

September 18, 2026

Town of Medway
155 Village Street
Medway, MA 02053

**Re: Site Plan Review and Land Disturbance Permit Application
Peer Review Response Letter
Medway Municipal Complex
Medway, MA
Langan Project No.: 151072201**

Dear Members of the Planning & Economic Development Board:

On behalf of the Applicant, the Town of Medway, Langan is pleased to submit the attached comment responses in support of the Medway Municipal Complex Site Plan Review and Land Disturbance Permit Applications.

Please find below our responses to the peer review comments from Tetra Tech (TT) dated September 4, 2026. For ease of reference, all comments are included below followed by our response in **bold**.

In addition to the attached comment responses, the enclosed revised application materials reflect updates made in response to the peer review comments and ongoing project coordination:

1. Site Plan Review & Land Disturbance Permit Drawings, prepared by Langan, revised 9/18/2026
2. Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Langan, revised 9/18/2026
3. Earthwork Calculations, prepared by Consigli
4. Energy and Sustainability Narrative, prepared by Dore + Whittier
5. Site Logistics Plan, prepared by Consigli, dated 7/31/2026

One hard copy of the Permit Drawings has been delivered to the Community and Economic Development office. We look forward to reviewing these materials with you at the PEDB meeting on September 22.

Sincerely,

Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, LLC



John M. Perry, PE
Associate Principal



Hannah E. Schur
Project Engineer

SITE PLAN REVIEW

PEDB Site Plan Rules & Regulations (Chapter 200)

1. A list of abutters within 300 feet of the property has been included on the Cover Sheet of the Plans. The Applicant shall confirm three sets of mailing labels were included with the application as required. (Ch. 200 §204-3.D)

RESPONSE: Three sets of mailing labels were included with the application as required. Receipt of these labels has been confirmed with the Town.

2. Tetra Tech did not receive any relevant approvals or permits from other Town boards and committees or federal/state agencies. The Applicant shall confirm that all applicable documents are filed with the Board. (Ch. 200 §204-3.E)

RESPONSE: There are no additional approvals or permits from other Town boards and committees or federal/state agencies for the Project.

3. An earth export volume has been noted in the Project Narrative; however, no supporting calculations were included in the submittal. Documented earth removal calculations shall be prepared by a licensed Professional Engineer (PE) in Massachusetts. (Ch. 200 §204-3.H)

RESPONSE: The latest earthwork calculations are enclosed. The net export is 88,500± tons or 55,000± cubic yards (cy).

4. Tetra Tech did not receive a copy of the latest recorded deed. (Ch. 200 §204-3.K)

RESPONSE: The Purchase and Sale Agreement was submitted to satisfy the property ownership documentation requirement. Receipt of this document has been confirmed with the Town.

5. The Plans were prepared using a variety of drawing scales ranging from 1" = 40' to 1" = 10'; however, the primary scale used was 1" = 30'. Regulations require the scale to be 1" = 40', although Tetra Tech believes the provided scales adequately represent the Project area and proposed improvements. (Ch. 200 §204-4.B)

RESPONSE: Comment acknowledged.

6. Every plan sheet has the required contents described in this regulation; however, the Legend is exclusively shown on Topographic Survey Sheet and a signature block for the Board's endorsement is only provided on the Cover Sheet. (Ch. 200 §204-4.E)

RESPONSE: The legend for all civil & landscape plans is included on the Master Legend & Notes, sheet CS002. The board endorsement signature block has been added to all sheets.

7. It does not appear the zoning district classification is shown on the Cover Sheet as required. (Ch. 200 §204-5.A)

RESPONSE: The zoning district classification, Central Business (CB), has been added to the Cover Sheet.

8. The site locus map was not included on the Site Context Sheet; however, it is provided on the Cover Sheet. (Ch. 200 §204-5.B.1)

RESPONSE: Comment acknowledged.

9. It appears the Applicant has not provided a Site Context Sheet but rather embedded the information within other plan sheets. We recommend a Site Context Sheet be provided with all the required information noted in the Regulations. (Ch. 200 §204-5.B)

RESPONSE: A Site Context Plan, sheet CS003, has been added to the plan set.

10. A limit of disturbance delineation is shown on the Site Preparation Sheet; however, the amount of area which is to be disturbed is not noted on the sheet. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.2)

RESPONSE: The limit of disturbance (LOD) is 9± acres and has been labeled on the Site Preparation Plan, sheet CD101.

11. The Applicant has provided a Grading and Drainage sheet which shows contours at one-foot intervals which deviate from the required two-foot interval. The information provided is more detailed than required which is preferable and in our opinion the Project meets the requirement. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.3)

RESPONSE: Comment acknowledged.

12. The Applicant has proposed vertical granite curb, vertical concrete curb, and bituminous concrete curbs within the details sheet. However, their proposed locations throughout the site are not easily identifiable. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.5)

RESPONSE: Most of the proposed curbing is vertical concrete curb. Cape cod berm, or bituminous concrete curb, is proposed along part of the northern internal access drive. New curb proposed along Main Street shall be vertical granite curb to match the existing Main Street curbing. The proposed curb types have been labeled on the Site Plan, sheet CS101.

13. Horizontal sight distances are not shown on any of the Plan sheets. The project has five curb cuts spread across Main Street and Pond Street. Sight distance will be reviewed in detail in our traffic review of the Project which will be provided under separate cover. (Ch. 200 §204-5.D.18)

RESPONSE: *Sight triangles have been added to the Permit Drawings on the Sight Triangles Plan, sheet TM103, based on the desirable distances listed for each driveway exit in Table 7 of the Transportation Impact Assessment.*

14. The proposed building is greater than 10,000 square feet, which triggers the Town to encourage sustainable and efficient power sources. The Applicant shall comment on their effort to incorporate renewable energy into their design such as solar and why such practices were not implemented. (Ch. 200 §207-4.B)

RESPONSE: *The proposed design incorporates sustainable and efficient power sources. The enclosed Energy and Sustainability Narrative from Dore + Whittier further summarizes the energy-efficiencies incorporated in the design.*

15. The site entrances appear to exceed the two percent slope threshold. The Applicant has requested a waiver from this regulation. (Ch. 200 §207-11.A.14)

RESPONSE: *Comment acknowledged.*

16. Parking spaces are located within 20-feet of several building entrances which is in conflict with the requirements of the Regulations. The Applicant has requested a waiver from this Regulation. (Ch. 200 §207-12.G.3)

RESPONSE: *Comment acknowledged.*

17. The Applicant shall confirm if they have coordinated hydrant location on site with the Medway Fire Department. Two hydrants are proposed, one in the east portion of the site and one in the northwest. (Ch. 200 §207-15.C)

RESPONSE: *The hydrant locations have been coordinated with the Medway Fire Department. Based on coordination with the Fire Department, three hydrants are proposed: one east of Area A, one east of Area B, and one west of Area B. This hydrant layout is illustrated on the Utility Plan, sheet CU101.*

18. We could not locate gas service to the Project site on the Plans. The Applicant shall confirm if gas is proposed on the Project or if the site will be entirely electric. (Ch. 200 §207-16)

RESPONSE: *There is no gas proposed on the Project.*

19. The Applicant is proposing light trespass onto Main Street and Pond Street, mainly at the curb cut locations and abutting properties to the east and southwest of the Project site. This appears to conflict with the requirements of Zoning Bylaw Section 7.1.2. (Ch. 200 §207-18)

RESPONSE: *The lighting design minimizes off-site illumination to the maximum extent practicable while maintaining safe vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Minor spill illumination occurs immediately adjacent to the curb-cut locations where lighting levels transition between the public way and the site drive aisles. These areas are intentionally illuminated to provide safe visibility for vehicles entering and exiting the site and for pedestrian crossing movements. There is no off-site illumination that spills into abutting residential properties.*

With respect to Main Street, the light levels identified in the photometric plan as extending into the public right-of-way are primarily attributable to the proposed streetscape lighting improvements rather than the site parking lot lighting. The Project includes four new decorative street light fixtures along Main Street that are intended to match the existing Town standard Main Street fixture and continue the established roadway lighting character along the corridor. As public roadway lighting, these fixtures are intended to illuminate the sidewalk and adjacent roadway environment and therefore contribute to the light levels shown within the public right-of-way. The site lighting fixtures themselves are full-cutoff luminaires directed downward and onto the site to minimize glare and off-site light spill. No significant glare is directed toward motorists, abutters, or the public way.

20. The Applicant shall provide narrative related to landscape irrigation as the Project includes an extensive planting scope. (Ch. 200 §207-19.I)

RESPONSE: *The Project does not include a permanent irrigation system. Pursuant to Section 207-15.A and Section 207-19.I of the Medway Site Plan Rules and Regulations, connection to the Town's water service for landscape irrigation is not permitted. The proposed landscape improvements have therefore been designed utilizing hardy, drought-tolerant native and adaptive plant materials selected for long-term sustainability and viability without permanent irrigation. Temporary watering will be provided during the plant establishment and warranty period in accordance with the contract documents. Following establishment, landscape maintenance will be performed by the Town, including supplemental watering as needed during extended dry periods. The landscape design emphasizes native and salt-tolerant trees, shrubs, and groundcovers appropriate for municipal facilities and roadway environments, reducing long-term water demand and maintenance requirements.*

General Site Plan Comments

21. The Applicant notes an expected net material export of approximately 55,000 cubic yards (cy). We anticipate this is due to driveway slope requirements and meeting existing grade at the proposed curb cuts across the Project. We recommend the Applicant provide a Construction Management Plan (CMP) detailing trucking routes, Trucking staging, times and duration of export, etc. We recommend trucking be limited to the Pond Street side of the Project to limit impact on Main Street during construction.

RESPONSE: *A Construction Management Plan (CMP) will be provided prior to construction. The latest Site Logistics Plan prepared by Consigli is enclosed and includes additional detail on construction entrances and exits. All trucks will enter the site from a left hand turn into the site off of Main Street, utilizing the center turning lane. All construction traffic must exit the site on Pond Street with a left-hand turn, eliminating construction traffic entering residential neighborhoods. All construction traffic must turn right onto Main Street from Pond Street, eliminating back-ups on Pond Street due to left-hand turns against Main Street traffic.*

22. The Applicant is proposing to trench across Main Street and Pond Street to install proposed utilities. We recommend the Applicant coordinate with the Medway DPW to determine limits of repaving efforts in these areas.

RESPONSE: *Main Street and Pond Street trenching associated with the Project has been coordinated with Medway DPW. Main Street will be resurfaced at the end of construction from curb-to-curb as shown on the Site Plan, sheet CS101. Per coordination with Medway DPW, Pond Street will not be resurfaced as part of this Project.*

23. A handful of notes on the Utility Sheet overlay each other and are illegible.

RESPONSE: *Labels on the Utility Plan, sheet CU101, have been revised to eliminate text conflicts.*

STORMWATER & LAND DISTURBANCE REVIEW

Stormwater Management and Land Disturbance (Article 26)

24. The site appears to contain existing discharges to the Town's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). Stormwater discharges to the MS4 are proposed and we anticipate the Project will require an MS4 Connection and Discharge (CD) permit from the Medway Department of Public Works (DPW). (§26.4.2.a)

RESPONSE: Comment acknowledged.

25. The Project disturbs greater than 20,000 square feet (sf) of land area and it appears will require a Land Disturbance Permit issued through the Board. The Applicant has submitted a Land Disturbance Permit Application along with the submittal documents. (§26.5.1.a)

RESPONSE: Comment acknowledged.

26. The Applicant provided a "Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan" (ESCP) which shows various sediment controls during construction. It does not appear the Applicant has provided a construction sequence/phasing or any sediment basins as part of the ESCP scope. We anticipate stormwater runoff during construction may be difficult to manage due to the slope of the site and existing soil conditions. We recommend the Applicant include temporary sediment basins in the ESCP. Post-construction stormwater basins shall not be used for construction term runoff management. (§26.5.6.2)

RESPONSE: A Construction Management Plan (CMP) will be provided prior to construction. The latest Site Logistics Plan prepared by Consigli is enclosed. Temporary sediment basins will be implemented and will be incorporated into construction phasing documentation prior to construction.

27. The Applicant has provided a draft of the proposed US EPA NPDES Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). In our opinion, this document covers required content for the "Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Plan during Construction" narrative. (§26.5.7.2)

RESPONSE: Comment acknowledged.

28. The Project is a typical site development scope and does not appear to utilize many Low Impact Development (LID) techniques. We recommend the Applicant provide a narrative on whether they considered LID measures across the site in their design development of the Project. (§26.5.8.2.a)

RESPONSE: Low Impact Development (LID) techniques were evaluated and incorporated throughout the proposed design. The Project is a redevelopment that reduces impervious area compared to existing conditions, minimizes new land disturbance where practicable, and

preserves existing mature trees and vegetation to the greatest extent feasible. The design utilizes vegetated swales and open drainage systems in lieu of a fully piped conveyance network where appropriate, promoting infiltration, runoff attenuation, and treatment closer to the source. In addition, the Project introduces stormwater treatment measures where none currently exist and includes extensive native and drought-tolerant landscaping to enhance site hydrology and reduce long-term maintenance demands. Porous pavement was considered during the design process; however, due to the operational requirements associated with the municipal complex, it was determined to be programmatically infeasible. The proposed redevelopment incorporates numerous LID elements and represents a significant improvement over existing stormwater management and environmental conditions.

29. The Operation and Maintenance Plan (O&M Plan) does not include the owners/responsible parties with signatures for implementing the O&M procedures post-construction. (§26.5.9.2.a)

RESPONSE: The signed O&M Plan has been included in Appendix H of the Stormwater Management Report.

30. The Applicant shall add the date of required annual updates that shall be submitted. We anticipate the town will be managing the O&M procedures for the Project long-term but the required date (December 15) of annual reporting shall be included in the O&M Plan to comply with the Bylaw. (§26.5.9.6)

RESPONSE: The required date of annual reporting has been included in the O&M Plan in Appendix H of the Stormwater Management Report.

MassDEP Stormwater Standards/Handbook

31. It appears offsite areas from the northeast (rooftop and rear yards of homes along Meadow Road) may discharge to the site and should be included in the watershed analysis for the Project. This is required to ensure all off-site runoff entering the property is accounted for in the design. (Standard 2)

RESPONSE: The offsite areas associated with the homes on Meadow Road have been included in the watershed analysis for the Project. See revised analysis in the Stormwater Management Report.

32. The Applicant shall clarify water surface elevations from the test pit logs and whether the elevation noted was observed groundwater or redoximorphic features establishing elevation of estimated seasonal high groundwater (ESHGW). There appears to be conflicting information between the test pit logs and the data table provided on the "Surface Basin" detail shown on Sheet CG502 of the Plans. The table appears to show that the bottom of the basin is within two feet of ESHGW which is in conflict with requirements of the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook. (Standard 3)

RESPONSE: *Estimated Seasonal High Groundwater (ESHGW) elevations were established based on groundwater observed during springtime subsurface explorations. No redoximorphic features were identified within the test pits. The groundwater elevations shown on sheet CG502 have been corrected to be consistent with the geotechnical test pit logs. As revised, both proposed surface basins maintain a minimum of two feet of separation between the basin bottom and ESHGW, in accordance with MassDEP Stormwater Handbook requirements. Because the basins are designed to recharge only the required Water Quality Volume (WQV), exfiltration from the basin bottoms has not been credited in the stormwater model, consistent with the Stormwater Handbook.*

33. The Applicant included approximate existing ground surface elevations for all test pits. The elevations provided appear to have been rounded to the nearest 0.5-foot and when compared to their locations on the Plans do not appear to be consistent with the existing topography at the site. We recommend a greater level of accuracy be provided when reporting existing ground surface elevations particularly since the bottom of the proposed infiltration basins appear to be designed at or near their two-foot regulatory limit from ESHGW. (Standard 3)

RESPONSE: *Test pit locations were field-located via GPS and tied to the existing conditions survey. Ground surface elevations associated with the test pits were derived directly from the surveyed topography. While elevations in the test pit logs were reported to the nearest 0.5 foot, this level of precision is consistent with the accuracy of the available subsurface data and avoids implying a greater degree of certainty than is warranted. Furthermore, the reported elevations were generally rounded upward relative to existing grade, resulting in a higher calculated ESHGW elevation and a more conservative estimate of the available separation between the proposed infiltration systems and groundwater.*

34. The Project is proposing to decrease impervious coverage, decrease runoff and increase water quality treatment as compared to pre-development conditions. In our opinion, the Project appears to meet the requirements for consideration of the MassDEP Redevelopment Standard. (Standard 7)

RESPONSE: *Comment acknowledged.*

35. The Project appears to meet the requirements for coverage under the US EPA NPDES General Permit for Discharges from Construction Activities (CGP). We recommend a Condition requiring the Applicant provide proof of coverage under the NPDES CGP and provide a copy of the approved Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to construction. (Standard 8)

RESPONSE: Comment acknowledged.

36. The Applicant has not provided anticipated inspection and maintenance cost in the Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Plan. Additionally, maintenance thresholds shall be added to the "Infiltration Basin" description (Standard 9)

RESPONSE: The estimated annual cost for implementation of the O&M plan is \$5,000. Infiltration basins should be inspected and maintained at least twice a year, after every major storm event, and if the basin does not drain within 72hrs of a storm event. A major storm event is defined as a storm that is equal to or greater than the 2-year, 24-hour storm which is 3.37 inches in a 24-hour period in Medway, MA. The estimated implementation cost and infiltration basin maintenance thresholds have been included in the Operation & Maintenance Plan, Appendix H of the Stormwater Management Report.

37. The Applicant has not provided a signed illicit discharge compliance statement. (Standard 10)

RESPONSE: The signed illicit discharge compliance statement has been included in Appendix I of the Stormwater Management Report.

General Stormwater & Land Disturbance Comments

38. The Applicant has not provided any elevation data for the proposed subsurface detention system (Stormwater System B1) on the Plans such as bottom of system, top of system, etc. These elevations should be provided to determine depth of the structure, cover height and extent to which the basin is installed within the groundwater table. These values appear to be shown in the HydroCAD model but should also be included on the Plans for consistency.

RESPONSE: Elevation data for Stormwater System B1 has been added to the Drainage Plan, sheet CG201.

39. The sizing of the proposed "Retain It" subsurface basin units appears to differ from the dimensioning shown on the Plans. These dimensions should be coordinated to ensure a similar sized system is being modeled and constructed.

RESPONSE: The dimensions for Stormwater System B1 have been corrected on sheet CG502.

40. The outlet to proposed Water Quality Vault B1 is at the same elevation as the primary outlet from Stormwater System B1 which would treat a portion of the flow discharging from the basin. We recommend the Applicant clarify the design intent of the treatment

RESPONSE: The outlet from Stormwater System B1 has been revised. All flow leaving Stormwater System B1 is routed through Water Quality Vault B1 for treatment.

41. We recommend the Applicant include links in the pre- and post-development HydroCAD models for Design Points A and C for consistency with the watershed figures and ease of review.

RESPONSE: Links have been added for all Design Points for consistency.

42. The Grading Plan (Sheet CG101) provides spot grades at the bottom of both infiltration basins. However, there appears to be conflicting information provided by the spot grades shown on the Grading Plan and the data table provided on the "Surface Basin" detail shown on the Grading & Drainage Details II Plan (Sheet CG502). We recommend the elevations be coordinated to clarify the record and for ease of review.

RESPONSE: The elevation data for the surface basins has been corrected on sheet CG502.

43. The invert elevation for OCS-A1-101 is inconsistent between the Plans and HydroCAD analysis. We recommend these elevations be coordinated to clarify the record and for ease of review.

RESPONSE: The invert elevation for OCS-A1-101 has been corrected in the HydroCAD model.

44. A detail of the proposed outlet control structures has not been provided and should be included on the Plans.

RESPONSE: Outlet control structure details have been added to the Grading & Drainage Details on sheet CG502.

45. The Project proposes a swale and culverts along the Pond Street right of way. We recommend the Applicant provide capacity analyses of these drainage features to ensure they have sufficient capacity to convey at a minimum the 25-year storm event.

RESPONSE: Capacity analysis for the swales and culverts along Pond Street have been included in Appendix G of the Stormwater Management Report.

46. The pavement subdrain detail notes subdrainage is to be installed in a grid pattern but plans show legs of the system extending from a common manifold. We recommend the plan and details be coordinated to ensure design intent is consistent.

RESPONSE: The pavement subdrain shall be installed per the plan layout. The subdrain detail has been corrected on sheet CG503.

47. The Project includes level spreaders that rely on a volume of stone and pipe to fill and rise to the surface to discharge which in our opinion is an effective design at redistributing flow to sheet flow condition at the outlet. However, we recommend this configuration be provided with a surface discharge bypass in the event the level spreader section freezes which may heave the section and/or limit discharge.

RESPONSE: The level spreaders are located immediately adjacent to the proposed vegetated swales. In the event freezing conditions temporarily reduce the discharge capacity of a level spreader, stormwater would discharge to the adjacent swale at the nearest low point, providing an overland relief path and preventing prolonged ponding upstream. Accordingly, the proposed design includes an inherent surface bypass to the swale should the level spreader become partially or fully obstructed due to ice formation.

48. The callout for proposed drainage structure downstream of OCS-B1-101 is off page and should be shown on the revised plans.

RESPONSE: Labels on the Drainage Plan, sheet CG201, have been revised to eliminate text conflicts.

49. We recommend the Applicant provide structure dimensions for existing EX-DMH-B3-101. Several large diameter pipe connections exist and one is proposed at the structure for a total of five connections post-construction. The structure may be required to be upsized to account for the number and size of the connections to maintain structural integrity of the DMH. This structure is also located at the main entrance to the fire station and will likely be loaded regularly with heavy vehicular traffic.

RESPONSE: The dimensions and condition of EX-DMH-B3-101 will be field verified. The proposed connections, structure geometry, and anticipated loading will be evaluated, and the structure will be replaced or upsized if needed to accommodate the proposed configuration.

50. The Applicant is proposing one site construction entrance on Main Street. We recommend construction traffic be directed to the proposed Pond Street entrance to limit disturbance to Main Street during construction.

RESPONSE: *The latest Site Logistics Plan prepared by Consigli is enclosed and includes additional detail on construction entrances and exits. All trucks will enter the site from a left hand turn into the site off of Main Street, utilizing the center turning lane. All construction traffic must exit the site on Pond Street with a left-hand turn, eliminating construction traffic entering residential neighborhoods. All construction traffic must turn right onto Main Street from Pond Street, eliminating back-ups on Pond Street due to left-hand turns against Main Street traffic.*

51. We recommend the Applicant install compost filter sock around completed post-construction stormwater basins once they are constructed. We anticipate construction of the basins will occur in the early stages of the Project and should be protected from sedimentation throughout the construction term.

RESPONSE: *Erosion control around the completed post-construction stormwater basins has been incorporated on the Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, sheet CE101.*

52. We recommend silt sacks/inlet protection be installed in catch basins along Main Street and Pond Street to limit sedimentation to the MS4.

RESPONSE: *Inlet protection in catch basins along Main Street and Pond Street has been incorporated on the Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, sheet CE101.*

53. The Applicant is proposing grading activities to the property line around much of the Project site. The Applicant shall adjust proposed site fence and erosion controls to ensure the work occurs within the erosion control limits.

RESPONSE: *Erosion controls will be installed to fully encompass the limits of disturbance and grading. The controls shown on the Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, sheet CE101, are offset in certain locations for graphical clarity only. All grading activities will occur within the protected limits of construction, with erosion controls installed along the disturbance limits and downgradient of disturbed areas as appropriate.*

54. The Applicant is proposing linear erosion controls downgradient of the area in the northeast corner of the site that is proposed to be maintained as existing. We recommend the proposed linear erosion controls be removed from this area to limit issues with stormwater runoff in this area.

RESPONSE: *Erosion controls have been removed from the area noted on the Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, sheet CE101.*