



DeLUCA-HOFFMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.  
CONSULTING ENGINEERS

778 MAIN STREET  
SUITE 8  
SOUTH PORTLAND, MAINE 04106  
TEL. 207.775.1121  
FAX 207.879.0896

- SITE PLANNING AND DESIGN
- ROADWAY DESIGN
- ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING
- PERMITTING
- AIRPORT ENGINEERING
- CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION

August 8, 2011

Ms. Jean Fraser, Planner  
City of Portland  
389 Congress Street  
Portland, Maine 04101

**Subject: McFarland Spring Corporation  
280 Warren Avenue  
Response to Peer Review Comments**

Dear Ms. Fraser:

We are in receipt of your July 27, 2011 comments regarding the review of the plans for the subject project, and offer the following responses:

**PARKING:**

*Comment 1:*

*The submitted text states that 17 or more parking spaces will be provided. The site plan depicts only 12 specific parking spaces. Please revise the site plan to show details (location and dimensions and access drives) of all designated parking spaces; applicable standards are included in the City's Technical Manual.*

**Response:**

The accompanying revised site plan indicates the locations of parking available across the site. Generally speaking, the parking varies across the lot depending on the flow of business and daily demands of customers. Based on the capacity of the business and number of employees, the owner finds that parking availability has not been a concern, as they have ample area on which to park. No permanent pavement markings are in place on the site and the owner requests the right to maintain the existing conditions with respect to how parking functions. The accompanying plan simply outlines the available parking capacity and maneuvering areas on the site.

*Comment 2:*

*We request clarification as to how the site will work with the business operating and how vehicles will be maneuvered in and out during repairs. Please revise the site plan to show details of the circulation areas, with dimensions.*

Ms. Jean Fraser  
August 8, 2011  
Page 2

Response:

The accompanying figures depict the general site circulation patterns. The owner has operated the existing facility for a significant period and they have never experienced concerns with site access or circulation.

Comment 3:

*Please incorporate 4 bicycle parking spaces near an entrance as per the Ordinance requirements in 14-526 (a)(4)b; further information is included in the City's Technical Manual. In this case they would largely be for employees.*

Response:

In accordance with Section 14-526 (a)(4)(b)(ii) of the City Code the applicant is requesting a waiver of the City's ordinance requirements to provide bicycle parking spaces. The nature of their business generally precludes customer bicycle traffic and the applicant's employees do not bicycle to work. Given the industrial nature of their business and location within a busy commercial corridor they foresee no demand for bicycle parking on their property.

**TRAFFIC ENGINEERING:**

Comment 1:

*The site currently has three access/egress points\* on Warren Avenue and we would suggest that one of the driveways be closed; based on our site investigation, we would suggest that the westerly driveway be closed. If you do not want to close any of the driveways, please submit information that documents the need for all curbs, including Auto-Turn graphics and other supporting documentation.*

Response:

According to the property survey plan the applicant's property currently has only two driveways onto Warren Avenue, with the third driveway referenced in this comment being almost entirely on the adjacent property. The applicant has previously worked with the Maine Department of Transportation during their reconstruction of Warren Avenue several years ago to allow them to maintain the two existing driveway openings. These driveway conditions were maintained as part of the Warren Avenue improvements. The applicant has no intentions nor is willing to close either of their existing driveways as they find it imperative to have the two driveways for traffic circulation and proper use of their site. The neighboring driveway to the east is used by that property for access to their loading docks; therefore it would be impractical for them to close their driveway. As evidenced by the photograph their driveway is not commonly used by McFarland Spring since the abutting users often park there.



Ms. Jean Fraser  
August 8, 2011  
Page 3

Comment 2:

*Please note that an interim closure plan would be acceptable for closing a driveway (ie such as bituminous curb or other infill option along with a longer term performance guarantee for the installation of granite curbing) thus avoiding pavement moratorium fees. The details of this interim program would need to be established, as well as the longer term final layout.*

Response:

As stated in the response above the applicant will not consider closure of either of their existing driveway openings.

Comment 3:

*Vehicle turning templates should be provided that documents the need for the pavement widening on the side of the building where the expansion is proposed.*

Response:

The accompanying figure depicts the turning movement for typical vehicle entering into the expanded building side.

**LANDSCAPE:**

Comment 1:

*Tree and landscape improvements – Depending on the final driveway access openings to Warren Avenue, additional street-trees should be included along Warren Avenue frontage as space allows and/or add trees to the space along the right property line. This should be between the front building plane and street. These trees may be shade or evergreen trees.*

Response:

The accompanying site plan includes multiple new landscape plantings along the Warren Avenue frontage that are provided to meet the general intent of the City's review comments. The plantings are located within the existing areas not otherwise used for the storage of snow during the winter.

Comment 2:

*Create a small landscape planting along the front of the building expansion. This could be similar to 'foundation' planting along the building using hardy shrubs. The planting may be protected by 'Cape-Cod' style bituminous, concrete or granite curbing as desired by the project or wooden guardrail. This small planting adds relief to the large paved areas and building.*

Ms. Jean Fraser  
August 8, 2011  
Page 4

Response:

The applicant requests a waiver to provide landscaping along the building foundation as this area will be prone to roof runoff and within the area of general business activity around the perimeter of the building. It is the applicant's opinion that a planting area adjacent the building will not survive and will inhibit their functional use of the surrounding paved areas. Alternatively the accompanying plan includes plantings located to meet the intent of the review comment.

**STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:**

Comment 1:

*Per Section 5 of the City of Portland Technical Manual, Level II Site Plan Applications are required to submit stormwater management plans pursuant to the regulations of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MaineDEP) Chapter 500 Stormwater Management Rules, including compliance with the Basic, General and Flooding Standards. A stormwater management plan was not provided in the application, and the Applicant has requested a waiver from this requirement. We cannot support a waiver from this requirement. One suggestion provided during consultation with the City Department of Public Services is that the Applicant can elect to eliminate (change to pervious) an existing on-site impervious area of equal or greater size to the proposed new impervious area, and effectively meet the General and Flooding Standard.*

Response:

To satisfy the standards, we have modified the site plan to eliminate approximately 1,814 SF of existing impervious surface on the site in order to offset the proposed impervious areas depicted on the site plan.

Comment 2:

*The project is located within the Capisic Brook Watershed, which is identified as an Urban Impaired Stream. Section 5 of the City of Portland Technical Manual requires that all development within the Capisic Brook watershed, except single and two family homes, comply with the Urban Impaired Stream Standard pursuant to MaineDEP Chapter 500 Rules. To meet the Urban Impaired Stream standard, the Applicant must either pay a compensation fee or mitigate project impacts by treating, reducing, or eliminating an off-site or on-site pre-development impervious stormwater source.*

Response:

By eliminating existing impervious surface on the site, it is our opinion that this comment has been addressed.

Ms. Jean Fraser  
August 8, 2011  
Page 5

Comment 3:

*In summary, the Applicant must meet the Basic, General, Flooding, and Urban Impaired Stream Standards for the project. If the Applicant elects to eliminate (change to pervious) an existing on-site impervious area of equal or greater size to the proposed new impervious area, the requirements for meeting the General, Flooding and Urban Impaired Stream Standards will effectively be met, and a stormwater management plan will not be required (as the Basic Standards will be met based on the Erosion and Sediment Control information provided on the plans). However, if additional net impervious area is proposed as part of the project, the Applicant must provide a stormwater management plan meeting the Basic, General, Flooding and Urban Impaired Stream Standards.*

Response:

See previous responses to Comments 1 & 2.

Comment 4:

*Please provide a detail for the proposed stabilized construction exit per B-4 of the MaineDEP Erosion and Sediment Control Best Management Practices Manual.*

Response:

A typical detail has been added to the accompanying plans.

**SURVEY:**

Comment 1:

*The site plan survey is incomplete since the property corners have not been set. All property corners shall be set before a building permit is issued.*

Response:

The Applicant has requested that Owen Haskell Inc. complete the installation of any missing property corners in advance of the issuance of a Building Permit.

Comment 2:

*The eastern-most access is located on the former Meadow Street. The survey does not show that the applicant has an easement to use that access, which is mostly on the part of the former street owned by the abutter. If this is the case (ie no easement for access here) then the layout should be designed (see Parking and Traffic comments) to operate without that access.*

Ms. Jean Fraser  
August 8, 2011  
Page 6

Response:

The applicant does not use the eastern most access although there are no restrictions for vehicles to circulate between the two properties. The existing site conditions have been in existence for a substantial period of time and the two owners have cooperatively maintained these conditions during that period. The applicant has no intentions to make changes to the site in order to limit access between the properties, as this is not within their budget for the small building expansion for which they are proposing. The applicant is aware of no specific site circulation issues or long term concerns related to the existing site conditions; therefore they will not consider any modifications to these features.

We trust this information satisfies the comments to date. As you may surmise from our responses, the applicant is determined to minimize any ancillary costs not related to their expansion proposal.

If you have any questions with regard to this letter, please contact our office.

Sincerely,

DeLUCA-HOFFMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.



Stephen R. Bushey, P.E.  
Senior Engineer

SRB/smk

Attachments

c: Jim Biskup, Biskup Construction (via Email)  
J. David Parsons, McFarland Spring (via Email)