



Jean Fraser - Planner  
City of Portland  
Planning & Urban Development Department  
389 Congress Street  
Portland, ME 04101

October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2012

Subject: Eldredge Lumber & Hardware, Inc.  
165 Presumpscot Street  
Comment Response Letter

On behalf of Eldredge Lumber & Hardware, Inc. we are pleased to address the final comments from the City of Portland, including:

- City of Portland Planning and Urban Development – Level II Site Plan Review Letter, dated October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012.
  - Attachment 1 - Woodard & Curran – Peer Review Memo, dated October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2012.
  - Attachment 2 – Two emails from Marge Schmuckal, dated October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012

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

### **City of Portland Planning and Urban Development Comments**

1. *Right, Title and Interest (RTI): The proposed berm and some parking is located in Parcel 3, for which RTI has not yet been submitted. Any site plan approval would apply to everything shown on the plan (and the notes on the plan) so RTI needs to relate to all of the land for which "development" (existing and proposed) is shown on the site plan.*

**Response:** The applicant continues to work with the Maine DOT to complete the purchase of Parcel Three and expects a final purchase and sale agreement any day. The applicant would request that the purchase and sale agreement be a condition of approval.

2. *Traffic Engineering: Thank you for the additional information relating to traffic generation and the use of the private access drive. We have the following comments;*
  - a. *A Traffic Movement Permit will not be required.*

**Response :** No response necessary.

- b. *We note that Richard Waltz property on the corner has an access from the drive and we would like confirmation that this will remain.*

**Response:** Richard Waltz does not currently have a deeded access to Parcel 2. At this time the applicant will continue to provide Richard Waltz with access to Parcel 2, and may negotiate a deeded access in the future.

- c. *We would encourage the drive be a joint access for your project and the surrounding properties, and encourage its improvement in view of the likely increase in use by the public and large vehicles.*

**Response:** At this time the applicant will continue to provide joint access for the surrounding properties which do not have deeded access.

3. **Bicycle Parking:** *We note your request for a waiver of the bicycle parking requirements in the Site Plan Ordinance. A waiver is not supported as we consider that employees may wish to commute by bicycle, but we would require only 2 bicycle parking spaces (one “hitch”) rather than the 4 spaces which would be the Ordinance requirement. We support a waiver for the scooter and motorcycle parking.*

**Response** – The Site Plan was revised to include one “hitch” to the southwest of the office/retail building.

4. **Zoning:** *Thank you for the parking analysis and please revise the plans to show an additional two parking spaces to meet the zoning requirements. I attach the Zoning comments for your information since they clarify several points.*

**Response** –

- *The Site Plan was revised to include two additional spaces to the west of the previously provided spaces.*
  - *The applicant intends to store building supplies within the outside storage areas noted on the plans.*
  - *Separate applications will be provided for any new signage.*
5. **Landscape:**
- a. *The Ordinance clarifies that the plans need to show proposed site landscaping and screening. The southern part of the site abuts a residential zone (R-5) on the east and therefore the Ordinance Site Landscaping requirements for industrial and commercial zones would apply. In this case the proposed berm would provide some screening, but it would need to be landscaped. We suggest red or white pine tree-planting along this south-eastern edge.*

**Response:** Eleven Red Pine trees were added to the proposed earthen berm spaced every 42 feet. Please refer to the Site Layout plan for locations and the Tree Planting Detail on Sheet C-32, for further information.

- b. *The Ordinance requirements for parking lot landscaping (see Landscaping and Landscape Preservation: Parking Lot Landscaping) applies to all parking on the site, not just to additional parking. Please add tree planting to the site plan along the front of the identified parking nearest to the access drive and railway; red maples are suggested.*



**Response:** Five Red Maples were added between the proposed parking spaces and the private roadway spaced every 20 ft. Please refer to the Site Layout plan for locations and the Tree Planting Detail on Sheet C-32, for further information.

- c. All planting should meet the requirements of the above referenced Ordinance provisions and the City of Portland Technical Manual Section 4.*

**Response:** Please refer to the Tree Planting Detail on Sheet C-32. The notes specify that all plant installation and selection will be in compliance with the City of Portland Technical Manual Section 4.

- d. Additional street trees are not required, but the trees (requested above) near the parking should be visible from the public right of way if possible.*

**Response:** The five Red Maples will be visible from the public street right of way.

### **Woodard & Curran – Peer Review Memo**

1. *In accordance with Section 5 of the City of Portland Technical Manual, a Level II development project is required to submit a stormwater management plan pursuant to the regulations of Maine DEP Chapter 500 Stormwater Management Rules, including conformance with the Basic, General, and Flooding Standards. We have reviewed the applicability of these standards relative to the proposed project and offer the following comments:*
  - a. Basic Standards: 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.*
  - b. General Standards: The project will result in a net reduction of impervious area. As such, the project is not required to include any specific stormwater management features for stormwater quality control.*
  - c. Flooding Standards: The project will result in a net reduction of impervious area. The applicant has prepared and submitted a model demonstrating that peak flows from the post-development condition will not exceed those in the pre-development condition at two study points (discharge points) on the site. As such, the project is not required to include any specific stormwater management features to control the rate or quantity of stormwater runoff from the site.*

**Response:** No response necessary.

2. *The applicant is proposing two Inserta-T connections for new 12 and 18-inch storm drain pipes into an existing City-owned 36-inch RCP storm drain that crosses the site within a 30' wide easement. Per discussions with DPS, the applicant should utilize drain manhole(s) for these connections. A single drain manhole that allows for both connections would be acceptable; however, the applicant will need to verify that the pipe elevations and the configurations of the pipe penetrations can be accommodated by a single structure.*



**Response :** The connection to the City-owned 36" RCP storm drain was changed to reflect the peer review engineer's and DPS's comments. The proposed connections are two 6 ft diameter structures, one manhole and one catch basin. The Grading, Drainage & Erosion Control Plan was modified to reflect the associated changes. New details were also added for catch basins/manholes greater than 4 ft in diameter. The manhole to the west of Building 1 was changed from a manhole to catch basin 5. The Hydraflow Storm Sewers 2008 calculations were updated to reflect the associated changes to the storm drain, manholes and catch basins.

3. *The applicant has indicated that an area of existing impervious gravel will be changed to grass, resulting in a net reduction in impervious surfaces on the site. The applicant should clarify the proposed grassed areas on the plan and should provide notes and information about the construction practice that will be utilized to vegetate the site (removal of packed gravel, depth of loam, seeded areas, erosion controls as needed, including blanket lining at swales or steep slopes).*

**Response:** The following Note 6 was added to the Grading, Drainage & Erosion Control Plan:

6. Removal of existing impervious area - all areas on parcel 1 and 3 that will not have proposed pavement, proposed crushed stone, existing buildings, or otherwise noted on the plans shall receive the following construction requirements:

- 6.1. Scarify the first 12" of compacted gravel preferably using a single or multi shank ripper behind a bulldozer.
- 6.2. Regrade to establish the pre-existing grade preferably by back dragging. The contractor shall be sure to use the proper equipment and construction technique to mitigate the potential to re-compact the aggregate material.
- 6.3. Install 6" of loam and stabilize in accordance with the erosion control measures and site stabilization notes.

The Erosion Control Details & Notes were modified to include the temporary and permanent seeding plan within the notes. Tables were provided to specify the permanent and temporary seed application rates. The removal of existing impervious areas requirements is consistent with the Long Creek Restoration Project's guidance on the removal of impervious surfaces.

4. *Sheet C-20 depicts a compacted gravel swale along the west edge of the site, adjacent to and parallel with the west wall of building #5. Concentrating flow over compacted gravel will result in erosion. We understand that the applicant is attempting to maintain a 10' pavement setback from the property line in this area, but we request the applicant propose an alternate surface (crushed stone) or alternate drainage concept in this area to avoid erosion.*

**Response:** The Grading, Drainage & Erosion Control Plan was updated to include 6" of compacted crushed storm over filter fabric 600x within 10 ft of the property line adjacent to Building 5.



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

Sincerely,



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

Cc: Scott Eldredge and Dan Remick – Eldredge Lumber & Hardware, Inc.

Attachments:

1. Hydraflow Storm Sewers 2008 calculations
2. Full Plan Set – Issued for: Response to Comments 10/29/12
  - a. 11"x17" Paper Copy
  - b. CD containing PDF files