



Jean Fraser  
Planning Division, City of Portland  
389 Congress Street  
Portland, ME 04101

March 1, 2016

Subject: 31 Fore Street Redevelopment  
Comment Response Letter

On behalf of Peninsula Property Development, LLC we are pleased to respond to the comments provided by multiple reviewers.

To facilitate the review, City and reviewer comments are provided on separate pages below in italics followed by Acorn Engineering, Inc.'s response. The comments were attached to the City Planning Division's Memo dated February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

**Keith Gautreau – Submitted Comments 1/20/16**

**Comment** – *Emergency access is really good to this site being on the corner of Fore and Waterville.*

**Response** – We agree that this designated section of the property provides the best access for emergencies; thank you for your review.

**Comment** – *Hydrant located right in front of this building will be adequate water supply for this 4-unit light hazard building.*

**Response** – Thank you for your review.

**Comment** – *NFPA 101 2009 ed. Would allow a single means of egress in a sprinklered building up to 4 stories in height.*

**Response** – The Architect has confirmed that one means of egress is acceptable.

### David Senus, Civil Engineer Peer Review – 1/25/16 Email Correspondence

**Comment** – *The Application is preliminary. As such, we anticipate additional information and details will be provided with the final submittal.*

**Response** – The final submittal includes modifications as discussed in this review summary but also a landscaping plan, and updated subdivision plat.

**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:*

- a) *Basic Standards: The written Plan included with the application addresses erosion and sediment control requirements, inspection and maintenance requirements, and good housekeeping practices in general accordance with Appendix A, B, & C of MaineDEP Chapter 500. The plan sheets should reflect specific elements of the plan, including catch basin inlet protection, a stabilized construction entrance, perimeter controls, and notes regarding dust control and frequent street sweeping.*
- b) *General Standards: The project will result in a net increase of impervious area of just below 1,000 SF, as such, the project is not required to include stormwater management features for stormwater quality control. The Applicant has proposed to construct a rain garden to capture and treat stormwater runoff. We find this to be an acceptable approach for stormwater management for the site. We request additional grading detail be added to the site plan in and around the rain garden to understand how the rain garden in-slopes will transition to the building wall and the adjacent sidewalk. Also, a stabilized discharge location for the roof water into the raingarden should be identified in the Final submittal.*
- c) *Flooding Standard: The project will result in a net increase of impervious area of just below 1,000 SF, as such, the project is not required to include stormwater management features for stormwater quantity control. The Applicant has proposed to construct a rain garden to capture and filter stormwater runoff. This measure will help to reduce the rate of runoff from the site to the combined sewer system; as such, we find the project to be in conformance with the Flooding Standard.*

**Response** – Thank you for your review. C-30 has been revised and updated to reflect greater grading detail in and around the rain garden as well as a stabilized location for the rainwater discharge. A detail of the rain garden with grades and stabilized discharges was also added to C-43.

Additional information regarding erosion control measures to be implemented, including catch basin inlet protection, stabilized construction entrance, perimeter controls, and dust control measures, are outlined in C-44 was added to C-30.

**Comment** – *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** – As part of the preliminary application, ability to serve requests were sent out to the Portland Water District, Central Maine Power, Unitil, Fairpoint Communications, and Time Warner Cable. We have since received responses from each of these companies and have incorporated their determinations and design requirements, if any, as necessary.

As addressed in the Planning Board memo for the February 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Wastewater Application for the City of Portland was revised and resubmitted for the Department of Public Services. The application was approved. Please refer to the attached ability to serve responses from Central Maine Power, Fairpoint Communications, Unitil and the Portland Water District.

**Comment** – *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** – As noted in C-20 of the Civil Plan Set (Note 5), there is a back water valve provided within the City right-of-way along Waterville Street for the sanitary sewer outlet to the combined sewer system. The valve assembly is detailed in C-43.

**Comment** – *Pavement saw cut lines should be shown for the utility connections within Waterville Street.*

**Response** – Pavement saw cut lines for utilities have been added to C-20 of the Civil Plan Set; refer to the attachments for an updated plan set.

**Comment** – *An Oil/Water separator unit is required to treat the garage floor drains prior to entry into the City's combined sewer*

**Response** – An Oil/Water separator has been added to C-20 and is described in greater detail in the Details portion of the attached plan set. The design of the Oil/Water separator was coordinated with the City Engineer - David Margolis-Pineo.

**Comment** – *Future plans should indicate the location and connection point for the building foundation drain; this connection can be combined with the storm drain discharge from the site if preferable, but should not be combined with the sewer pipe discharge from the site.*

**Response** – C-30 has been updated to reflect the foundation drain connection to the 6" Stormdrain outlet from the rain garden; the stormwater flow then outlets to the existing catch basin on Waterville Street.

**Tom Errico – 2/3/16 E-mail Correspondence**

**Comment** – *The proposed project does not meet City standards as it relates to corner clearance. City standards require 35 feet of clearance, and the project will be providing approximately 31 feet of clearance. Given that the project is providing a driveway on the lower volume street (not on Fore Street), providing increased separation with a nearby driveway, and site design factors, I find the driveway location to be acceptable and I support a waiver from City standards.*

**Response** – Thank you for your review. We agree with your conclusion and continue to request a waiver to this standard.

**Comment** – *The aisle width for the parking lot is slightly wider than City standards. I support a waiver from City standards.*

**Response** – We are in agreement that the increase in aisle width will only increase internal parking mobility; the waiver is being requested as part of the attached applicant's waiver request.

**Comment** – *The applicant shall provide a construction management plan for review and approval.*

**Response** – Acorn has updated the Construction Management Plan submitted with the Preliminary Application; it is attached to and is submitted as part of this response. The Construction Management Plan includes a detail from Structural Integrity on how the existing foundation wall will be utilized as shoring during construction to mitigate the need for offsite temporary construction easements.

**Comment** – *On-street parking regulations appear to require changes with the project and will require City Council action. This comment is intended to notify the applicant of this requirement and will need to support City staff in preparation of the City Council packet.*

**Response** – We will continue to coordinate and support the City in making these amendments.

**David Margolis-Pineo – 1/29/16 Email Correspondence**

**Comment** – *Add State Plane Coordinates for the property corners and three foot offset monument to be set. Show the monument to be set on the Site Plan in addition to the Subdivision Plat.*

**Response** – Owen Haskell has provided the design team with a 1 ft. topographic survey that includes State Plane Coordinates and offset monuments; the updated survey is included in the final submission. The Subdivision Plat has been also updated to show the new survey and highlights the monuments.

**Comment** – *The proposed 12'-4" wide driveway on Waterville St. has an approximate 31' separation from the street corner as measured from the center of the drive to the street right of way (corner) of Fore St. Code requires 35'. Please try to make up the additional four feet by reducing the drive cut to 12', reduce the aisle width from 25'-8" to 24' and incorporate compact parking spaces (8' X 15') in an innovative manner.*

**Response** – Due to architectural constraints it is not feasible for the driveway to be moved, allowing for a maximum 31.26' from Fore Street without a significant redesign of the living spaces above the garage. The driveway was reduced from 12'-4" to 12' and moved 6" to be flush with the building edge from our prior submission to increase the setback by 8".

**Jeff Tarling - Email Correspondence 2/4/16**

**Comment** – *The two new street trees proposed for Waterville Street should be 'Autumn Gold' Ginkgo 2" caliper, planted in 4 x 7' tree cut outs in the walk. Exact tree locations should match the 'in-between' spaces for any on-street parking to help avoid door openings into the tree trunk.*

**Response** – The street trees have been added and defined in the plant schedule as the Ginkgo 'Autumn Gold' in coordination with the developer and abutting property owners. The tree wells have been orientated so to not be impacted by on street parking space allocation as noted on L-1.

As addressed in the City Planning Board meeting on February 9<sup>th</sup>, the new street trees will also be planted within raised granite curb tree wells; the tree wells will serve to protect the tree root integrity against sidewalk snow removal processes and limit salt impact from Waterville Street.

**Comment** – *The street tree along Fore Street should be protected during construction, any broken branches damaged should be pruned as part of the project.*

**Response** – The street tree along Fore Street is to remain and be protected as noted in C-10 and in accordance with the detail outlined in C- 41.

**Comment** – *The area North or uphill of the project between the existing residential unit should receive landscape treatment. This should be in the form of trees / shrubs and ground treatment options of 'lawn' or 'groundcover'. The same for the space between the building and the next door unit on Fore Street. Vegetated buffer similar to existing should be considered for the proposed project.*

**Response** – A landscaping plan has been developed and is attached as part of the final submission. It includes landscaped areas along the Fore Street frontage, as part of the rain garden, along Waterville Street, and within the northernmost property setback. These areas are defined by a plant schedule.

All species were selected based on sun availability and durability with special attention to salt resistant for areas along Fore and Waterville Street; all species are also listed as preferred buffer species within the Maine DEP's Buffer Handbook Plant List.

**Comment** – *Specific details on the rain garden are requested, if the project is to qualify for 'Stormwater' credits the project should follow Portland Water Resources 'rain garden' guidelines.*

**Response** – As per City requests, C-30 has been updated and revised to show greater detail in how the rain garden is to be implemented and graded; additional information is provided in C-43. The rain garden shall be populated by species as noted in the Plant Schedule on the landscaping plan. These species comply with those recommended and approved by the Maine DEP Best Management Practices guidelines.

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

Sincerely,



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