

From: Mark T. Arienti
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 10:03 AM
To: Stephen J. Puleo; Amanda L. Lessard
Subject: Eventide

Steve, Amanda,

I know this is a last minute response since they're on the meeting agenda for Monday so I apologize for that, but here are my thoughts on DM Roma's responses,

Thanks,

Mark

DM Roma Response #23 – We discussed the driveway separation situation with the Town Engineer over the phone after receiving this comment. As we discussed, the driveway separation requirements listed in Table 2 of Appendix A was taken from the Maine DOT Chapter 299 design manual and references a table that is only applicable to major arterials that carry the MDOT designation of “Mobility Corridor”, which is not applicable to River Road. If this segment of River Road was located outside of the Urban Compact area, it is our opinion that the proposed Entrance would meet all MDOT criteria and an entrance permit could be issued without requiring a waiver. It is important to note that there are no “Entrances” as defined by MDOT within 265 feet of the proposed Eventide Drive entrance, and all “driveways” that are located within 265 feet provide access to single family dwellings that produce extremely low traffic volumes. Moving the driveway entrance further south to achieve more separation from the adjacent driveway to the north would only reduce the amount of sight distance looking south from Eventide Drive, which would not make the intersection safer.

Town Engineer Response: I agree with how the response characterizes the MDOT entrance rule however the Town ordinance is a separate requirement. If the separation between the proposed entrance and the nearest entrance, which is the entrance 70-ft to the north, does not meet the spacing requirement in the Town ordinance (265-ft at the 45 mph speed limit) then the Applicant must submit a waiver. I also do not agree with the distinction noted in the response between a driveway and an entrance. At least from the Town perspective they are viewed the same.

DM Roma Response #24 – The Town's engineering consultant is in the process of reviewing the stormwater management plan and MDEP Stormwater Permit application, and as of the date of this response we have not yet received review comments. Once we receive the review comments from the Engineering consultant we will revisit the stormwater design and make every effort to incorporate design elements to attempt to reduce the peak flow rates for those design storms where the increases are currently proposed.

Town Engineer Response: Regardless of the Engineering consultant's evaluation, if the discharge to the abutting property on the opposite side of the River Road will need a drainage easement particularly if the increase is as much as currently proposed.

DM Roma Response #25 – A waiver request has been submitted with this response.

Town Engineer Response: I think that because of the proximity of the entrances that the traffic analysis should be required. The traffic analysis is supposed to look at access conditions.

DM Roma Comment #26 – the applicant has indicated that they want to offer the road to the Town as a public road when construction is complete, however the road design does not meet the public road standard. The land use ordinance states that major local streets and minor local streets to provide either a shoulder or a sidewalk to provide for safe pedestrian or bicycle travel. The applicants design does not include a sidewalk up to STA 12+00 and only the standard 2' paved shoulder plus a 2' gravel shoulder, and from 12+00 to the end the design includes a 2' paved shoulder with curb and no secondary shoulder at all. The ordinance requires at a minimum, an additional one foot of paved shoulder, on each side of the street. The proposed design does not meet the requirements of a public

road. Response #26 – We have revised the plans to propose building the road with 3-foot paved shoulders and a total paved width of 26 feet.

Town Engineer Response: I'm ok with that, but acceptance of the road as a public road is contingent on Council Approval not necessarily on whether the road meets the public road standards.

DM Roma Response #27 – We have added proposed landscaping along the rear of Lot 1 to provide buffer screening to the property that abuts to the north. It is our understanding that the 50-ft perimeter buffer is intended to be primarily a structure setback with only “natural vegetation or landscaping” permitted. We are not proposing any structures, parking areas or pavement within the buffer area, and the soil filters will be completely vegetated and have the general appearance of a field that will be mowed a couple of times per year. There are no existing structures that would benefit from a thick screening of trees in the area where the vegetated soil filters are proposed. We feel that the appearance of the vegetated soil filters meets the intent of what the perimeter buffer ordinance was intended to achieve.

Town Engineer Response: No further comment.