


Memorandum to File

Project: 34 Hutchins Drive
Engineering Peer Review – Memorandum #1

To: Jean Fraser, City of Portland Planner

Prepared By: Alton Palmer, P.E. 

Project Number: 1343.09

Date: July 24, 2006

Summary:

As requested by the City of Portland, Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers, Inc. has conducted a peer review of the above referenced project. Our review has focused on:

- ◆ Whether the application appears to be complete, or if additional information is warranted to assist in the review of the project

Information provided to Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers, Inc. for review included:

- ◆ "Letter from Mohr & Seredin dated July 10, 2006, including application and attachments"
- ◆ "Drawing No. L1.0 and L2.0 prepared by Mohr & Seredin, dated July 7, 2006"
- ◆ City of Portland file information regarding MDEP permitting for Stroudwater Estates and abutting parcels.

For the purpose of our review, we have assumed that this project will be classified as a Minor Site Plan.

Application Completeness Review

Based upon our review of the submittal, our office would recommend that the City consider the following comments:

1. Title, Right or Interest would appear to need to be clarified. The Applicant (Cianchette Family LLC) has submitted a Quit Claim Deed from CADCAM Associates. In reviewing the Quit Claim Deed, it appears to be for the parcels on the opposite side of Hutchins Drive (Lots 15 and 16 of Stroudwater Estates) rather than for the current project. The Property in question is Lot 9 of Stroudwater Estates, which based on City records is owned by Sunview Associates Limited Partnership. No information has been provided demonstrating TRI between Cianchette Family LLC and Sunview.
2. Our office would recommend that a Standard Boundary Survey be provided, along with updated topographic information. While the Applicant has requested a waiver for submitting the Boundary Survey, no supplemental information is provided to justify the waiver. Due to the constraints of the site, the numerous easements which appear to encumber the site, and the work done to date, we couldn't recommend granting the waiver.

Peer Review
34 Hutchins Drive
Page 2

In addition to providing the Standard Boundary Survey, it would appear that the applicant should provide updated topographic information. The Applicant references existing Public Works information as the source for the topography, but based on our site visit, the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. No utilities are shown within Hutchins Drive
 - b. No information is shown on the location or elevation of the sanitary sewer line that bisects the site. It is noted that a review of the City Tax Map appears to include a note that the sewer wasn't installed within the easement, which should be verified.
 - c. A CMP culvert which appears to cross the sewer easement is not shown.
 - d. A drainage course which appears to originate from the parking lot of Map 238A, Lot B-1 (2385 Congress Street Associates LLC) is not shown.
3. Our office would recommend that a wetland scientist visit the site to determine to the best of their ability the following:
 - a. Whether any jurisdictional wetlands existed in the area of disturbance
 - b. Whether the drainage course that emanates from the adjacent parking lot would be a stream under the MDEP regulations
 - c. Confirm that the major watercourse (located within the 30' Drainage Easement) is a stream per MDEP regulations
 4. After completion of Item 3 above, we would recommend that the Applicant provide a list of other permits (MDEP and ACOE) that are required for the project and their status.
 5. Demonstration that the proposed improvements will not negatively affect the existing sewer main or the rights of the City under the easement. Within the proposed "gravel work yard" the Applicant is proposing to modify the elevations by cutting up to at least 1 foot and filling up to at least 3 feet. In the proposed swale, the Applicant is proposing to cut between 2 and 2.5 feet within the easement.
 6. As the majority of the proposed parking area has been disturbed, and it will take a period of time to obtain the necessary permits, our office would recommend that the City consider:
 - a. Requiring the Applicant to submit a Temporary Stabilization Plan to provide protection to the downstream resources while the various permit reviews are underway. While an effort has been made with respect to erosion control, it is not adequate in our opinion based on the anticipated permitting timeframe, and additional measures are warranted.
 - b. Requiring the Applicant to provide surety during the review of the current application for permanent stabilization in the event that permits (local, state or federal) are not obtained. Based on our site walk and experience with the MDEP, it appears that the major drainage course is a stream and would normally require a 75' undisturbed buffer. Based on the submitted topography, this would appear to constrain the portion of the site north of and including the 30' sewer easement.
 7. Details for the riprap slope.
 8. Pipe sizing calculations for the driveway culvert.
 9. All plans submitted should be stamped/signed by the professional responsible for their preparation.

Peer Review
34 Hutchins Drive
Page 3

Additional Items to be Reviewed as Project Proceeds

In addition to the items noted above that affect the completeness of the application, our office would highlight the following concern which will be reviewed upon receipt of a modified package.

10. While the Applicant is correct that under the City Ordinances due to the size of the project formal stormwater treatment measures are not required, it does not appear to be warranted to have a gravel parking lot sheet flow to within 40' of a stream. Alternate grading or treatment measures would appear to be available that would provide greater protection to the watercourse.