

December 30, 2005

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

Re:

Woodard & Curran Building Addition

Major Site Plan Review - Additional Information

Dear Jean:

On behalf of the joint applicants, CADCAM Associates and Peggy and Eric Cianchette, we are submitting 10 copies of additional information in support of the Major Site Plan Application for the Woodard & Curran Building Addition, originally submitted September 21, 2005, to be used in Planning Board review.

These documents were prepared in accordance with Chapter 14, Land Use, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Portland, Maine, and meet the applicable sections of the City of Portland, Maine, Technical and Design Standards and Guidelines adopted September 1987, last amended March 2000.

The additional information that follows included updated plans and addresses comments provided during our meeting on December 20, 2005 at our office and in a memo received from Jim Seymour, Sebago Technics, on December 22, 2005. Specific to issues we have discussed:

- Abutter information has been added to the Existing Site Plan
- The sidewalk has been extended to be even with the CADCAM property lines in each direction. The Portland Water District has been contacted and is agreeable to the location of the sidewalk; however, they do not wish to grant a perpetual easement to the City for the sidewalk.
- The sewer has been relocated such that it will be 15 feet away from the building addition. The relocated sewer easement has been shown as 30 feet wide, centered on the sewer main.

The following responses address comments provided in the memo received from Jim Seymour, Sebago Technics, on December 22, 2005. Our responses have been organized in order of the comments provided.

Stormwater Management

Comment:

The project will require evidence that they meet the stormwater quality standard as required by the City's stormwater standard for required treatment when parking areas exceed 25 spaces. A narrative and calculation discussing and showing proof that the standard has been met must be submitted for the entire site. Recent meetings disclosed that the previous DEP order required quantity control. Given the City had authority with DEP with the standards before November 2005, we feel that if the site controls the 2 yr



storm and treats that volume for the feasible majority of the site proposed for expansion and redevelopment that the larger rain events can be released to the adjacent stream without detaining.

Response:

Existing buffers will be used to the extent possible in treating runoff from the parking area at the rear of the proposed addition. Runoff from the proposed expansion to the satellite parking lot will be treated using both filtration basins and existing buffers. The narrative and calculations will be included in an updated Stormwater Management Plan (Section 6).

Satellite Parking lot drainage issues

Comment:

Cape cod curb north side of satellite parking lot and build shallow shelf at slope bottom against curb back.

Response:

The grading on the north side of the Satellite parking lot expansion has been modified to reflect the shallow shelf and curb. Cape Cod curb has been called out. A detail will be included on a revised detail sheet, to be submitted separately.

Comment:

Place basin at corners of north side of satellite lot to direct to drainage/treatment basins.

Response:

The satellite parking lot is graded away from the north edge in an effort to follow existing grading to the extent feasible. As a result, catch basins along the northern side of the lot would not collect any flow and have not been added.

Comment:

Underdrain the north side of parking lot.

Response:

The underdrain has been added along the northern edge of the satellite parking lot expansion, discharging to the northernmost filtration basin.

Comment:

Guardrail is needed on east side of satellite lot where slopes lead to basins/ponds.

Response:

A guardrail has been added to the east side of the satellite parking lot where the proposed grade slopes into the filtration basin.



Comment:

Consider revising the existing pond to provide infiltration treatment for the current satellite parking area.

Response:

After revisiting the existing pond, we have determined that it does not have the storage required to function as a filtration basin. As such the pond will remain in its present condition as a detention pond.

Comment:

Berm landscape Hutchins Street frontage as allowed (outside PWD land or with permission) with berms and tree vegetation.

Response:

The grading of the area between the existing satellite parking lot and Hutchins Drive has been revised to provide a landscaped berm on either side of the entrance to the parking lot. The berm is located entirely within the CADCAM property.

Building parking lot

Comment:

Revise parking layout at the east end. Consider semi circle layout for easier access and turnaround movement and dumpster location.

Response:

The east end of the parking lot was revisited to consider a semi-circular configuration. However, the width of area between 25-foot wetland setbacks does not allow this configuration. Further, the proximity of the brook to the wetland edge in this area does not allow for construction within the setback. The parking configuration remains as most recently proposed.

Comment:

Regrade east side parking to sheet flow stay on a northeast course and install sediment basin at the end of the parking lot, to then collect sediment and us buffers to further treat runoff.

Response:

The rear parking lot has been regraded and curbing added to facilitate collection at the northerly end in a small sedimentation basin. Runoff will flow to the basin and receive some pretreatment before being discharged through a level lip spreader into the wooded buffer area behind.

Comment:

Curb both sides of lower access road to east parking lot from the entrance at Hutchins Dr. to throat of parking lot. The inside edge should begin at sidewalk ramp/crossing.



Response:

The access road has been curbed on both sides; however, the curbing along the inside edge of the road will be terminated about 40 feet beyond the end of the building to allow runoff the flow into the catch basin between the road and the rear parking lot.

Comment:

Drainage collection is needed for drop-off circle/sheet flow is too indirect and long. Icing and erosion on the driveway edge will occur.

Response:

A catch basin has been added at the low point of the paved plaza circle to collect runoff.

Comment:

All piped outlets shall be protected with stone riprap plunge pools and aprons. Inlets shall be riprap-lined aprons appropriately sized.

Response:

Rip Rap Plunge Pools have been indicated at all outlets where Level Lip Spreaders are also proposed. Where Level Lip Spreaders are not proposed, Rip Rap Aprons have been indicated. Details will be included on a revised detail sheet, to be submitted separately.

Comment:

Locations of underground storage for detention must be outside of any City sewer easements.

Response:

The subsurface detention structure is located entirely outside the proposed relocated sewer easement.

Comment:

The access drive is shown at 20 feet the city standard requires 24 feet for two-way traffic. There appears room next the building for an additional 4 feet given the driveway will be curbed.

Response:

There is an emergency exit proposed for the north face of the building addition, preventing the location of the road closer to the building. Widening the driveway to twenty-four feet by increasing the width away from the building will bring the road even closer to the wetland. As a result, we are requesting a waiver from the 24 foot wide driveway standard.

Comment:

The sliver of land between the immediate parking lot just behind the addition and the access driveway should be paved and separated by wood guardrail if the remaining land is less than 2 feet wide.



Response:

The width of the remaining land varies between two and six feet. As a result, we prefer to leave this small area unpaved.

Comment:

The four space parking area on the south side of the building front, should consider underdrain along the edge to alleviate runoff and groundwater in the cut area.

Response:

The underdrain has been added along the southern edge of the parking spaces, discharging to the nearby catch basin.

Road Access/Circulation

Comment:

Please refer to comments from the City Traffic Engineer for concerns of traffic movements, trip generation, and internal movements.

Response:

We have not received comments from the City Traffic Engineer.

Comment:

The access lanes shall be 24 feet for two-way access.

Response:

As stated above, we are requesting a waiver from the 24 foot wide driveway standard.

Comment:

The sewer location shall be in the center of the driveway.

Response:

Based on discussions with Eric Labelle, the proposed relocation of the sewer is 15 feet from the building addition and has been indicated on the drawings.

Utilities

Comment:

Letters to serve and available capacities have been requested showing that adequate service exists for the development.

Response:

No response required.



Comment:

The City wastewater division and City Engineer shall assist review of the construction details and location of the re-located interceptor sewer.

Response:

No response required.

Grading & Erosion Controls

Comment:

The applicant should consider mulch berms along with sedimentation fence for an erosion barrier given the close proximity to a stream.

Response:

The drawings initially called for erosion control mix berms to be installed for erosion control with silt fence to be added in areas of steep slopes. We agree that given the close proximity to the wetlands, the combination of the two is prudent. The detail will be modified to reflect the combination of both measures on a revised detail sheet, to be submitted separately.

Comment:

Winter erosion control notes will be needed along with formal plans reflecting erosion control notes/measures needed on the site during construction.

Response:

Erosion Control notes have been previously submitted on Sheet C302.

Water Quality Treatment

Comment:

Per the City of Portland Technical and Design Standards and Guidelines, the applicant is required to treat stormwater runoff from parking facilities with 25 cars or more. As previously mentioned the site does not appear to need to conform to the state's Stormwater Law Chapter 500, for water quality. We will refer to treatment measures from the DEP's BMP manual as proof that the entire site conforms to a water quality standard to the maximum extent as feasible.

Response:

Existing buffers will be used to the extent possible in treating runoff from the parking area at the rear of the proposed addition. Runoff from the proposed expansion to the satellite parking lot will be treated using both filtration basins and existing buffers. The narrative and calculations will be included in an updated Stormwater Management Plan (Section 6).



Comment:

The sizing and detailed specifications with clear relativity to the water quality units/measures shown on the plan shall be attached for review along with a site specific maintenance plan and draft contract for cleaning services.

Response:

Sizing and specifications (where applicable) for stormwater treatment measures, along with the narrative and calculations, will be included in the updated Stormwater Management Plan (Section 6). The site specific maintenance will be updated. Because there are no structural treatment measures proposed, no draft contracts exist.

General

Comment:

The plans shall reflect the actual amount of wetlands or protected land that will require filling disturbance, and require permitting from the DEP.

Response:

A small area of wetland fill totaling approximately 50 square feet has been indicated just south of the satellite parking lot expansion. As the area of wetland fill is over 100 feet from the brook running through the center of the site, no permitting is required. No other areas of wetland fill are proposed.

NRPA permitting, in the form of a Permit By Rule (PBR), is required for activities adjacent to protected natural resources. Through discussions with MeDEP, the natural resource of concern on the CADCAM site is the brook running through the middle of the property. The PBR will cover activities within 75 feet of the brook. A copy of the PBR Notification Form will be submitted to the City upon completion.

Comment:

The applicant is likely required to file a revised Maine Construction General Permit for this project. This must be obtained prior to the start of construction.

Response:

A Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with the Maine Construction General Permit will be filed with the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MeDEP) prior to construction. Following procedure, the MeDEP will send a copy to the City.

Comment:

The applicant has appears to have available space for development, but given resource protection limits, treatment measures requiring avoidance of snow storage, and given the extent of parking, snow removal is of some concern. Please provide on a plan to address snow storage locations on site.



Response:

There is an area roughly 15 feet wide between the proposed satellite expansion and Filtration Basin #1 and an area about 10 feet wide between the lot and Filtration Basin #2 that can be used for snow storage. Further there is an area off the eastern edge of the lot between the two basins that can be used.

The sedimentation basin off the northern end of the proposed parking lot behind the building addition does not serve as a filtration measure and can therefore be used for snow storage. Additionally, the cut area just south of the four parking spaces near the central plaza will provide snow storage area.

Thank you for the assistance you have provided thus far. We look forward to continuing our work with your office and the Planning Board on this project. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at (207) 797-7515, or via email, kvolock@woodardcurran.com.

Sincerely,

WOODARD & CURKAN INC.

Kenneth Volock

Engineer

KRV/djt 203834.01

Enclosures:

Sheet C100 Existing Site Plan

Sheet C200 Proposed Site Plan Sheet C201 Proposed Utility Plan