



Memo

Response to Comments: 65 Munjoy Street Condominium Development

Date: January 27, 2016

Comments Submitted by: Nell Donaldson, Planning Division on 2015-12-31

1. Provide turning templates showing access to parking spaces.

Response: See response to comments by Tom Errico the City's consulting Traffic Engineer.

2. Provide graphic depicting accessible route from sidewalk. In revised plans, show ADA accessible parking spaces as well. Additional comments on the ADA access may be forthcoming

Response: The ADA route from the sidewalk to the building is shown in the attached sketch: 65 Munjoy-ADA Access from Sidewalk as well as on the site plan C-1. As indicated by the spot elevations, the grades will be less than 2% in all directions along the entire route. The parking spaces on either side of the 5' isle are geometrically compatible with providing ADA parking accommodations for physically challenged condominium residents and will be designated to physically challenged condominium residents as applicable.

3. What will prevent parked cars from encroaching on utility closets or rear door?

Response: Concrete wheel stops will be installed at the end of the parking spaces as shown on the civil drawings.

4. Street tree standard for multi-family (TM 4.6.1):1 tree/unit in ROW – 8 required, 1 provided, 1 existing. Contribution for 6 remaining.

Response: We are proposing to install 5 trees at the end of the driveway on adjacent City land, which currently functions as a public park. We are asking that these trees be considered as a contribution. This would leave a contribution of 1 tree remaining, which could be addressed by planting an additional tree on City land or paying into the tree fund at the City's discretion.

5. OHE to property to south appears to cut through proposed building. Please provide alternative in revised plans.

Response: A conceptual alternative alignment has been provided on the revised civil plans.

6. Electrical service also appears to conflict with the existing street tree.

Response: The electrical service alignment has been adjusted to avoid this conflict. Good catch, thank you.

7. Need PWD capacity, DPW capacity

Response: PWD capacity has been provided. We have not heard back from DPW.

8. Is cobrahead necessary? Or could this be removed in favor of site lighting?

Response: The cobra head is not necessary for our needs. It is our understanding that the City's preference is to remove this streetlight and the plans have been adjusted to indicate this.

9. Waivers

- Aisle width
- Parking space dimensions

Response: See response to comments by Tom Errico, the City's consulting Traffic Engineer.

10. Additional Submittals Required

- Distance to Property lines (front and sides)
- Material on driveway
- Width of sidewalk

Response: The site plan (C1) has been revised to include the above information.

11. Zoning

Distance to Property Show full height on elevations (i.e. include distance from ground to FFE)

Response: The distance from ground to FFE has been included in the revised architectural drawings.

12. Easement

C2 notes need for temporary 'grading license' for grading to swale and catch basin at rear of site. Landscaping plan also shows note reading –'work with city arborist to finalize plant selections in this area'. An easement may technically be required pending further discussion with DPS.

Response: We are committed to working with the City to develop the appropriate legal vehicle in order to facilitate the proposed grading and planting.

Comments Submitted by: by Tom Errico on 1/7/2016

1. I find the driveway width and location to be acceptable.

Response: No response necessary.

2. The applicant notes conducting an auto-turn analysis for accessing the parking spaces. The analysis should be provided. The applicant also references a similar parking layout on Lafayette Street for documentation of vehicle circulation adequacy. I did conduct a field review of the Lafayette Street site and vehicle circulation is constrained. In addition to providing the analysis information, I would like to request a field meeting with the applicant at the Lafayette Street site.

Response: On Wednesday, January 20, John Mahoney and Tom Errico met in the parking lot at 65 Munjoy Street to field test the parking accommodations proposed for the development. The proposed parking geometry was "mocked up" using spray paint, cones and parked cars to simulate actual parking conditions.

Tom tested the parking accommodations with his personal vehicle and found the proposed dimensions were acceptable with the following modification: Approximately two thirds of the driveway (isle width) will be widened from 18' to 19' as show on Sheet C1.

Additionally, the consensus was agreed that a presentation of a turning template analysis would not be required.

3. The site plan locates the narrowest parking space in a location where the building column will constrain vehicle maneuvers. I would suggest that the narrow space be located without building column interference.

Response: The narrowest parking stall has been relocated as shown on Sheet C1.

4. I support a waiver for the non compliant dimensional parking spaces.

Response: Thank you

5. Backing maneuvers onto Munjoy Street will be required. I support this condition given low traffic speeds and volumes on Munjoy Street.

Response: Thank you

6. I am reviewing ADA accessibility compliance as it relates to access from the public sidewalk and will provide comments in the future.

Response: No response required.

Comments Submitted by: by Dave Senus on 1/7/2016

1) a) Basic Standards: Additional notes and details should be provided to address erosion and sediment control requirements, inspection and maintenance requirements, and good housekeeping practices in accordance with Appendix A, B, & C of MaineDEP Chapter 500. Specific attention should be paid to controlling the tracking of silt and mud onto the City roadway. The plans should include a requirement for frequent street sweeping of Munjoy Street (currently called out as “May Street” in the note on C2). Temporary catch basin inlet protection (silt sacks) should be installed at the catch basins downhill of the site, both at the corner of Munjoy & Wilson and at the field inlet within the park.

Response: The plans and notes have been updated to address the above comments.

1) b) General Standards: The project will result in a net decrease in impervious area of approximately 1,300 sq ft, as such, the project is not required to include stormwater management features for stormwater quality control. The Applicant has proposed to construct three rain gardens to capture and infiltrate stormwater runoff, along with a pervious paver patio area to infiltrate stormwater that falls onto the patio surface. We find this to be an acceptable approach for stormwater management for the site.

Response: No response required.

1) c) Flooding Standard: The project will result in a net decrease in impervious area of approximately 1,300 sq ft, as such, the project is not required to include stormwater management features for stormwater quantity control. The Applicant has proposed to construct three rain gardens to capture and infiltrate stormwater runoff, along with a pervious paver patio area to infiltrate stormwater that falls onto the patio surface. These measures will help to further reduce runoff from the site; as such, we find the project to be in conformance with the Flooding Standard.

Response: No response required.

2) The Applicant has requested letters from utilities confirming capacity to serve the proposed development; evidence of confirmation of capacity to serve the proposed development should be provided upon receipt.

Response: See response to Comment #7 from Nell Donaldson.

3) In accordance with Section 2.6.9 of the City's Technical Manual, all new (sewer) laterals connecting to a combined sewer system shall have a back water valve. The back water valve should be located on private property and a detail should be provided.

Response: Based on additional discussion with David Pineo and conditions specific to this site, a back water valve will not be required at the 65 Munjoy development. See attached email from Dave.

4) Runoff from the driveway area will enter a raingarden that is situated approximately 2.5' lower in elevation than the adjacent driveway grade through a break in a retaining wall. A detail should be provided to show the interface of the wall/inlet into the raingarden.

Response: A detail has been provided.

5) A detail should be provided for the proposed retaining wall.

Response: A detail has been provided.

6) The intent of having a "swale" within the tree lined vegetated strip between the driveway and the western property edge is unclear. The tree plantings in this location and snow storage is likely to impede drainage.

Response: The intent of the "swale" along the tree lined strip at the western edge of the property is to direct snow melt from the snow storage area onto City property (where it currently drains to) rather than onto adjacent residential property. Also a small portion (approximately 20%) of the proposed driveway will drain to this area. This area will see very little runoff from the proposed development and no runoff from offsite. While it is true that the trees and snow will impede drainage somewhat, we do not anticipate any issues because the drainage area is very small and concentrated flows are unlikely to develop.

7) Pavement saw cut lines should be shown for the utility connections within Munjoy Street.

Response: Pavement saw cut lines are now shown on the civil drawings.

8) As noted on the plans, additional coordination is needed to re-route overhead utilities that cross the property to provide service to the adjacent, abutting properties.

Response: No response is necessary.

Comments Submitted by: by Jeff Tarling on 1/11/2016

1. Overall the landscape plan works for this site. To meet City landscape standards the proposed 'Green Pillar' Oak should be 2" caliper vs 1.5". They could use "Regal Prince' variety of upright Oak also for the same effect with perhaps a better cultivar.

Response: The landscape plan has been adjusted to indicate 2" caliper trees and the suggested cultivar.

2. The sidewalk tree cut out should be rectangular in shape with a minimum width of 3.5' depending on ADA sidewalk requirements between back of sidewalk and the tree. Ideally we would like to see 4' width tree pit; the length should be roughly 7'.

Response: The tree pit has been adjusted to be 7' long by 4' wide.

3. Proposed landscape work in or near the Adams School "Park / Playground" can be reviewed as suggested in the Plan Notes. We like the native Little Bluestem grasses over the Switchgrass as a start.

Response: Final design and installation of landscaping work will be coordinated with the City and City Arborist. We look forward to a collaborative process.

Comments Submitted by: by Jeff Tarling on 1/11/2016

1. The Subdivision Plat dated 12 10 2015 looks good and the bearings and distances match the metes and bounds description I prepared on October 9 2015.

Response: No response necessary.

2. Might want to add the basis of the elevations on the Site Plan as revised through 12 11 2015.

Response: The basis of elevations has been added to the site plan.