



A C O R N

ENGINEERING, INC.

Matthew Grooms – City Planner
Planning Division, City of Portland
389 Congress Street
Portland, ME 04101

August 4, 2017

Subject: Comment Response Letter
155 Sheridan Street – Portland, Maine

On behalf of BD Sheridan, LLC we are pleased to respond to the civil-related comments provided by multiple reviewers.

To facilitate the review, comments are provided below in italics followed by Acorn Engineering, Inc.'s response.

Woodard & Curran, Stormwater and Civil Engineering

Comment – *Per Section 12 of the City's Technical Manual, the Applicant is required to submit a photometric plan demonstrating minimal light trespass from the site.*

Response – The Comment-Response submittal package includes a Photometric Plan.

Comment – *In accordance with Section 5 of the City of Portland Technical Manual, a Level III development project is required to submit a stormwater management plan pursuant to the regulations of MaineDEP Chapter 500 Stormwater Management Rules, including conformance with the Basic, General, and Flooding Standards. We offer the following comments:*

Basic Standard: *Plans, notes, and details have been 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.*

Response – Thank you for your review.

Comment – ***General Standard:*** *The project will result in an increase in impervious area of approximately 9,783 square feet. As such, the project is required to include stormwater management features for stormwater quality control. We have the following comments on the proposed treatment system.*

The Applicant has indicated in the Stormwater Management Report that the subsurface sand filter was sized only to treat runoff generated from the roof of the proposed building and that landscaped areas will not be directed into the system. Table 2: Developed Area Treatment and Table 4: Water Quality Volume Table, both depict landscaped areas being treated by the subsurface sand filter. Please clarify if the proposed subsurface sand filter will treat the proposed landscaped areas.

Additionally, if landscaped area is to be directed towards the subsurface sand filter, the filter surface area provided in Table 3 should be revised accordingly.

Response – The report has been revised to state that the landscaped area within the rear private patio spaces is to be redirected and treated by the USSF system as well.

The total developed area and developed area with treatment as recorded in Table 2 include the area of the building that will be disturbed during the construction process. As such, the tributary area as recorded in Table 4 is less than the developed areas and represents the rear patio space entering the USSF system to be treated and included in the water quality volume calculations. Therefore, the USSF filter area is sized to treat at least 95% of all new impervious area and 80% of all disturbed area. The report has been revised to more clearly differentiate the two areas. The USSF filter area has also been updated and sized to the tributary areas.

Comment – *Flooding Standard: The project will result in an increase in impervious area of approximately 9,783 square feet. As such, the project is required to include any specific stormwater management features to control the rate or quantity of stormwater runoff from the site. We have the following comments on the associated stormwater model.*

- i. *Table 4 in the Stormwater Management Report specifies a provided storage volume for the subsurface sand filter of 1,086 cubic feet, however, the modeled storage for pond 1P is approximately 2,222 cubic feet. Please clarify the intended subsurface filter size.*
- ii. *The Time of Concentration flow path for Pre-Development does not appear to represent the most hydrologically remote point.*
- iii. *It appears that a portion of subcatchment 3 shown on the Post-Development watershed, is directed towards the subsurface sand filters and a portion flows directly onto Sheridan Street. Please clarify how flow from the rear of the lot is directed way from the proposed subsurface sand filters.*

Response –

- i. Table 4 has been updated to reflect the storage as recorded in the HydroCAD report. Note that the water quality storage is provided in the MC-4500 chambers and end caps, and the surrounding stone only and the number recorded in Table 4 reflects storage from those components only.
- ii. The Pre-Development Watershed Map has been revised to reflect a longer flow path as starting from a more hydrologically remote point. The HydroCAD model was updated as well.
- iii. The runoff from the rear part of subcatchment 3 is proposed to enter the underdrain installed alongside the retaining wall and connect to the outfall stormdrain of the USSF, thus bypassing the system before entering Sheridan Street.

Comment – *The provided bituminous pavement detail references both 9.5 and 12.5 mm HMA as the surface course. City of Portland Technical Standards require the use of 12.5 mm HMA.*

Response – The detail has been revised to reference 12.5 mm HMA pavement only.



Tom Errico, Traffic and Construction Management Review

Comment – *The applicant has prepared a traffic impact study and I find the methods and conclusions to be reasonable. The project is not be expected to create any mobility or safety deficiencies. Trip generation levels do not require a Traffic Movement Permit. The Washington Avenue/Walnut Street/Fox Street intersection is a High Crash Location, but the proposed project is not expected to add a significant amount of traffic to the intersection.*

Response – Thank you for your review.

Comment – *I have reviewed the parking layout and I find it to be acceptable.*

Response – Thank you for your review.

Comment – *The proposed driveway opening at the garage is 18-feet wide. Technically this width does not require a waiver from City standards given that the width increases at the property line (the minimum width permitted by the City is 20 feet). I find the driveway configuration to be acceptable. I would note that the driveway apron shall provide for a maximum 2% cross slope along the sidewalk or pedestrian route.*

Response – Thank you for your review; the brick driveway apron detail has been updated to reflect the maximum 2% cross slope along the pedestrian walkway route (minimum five feet).

Comment – *I have reviewed the construction management plan and greater detail is required as it relates to temporary sidewalk provisions. This should include resultant width of roadway and ADA compliant temporary ramps. Additionally, the applicant should specifically note if on-street parking is to be eliminated (with detailed limits) during construction and how contractor parking be managed.*

Response – Additional information has been added to C-03, Demolition, Construction Management, & Erosion Control Plan including the resultant width of Sheridan Street with the temporary, 4-foot sidewalk in place (20 feet) and temporary, paved ADA compliant ramps that will be removed following construction. As a result, it is anticipated that on-street parking will be eliminated for one side of the road for the length of the front property, approximately 8 spaces. The construction management company will be responsible for obtaining the appropriate permits from the City for closing the on-street parking spaces.

The construction management company and sub-contractors are made aware that parking will not be guaranteed onsite and they will be responsible for coordinating overflow parking for equipment and their employees during construction as stated in Note 15 of C-03. For example, the contractor would be responsible for entering a lease agreement with nearby rental lots to accommodate their parking needs. The Construction Management Document and Demolition, Construction Management, & Erosion Control Plan as submitted as part of the application has been revised to reflect this process.



Keith Gautreau, Fire Department Comments

Comment – Premises Identification:

- a) *The main entrance of the building must be the address for the property. This should be consistent with 911, tax assessor, Inspections Division and future mailing address.*
- b) *Street addresses shall be marked on the structure and shall be as approved by the City E-911 Addressing Officer.*
- c) *If the building entry faces a different street, both the street name and number should be large enough to read from the street.*
- d) *Address numbers must be a minimum of 6 inches high.*
- e) *The number should be in Arabic numerals rather than spelled out (for example, “130” instead of “One Hundred and Thirty”).*
- f) *Color: Addresses should be in a color that contrasts with the background.*
- g) *Whenever possible, should be illuminated.*
- h) *Provide additional address signs at entrances to the property when the building address is not legible from the public street.*
- i) *Buildings set back in groups that share common entrances can make quickly locating a specific building and the shortest route difficult. On such sites, additional signs with directional arrows and/or diagrams of the buildings and access layout should be posted.*

Response – The final premises identification design will comply with the abovementioned items. Refer to the architectural elevation drawings for additional information regarding the color and location of the street signage and lighting.

Comment – *There appears to be hydrants located at Walnut and Sheridan and at 135 Sheridan Street. According to GIS they are on dead end mains. Please confirm with PWD that this is the case and that they will provide a capacity to serve letter for domestic and fire protection for this proposed project.*

Response – An ability to serve response letter from PWD has been provided as part of the final Site Application submission package. The letter confirms the location and function of the existing hydrants in the project vicinity and the anticipation that the new, 8” water main replacement to be constructed in Fall 2017 by PWD’s Contractor has the capacity to serve the project.

Comment – *Essentially there is only access to one side of the building for Emergency Vehicles on Sheridan Street. Because of this Fire Dept. would like to see underground power rather than the proposed overhead lines. This will make access to the roof and roof top decks difficult or impossible.*

Response – The project team has met onsite with both a representative of CMP and the Captain Gautreau - Portland Fire Department to discuss the possibility of rerouting the existing overhead lines to taller poles. The lines would be raised an additional ten (10) feet into the air and redirected on alley arms to stretch into Sheridan Street and away from the building. This gives the Portland Fire Department at least ten (10) feet of clearance between the top corner of the building face and the overhead primaries. Both CMP and Captain Gautreau have expressed their acceptance of the new alternative routing. Refer to the final Utility Plan, C-20 as included in the final submission package as reference for the proposed changes.



The increased height will remain in compliance with the Sumner Park Overlay. Placing the overhead wires underground was explored in depth with CMP, however the complexity to do so, impact to existing users and resulting significant construction cost proved this method to be unfeasible.

Matthew Grooms, Site Plan and Subdivision Review Comments

Comment – *Will the elevator be ADA accessible from the proposed southerly most pedestrian entrance? If not, would the applicant consider making this a fully ADA accessible pedestrian entrance.*

Response – The elevator will be ADA accessible from either entrance (2) along Sheridan Street via a system of ramped surfaces. Unfortunately, the entrance as accessed by the Fort Sumner Park will not be ADA accessible due to the existing steep grade change and compliance with the view overlay ordinance.

Comment – *Indicate on the proposed site plan where the required bicycle parking shall be located.*

Response – Covered tenant bicycle parking will be provided on the second floor of the building. The Space and Bulk Standards table on C-10, Site Plan references the Architectural Plans for the location of the internal bike storage spaces. As requested during the Planning Board workshop meeting, additional exterior bicycle parking spaces (2) are proposed along the southeast corner of the Sheridan Street frontage.

Comment – *Façade mounted mechanical equipment is clearly visible from the public right-of-way. This equipment shall be screened in conformance with the City's site plan ordinance, Section 14-526(b)(2)(b).*

Response – Screening has been added to the exterior mechanical units. Refer to the architectural design response narrative for additional information.

Comment – *A copy of the finalized Geotechnical report will be required prior to the issuance of any building permit.*

Response – The final Geotechnical Report is included as part of the final application submission package.

Comment – *In line with the Fort Sumner Park Overlay Zone, this item is required to go before the Parks Commission for an advisory review and Planning Board recommendation., the Applicant should show how solid waste trucks will be able to access the site for removal.*

Response – The development was initially presented to the Parks Commission during their monthly meeting on July 6th. A second meeting is scheduled for the commission's September meeting in which the members will hold an advisory vote for the Planning Board. The final recommendation will be provided to the Planning Board in September when the project is formally reviewed as an agenda item.

Comment – *Site lighting details and associated photometric plan shall be provided with the final submittal package.*



Response – Updated Lighting Cut Sheets and a Photometric Plan have been added to the application submittal.

Comment – *A subdivision plan and recording plat shall be required as part of the final submittal package.*

Response – A preliminary Subdivision Plan & Recording Plat has been submitted with the comment-response documents for review. A Final Plat stamped by a Professional Licensed Surveyor will be provided to the Planning Authority, pending Planning Board approval and any associated conditions of approval.

Comment – *It is recommended that plantings along Sheridan Street be located within vertical granite planters, so as to protect vegetation from road salts and define private space.*

Response – There is vertical granite curbing proposed along the front planting bedding areas to create a raised planting area.

Comment – *Given the narrow sidewalk width along Sheridan Street, street tree placement is still under consideration. Further direction regarding street tree placement shall be provided.*

Response – In response to the concerns of the narrowing sidewalk width, we are now proposing to grant a public access easement to the City for an additional foot of brick sidewalk built to City standards that extends into the property lines. The easement, to be reviewed and accepted by the City and recorded with the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, will provide additional space to navigate around the trees and maintain at least a 5-foot walkway.

Caitlin Cameron, Design Review Comments

Design Review Comments to be addressed under separate cover by the project architect.

Jeff Tarling, Landscape Review Comments *(per 7/26/17 email forwarded to the project team)*

Comment – *After looking at the proposed Sheridan Street project and reviewing the existing sidewalk conditions, wanted to propose landscape / streetscape improvement next door along the Sheridan Street frontage of Fort Sumner Park. Although the current conditions are challenging it might present an opportunity to conduct improvements that will complement the project where it lacks space to do so on its site. Thus would like to open dialog to review that aspect of landscape and tree planting standards that could be met on or near site.*

Response – To expand upon the previous response, providing the sidewalk easement and a 5-foot wide walkway allows the project to propose four (4) street trees that add to the greenery and street scape that the future building residents will see directly from their units. Keeping the street trees within the scope of the development in addition to the landscaping improvements directly along the building face are proposed as such to satisfy the City's landscape design intent for developments to contribute to and improve the street environment as stated in Chapter 4.6.4 of the Technical Standard; the street trees and landscaping proposed within the site are intended to meet the street tree alternative standards for the required nineteen (19) trees.



Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

Sincerely,



William H. Savage, P.E.
Principal - Project Manager
Acorn Engineering, Inc.



Olivia Dawson, E.I.
Project Engineer
Acorn Engineering, Inc.