically between the Infiltration System and the existing building foundation as shown on the revised plan sheet 5.
2. Regarding prior Task 2A review items on Parking, Loading, and Vehicular Circulation, the following remaining comments are offered:
  - a. Loading Space – In my opinion, the proposed 9’ x 29’ loading space shown on plan sheet 4 is suitable for this type of development proposal. It is suggested that the space be permanently designated with pavement marking and/or signage (at the discretion of the Planning Board).
  - b. Snow storage and pavement setback from sidelines – No revisions have been proposed with respect to these issues. For prior comment, reference should be made to the Task 2A review under the heading ‘Parking, Loading, and Vehicular Circulation’ items 1b and 5 relating to inadequacy of, and access to, the proposed on-site snow storage.
  - c. Tandem Parking – The Applicant has provided additional turning diagrams that demonstrate the provision of adequate stacking space to accommodate two cars entering the site while vehicles are moved into/out of the tandem parking spaces at the front of

the project. As such, while this reviewer does not generally favor the tandem parking approach, it is acknowledged that vehicle movement and congestions associated with the two tandem parking areas will most commonly be limited to the project site.

- d. Vehicle Aisle proximity to existing building – In response to the Task 2A review comment regarding minimal separation between the existing building and the proposed vehicle aisle (i.e., 1 to 2 foot buffer strip), no geometric changes have been made to increase the buffer, however, granite bollard lighting has been added at four locations along the building. No engineering objection is offered to this approach, except to note that the bollards are spaced more than 20 feet apart, and that an improved condition would provide additional bollards and a reduced spacing increment.
- e. Retaining Walls & Grading – Previous grading concern noted in the Task 2A review has been addressed. It is noted that part of the solution involves the placement of a stone drip edge on abutting property of EBSCO. It is left to the discretion of the Planning Board whether written consent of the abutter should be provided for the record.

**Additional Items for Planning Board Consideration:** Should the Planning Board determine that the Application is ready to be voted upon (and if a vote to approve the project is taken), the following items are suggested for consideration.

1. It is suggested that a condition of approval be included to require that street parking realignment be authorized and conducted in accordance with the requirements of the DPW Director.
2. It is suggested that the Fire Department request relative to the entrance driveway be incorporated as a condition of approval. The condition should stipulate that the Fire Department successfully field evaluate the regraded driveway with their apparatus upon completion of binder course paving and that satisfactory evaluation by the Fire Department be required prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
3. Prior comment regarding the building egress at the rear of the existing building and the potential conflict between the stairway landing and the vehicle aisle remain unresolved. It is again suggested that the Applicant ask the Building Inspector to offer an interpretation and opinion on the landing requirement in this location. If this cannot be achieved prior to a Planning Board vote, it is further suggested that the Applicant be required to return to the Planning Board if the Building Inspector's opinion results in a modification to the Site Plan.
4. Regarding items suggested to ensure quality assurance of construction and long term care of the drainage and stormwater management infrastructure, the Board should refer to the 'Task 2A' report dated February 23, 2022 for items 1 through 6, under the heading 'Additional Planning Board Considerations.'

Please feel free to contact me if you have any remaining questions or require any clarification of the above comments and opinions.

Very truly yours,

*R.E. Puff*

---

Robert E. Puff, Jr., PE

cc: John Morin, PE (via email)  
Will Schkuta, PE (via email)  
Dan Powers (via email)