

From: Travis Letellier <travis.letellier@northeastcivilsolutions.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 2:07 PM
To: Mark T. Arienti; Amanda L. Lessard
Cc: Jennifer Curtis; Brandon Binette
Subject: RE: Plan set- Fielding Oil-Roosevelt Trail (job #: 41878)
Attachments: Waiver Request Form - Performance Standards_813A5a.pdf; 41878 Stormwater Report_RJan2021_Binder_Abbr.pdf; 41878-FIELDING 1-6-21 rev per Town comments.pdf; 41878-STORMWATER TREATMENT FIG 1-5-21 .pdf; TRP1_RDI1_QSP1_Geopak_psg.pdf; Viper_Small_LED_Strke Optic_spec_sheet.pdf

Hi Mark/Amanda/Jen,

Please see my response to the comments below. I do not have info for every comment, but should have some additional information for the meeting next week. I've added responses in **Bold after each comment**.

The revised stormwater report that is mentioned in the response comments and attached to this only includes the information that has changes or has been added to the report. I.E. the HydroCAD information has not changed with this update, so it has been excluded from the report.

Amanda, can you confirm that the waiver request for the façade is completed correctly.

Thanks again for the comments and we look forward to talking this over with the Planning Board next week.

Travis

From: Mark T. Arienti <mtarienti@windhammaine.us>
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2021 9:16 AM
To: Amanda L. Lessard <allessard@windhammaine.us>; Brandon Binette <brandon.binette@northeastcivilsolutions.com>
Cc: Jennifer Curtis <jcurtis@windhammaine.us>; Travis Letellier <travis.letellier@northeastcivilsolutions.com>; Shawn Allard <shawn.allard@northeastcivilsolutions.com>
Subject: RE: Plan set- Fielding Oil-Roosevelt Trail (job #: 41878)

Jenn et. al,

I reviewed the Fielding's Condos Final Site Plan Submission and associated Plan Set dated December 21, 2020 and I have the following comments in addition to those in Amanda's e-mail below:

- To meet the Town of Windham Street Standards in the Land Use Ordinance Appendix A, Table 4, the base course bituminous pavement thickness needs to be increased from 2" to 2.5". **The Detail has been revised on the attached plans.**
- The Sawcut and Match Pavement Detail on Construction Details Sheet 1 should be modified to clarify that at the driveway entrance the pavement at the existing ROW needs to be milled to a depth of 2" a width of 3', a tack coat applied and then overlain to match existing. **The Detail has been revised on the attached plans.**
- In order to comply with the Street Standards, the sidewalk section needs 10" of crushed gravel subbase

and 2 lifts of 1.25" thickness 9.5 mm HMA (see Table 4 in Appendix B of the Land Use Ordinance). The detail on Sheet 8 of the plan set shows 8" of gravel base and 2" on pavement without specifying lifts. **The Detail has been revised on the attached plans.**

- The Stormwater Report says that the proposed impervious area is 0.96 acres, which is 41,818 square feet (SF), but my measurements come up with over 44,000 SF. Page 4 of the Stormwater Report says that this project will not create one acre or more of new impervious surface area, and therefore an MDEP Stormwater Permit is not required. Please clarify the area considered impervious so that it is clear whether it is greater than or equal to 1.0 acres, and the MDEP stormwater permitting requirements can be verified. **I have re-calculated the areas on the plan in more detail and have added a new figure to the attached abbreviated revised stormwater report that goes into more detail about the impervious areas on the site. The total impervious area on site is just under 42,600 square feet (0.98 ac) and we are treating just over 40,900 square feet, or just over 95%, and the developed area is also calculated in more detail on the figure showing a treatment rate of just over 80%.**
- The HydroCAD analysis in the stormwater report uses a soil infiltration rate of 10 inches/hr for exfiltration from the Storm Tech chambers and for the drip edges along the edges of the building. How was the soil infiltration rate determined? The Maine DEP Stormwater BMP Manual Volume III, Ch. 6 says "the permeability of the soil at the depth of the base of the proposed infiltration system should be no less than 0.50 inches per hour and no greater than 2.41 inches per hour. Permeability should be consistent across the proposed infiltration area and should be determined by in-place well or permeameter testing, or by analyses of soil gradation." Please clarify the use of a 10 inch/hr infiltration rate. **I have included sheets for soil profiles that are found on site with the septic investigation. The soils information indicates that the underlying soils will have a 6-20 inch per hour infiltration rate, I have used 10 to be a little conservative with my assumptions.**
- Section 5 of the Stormwater Report says that "The underdrained sand filter provides treatment for 95.4% of the impervious area and 71.1% of the developed area associated with the linear portion of the project. Chapter 500 stipulates treating 95% of the impervious area and 80% of the total developed area: the proposed pond meets these criteria." The above statement is not true based on the stated numbers since 71.1% of the developed area treated is less than 80% required. Please clarify and distinguish between linear and non-linear portions of the project. It would be helpful if a table was provided identifying and quantifying the areas treated. **The updated stormwater report includes the corrected figures for the project. The project isn't looking for any exceptions for linear portions and are now showing compliance with the 95/80 standards. An additional figure is also attached which shows the extent of the developed area along with the treatment figures.**
- If Roof Dripline Filters are to be used to meet the MDEP Ch. 500 treatment requirements, then the design should meet the requirements in Volume III, Ch. 7.5 of the MDEP Stormwater BMP Manual. The proposed design as shown in the detail on Sheet 8 of the plan set does not appear to conform with that design. Calculations documenting the sizing of the drip edges should be provided. **We are proposing dripline infiltration which will collect water from the roof in the 2 foot deep 3 foot wide crushed stone reservoir, and then infiltrate that without any collection system, a hybrid between Section 6 and 7 of the design manual. I have added an additional calculation sheet showing how the reservoir of each drip line will accommodate the first 1 inch of runoff from the roof.**
- Regarding compliance with the flooding standard noted below in the Planning Director's comments, the 0.01 CFS increase in the post-development flow could be considered insignificant but the other issues noted above should be first addressed to determine their impact on peak flows. In addition, the pre- and the post-development areas should be equivalent, and the Stormwater Runoff Summary Table in the Stormwater Report indicates they are not so this issue should also be corrected. **The increase in the 10 and 25 year storm even is 0.1 cfs and is more of a result of the concentration of flow in the area that includes the storage buildings. This is also a necessary bypass for flow that comes off of**

Route 302 in the area, ensuring it will not enter the infiltration basin under the driveway. The discrepancy in total area from pre-development to post-development is due to a small subcatchment, S2, being cut off as a result of the development. The small area combined with the excellent soils in the area results in zero off site flows, even in the 25 year event. The 2,200 square foot subcatchment's drainage will have no effect on this property or any neighboring property and is the reason for the 0.04 acre discrepancy in watershed areas in the report.

I reviewed the Fieldings Condos Final Site Plan application and found it incomplete with regard to the application submission requirements. The following items are outstanding:

- Copies of any proposed easements – the plans show a proposed drainage easement across the Valente lot for a proposed drain line. Provide documentation of abutting property owner's intention to grant said easement to the applicant.
We have reached out to the neighbor to show his acceptance of the proposed easement. He has identified in the past that this was agreeable, and we will forward his acceptance as soon as we hear. We will plan to have a draft easement prepared for the next submission or materials.
- The Traffic Assessment does not provide an estimate of the Saturday peak hour and daily traffic.
 - Section 1204 also requires the traffic analysis for projects that require site plan approval to determine the traffic impact of new trips generated by the development project that pass through the North Route 302 Capital Improvement District within the peak commuter hour. The traffic analysis estimates the project will generate 11 trips in the evening peak hour. Please provide an estimate for how many of those peak hour trips are estimated to pass through the Route 302/Anglers Road intersection as the impact fee is \$382.65 per peak hour trip through that intersection.
 - Typically for projects with entrances on Route 302 the Board would like to see some comments from a traffic engineer on the need for turning lanes to serve the proposed project. The Traffic Assessment submitted does not provide any such conclusions.
The traffic report will be updated to include the assessments/revisions identified above. The revised report will be included in our next official submission of materials.
- Estimated costs of the development and itemize the estimated major expenses.
An estimate of the total costs will be included in the next official submission for review.
- Location of the nearest fire hydrant is not shown on the plan. There is a hydrant on Route 302 in front of the abutting Valente property between the entrances for 608 and 610 Roosevelt Trail.
The location of the nearest hydrant, just south of the project site, is now located on the plans. Please see the attached revised plans.
- Type of exterior lighting. The luminaire schedule is listed on the Site Lighting Layout plan, but please provide a detail or cut sheet of the fixtures. (Or point me to a location if it's in the plan set – I only saw a light pole base on Detail Sheet 8)
The exterior lighting plan has been updated and the cut sheets for the proposed lights have been attached to this response.
- No Approval Block for Planning Board signature is shown on the plan
The plans have been updated to include a signature block for the Board. Please see the attached revised plans.
- Digital transfer of any site plan data to the Town. Section 811.B.2.g specifies the GIS requirements, but

we also accept DWG files.

I will submit a DWG file of the final approved plan, sending in a cad file now would only confuse things down the line if there are any revisions to the plan from this point.

Not on the submission checklist, but also outstanding:

- Section 807.F requires that prior to submittal of the Final Plan application the following approvals shall be obtained in writing:
 - Maine DEP Stormwater Permit – please provide evidence of PBR application submission or approved permit

The DEP stormwater PBR will be forward to the Planning Staff as soon as it is received.

Other review comments will be provided as staff fully reviews the application, but I did also note the following during my completeness review:

- The Stormwater Management Report references a Stormwater Management Facilities Maintenance Plan that would be attached to the report and is not. Please submit or the revise the report to reference Plan Sheet 7 of 12.

The report has been updated to note the plan reference as suggested above.

- The post-development stormwater runoff exceeds the pre-development peak flows for the 10-year and 25-year storms which does not comply with Section 812.E.1.a. I'll defer to Town Engineer Mark Arienti to advise if this in an insignificant increase in peak flow that could be waived by the Board. A completed waiver request form may need to be submitted.

The proposed increase in peak flow is very insignificant in my opinion and is a result of adding considerations for road way drainage to bypass the property. Flows from the developed area itself will not increase offsite flows and all of the area draining to the infiltration infrastructure will be detained and infiltrated onsite without overflowing in the 25 year event. To put the calculated increase into context, the peak flow, which will last for about 5 to 10 minutes will occur once every 10 years, an increase from Zero to 0.1. For a site that is adding nearly an acre of imperious area, starting at zero in the pre-development state there is no statistical increase that is smaller than 0.1 within the bounds of the design software.

- The application materials interchangeable refer to the project as apartments and condos. Please clarify the ownership of the units. The Board must understand what entity is responsible for maintenance of the required improvements. If this will be a condo, please submit draft condo docs for review.

The development will be Condos and Condo docs will be sent to the planning office as soon as a draft is prepared. I will coordinate all references made to apartments and have then changed for the next submission of materials.

- Kara Taylor, E-911 Addressing Officer in the Assessing Department commented that if there is any possibility it will be condominiumized, she would want to plan for that by naming the access and giving each unit its own number.

The development will consist of individual condo units.

- To demonstrate compliance with the C-1 net density standard DHHS approval of the waiver of the State Minimum Lot Size requirement is required.

The waiver approval will be forwarded upon receipt.

- The plan, as submitted, requires a waiver from the Commercial District Design Standards façade performance standard. Please submit a waiver request form and address the waiver criteria.

A waiver request has been added to this reply for consideration by the Board.

- Please provide a rear elevation drawing of the storage buildings. They must also comply with the design standards. The narrative submitted to address the design standards is focused on the main building, and does not address these storage buildings in the same detail. What is the pitch of the roof? The horizontal façade exceeds 50 feet and must incorporate wall plane projections or recesses.
We would like to get the Boards opinion on this. These accessory storage buildings and to be required to have windows and projections would not fit in with the nature of their proposed use. Before we make any revisions, we would like to get the opinion of the Board.
- The setbacks listed in Note 7 on Sheet 2 should be corrected – the Front setback on Route 302 is 10-20 ft for principal buildings. Accessory building setbacks are the principal building setback + 20 ft
The setbacks have been revised on sheet 2. Please see the revised attached plans.
- If Vintage Drive is going to be a ROW with a street offered for public acceptance then the lot will be divided and proposed lot numbers and lot areas should be shown on the plan. The division is not subject to subdivision plan review, but I think it would be helpful to show this on the plan.
The lot will be split by the proposed ROW and the lots have been listed on the attached revised plans.
- On the Site Lighting Layout Plan there are two locations where the illumination exceeds the ordinance standard of 0.5 footcandles at the PTG Properties lot line.
The lighting plan has been revised to eliminate the greater than 0.5 FC trespass along the property line. The pole locations and heights are the same, but the lighting has been modled with backlight control optics that have reduces the limit of the 0.5 FC line.

Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions,

Mark

Mark Arienti, P.E., Town Engineer
Town of Windham
8 School Road
Windham, ME 04062

office: (207) 777-1948
cell: (207) 894-4107
fax: (207) 892-1916
www.windhammaine.us

From: Amanda L. Lessard <allessard@windhammaine.us>
Sent: Thursday, December 31, 2020 1:17 PM
To: Brandon Binette <brandon.binette@northeastcivilsolutions.com>
Cc: Jennifer Curtis <jcurtis@windhammaine.us>; Travis Letellier <travis.letellier@northeastcivilsolutions.com>; Shawn Allard <shawn.allard@northeastcivilsolutions.com>; Mark T. Arienti <mtarienti@windhammaine.us>
Subject: RE: Plan set- Fielding Oil-Roosevelt Trail (job #: 41878)

Brandon et al,

I reviewed the Fieldings Condos Final Site Plan application and found it incomplete with regard to the application submission requirements. The following items are outstanding:

- Copies of any proposed easements – the plans show a proposed drainage easement across the Valente lot for a proposed drain line. Provide documentation of abutting property owner's intention to grant said easement to the applicant.
- The Traffic Assessment does not provide an estimate of the Saturday peak hour and daily traffic.
 - Section 1204 also requires the traffic analysis for projects that require site plan approval to determine the traffic impact of new trips generated by the development project that pass through the North Route 302 Capital Improvement District within the peak commuter hour. The traffic analysis estimates the project will generate 11 trips in the evening peak hour. Please provide an estimate for how many of those peak hour trips are estimated to pass through the Route 302/Anglers Road intersection as the impact fee is \$382.65 per peak hour trip through that intersection.
 - Typically for projects with entrances on Route 302 the Board would like to see some comments from a traffic engineer on the need for turning lanes to serve the proposed project. The Traffic Assessment submitted does not provide any such conclusions.
- Estimated costs of the development and itemize the estimated major expenses.
- Location of the nearest fire hydrant is not shown on the plan. There is a hydrant on Route 302 in front of the abutting Valente property between the entrances for 608 and 610 Roosevelt Trail.
- Type of exterior lighting. The luminaire schedule is listed on the Site Lighting Layout plan, but please provide a detail or cut sheet of the fixtures. (Or point me to a location if it's in the plan set – I only saw a light pole base on Detail Sheet 8)
- No Approval Block for Planning Board signature is shown on the plan
- Digital transfer of any site plan data to the Town. Section 811.B.2.g specifies the GIS requirements, but we also accept DWG files.

Not on the submission checklist, but also outstanding:

- Section 807.F requires that prior to submittal of the Final Plan application the following approvals shall be obtained in writing:
 - Maine DEP Stormwater Permit – please provide evidence of PBR application submission or approved permit

Other review comments will be provided as staff fully reviews the application, but I did also note the following during my completeness review:

- The Stormwater Management Report references a Stormwater Management Facilities Maintenance Plan that would be attached to the report and is not. Please submit or the revise the report to reference Plan Sheet 7 of 12.
- The post-development stormwater runoff exceeds the pre-development peak flows for the 10-year and 25-year storms which does not comply with Section 812.E.1.a. I'll defer to Town Engineer Mark Arienti to advise if this is an insignificant increase in peak flow that could be waived by the Board. A completed waiver request form may need to be submitted.
- The application materials interchangeable refer to the project as apartments and condos. Please clarify the ownership of the units. The Board must understand what entity is responsible for maintenance of the required improvements. If this will be a condo, please submit draft condo docs for review.
- Kara Taylor, E-911 Addressing Officer in the Assessing Department commented that if there is any possibility it will be condominiumized, she would want to plan for that by naming the access and giving each unit its own number.
- To demonstrate compliance with the C-1 net density standard DHHS approval of the waiver of the State

Minimum Lot Size requirement is required.

- The plan, as submitted, requires a waiver from the Commercial District Design Standards façade performance standard. Please submit a waiver request form and address the waiver criteria.
- Please provide a rear elevation drawing of the storage buildings. They must also comply with the design standards. The narrative submitted to address the design standards is focused on the main building, and does not address these storage buildings in the same detail. What is the pitch of the roof? The horizontal façade exceeds 50 feet and must incorporate wall plane projections or recesses.
- The setbacks listed in Note 7 on Sheet 2 should be corrected – the Front setback on Route 302 is 10-20 ft for principal buildings. Accessory building setbacks are the principal building setback + 20 ft
- If Vintage Drive is going to be a ROW with a street offered for public acceptance then the lot will be divided and proposed lot numbers and lot areas should be shown on the plan. The division is not subject to subdivision plan review, but I think it would be helpful to show this on the plan.
- On the Site Lighting Layout Plan there are two locations where the illumination exceeds the ordinance standard of 0.5 footcandles at the PTG Properties lot line.

The application will be included on the January 11, 2021 Planning Board agenda as a public hearing. Abutters have been notified and legal notices of the meeting will be posted. The preliminary meeting agenda will be posted today <https://windhamweb.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>. Please submit any supplemental materials or responses to comments before January 7 to be included in the finalized meeting agenda.

Happy New Year!

Amanda

Amanda Lessard, Planning Director
Town of Windham
8 School Road
Windham, ME 04062

office: (207) 894-5900 x 6121
cell: (207) 400-7618
fax: (207) 892-1916
www.windhammaine.us

NOTICE: Under Maine's Freedom of Access ("Right to Know") law, documents – including emails – in the possession of public officials about town business are considered public records. This means if anyone asks to see it, we are required to provide it. There are very few exceptions. We welcome citizen comments and want to hear from our constituents, but please keep in mind that what you write in an email is not private and will be made available to any interested party.

From: Brandon Binette <brandon.binette@northeastcivilsolutions.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 30, 2020 12:43 PM
To: Amanda L. Lessard <allessard@windhammaine.us>
Cc: Jennifer Curtis <jcurtis@windhammaine.us>; Travis Letellier <travis.letellier@northeastcivilsolutions.com>; Shawn Allard <shawn.allard@northeastcivilsolutions.com>
Subject: Plan set- Fielding Oil-Roosevelt Trail (job #: 41878)

Hello Amanda,

Please see the attached plan set and application materials.

All the Best,
Brandon Binette
Project Engineer

(work) 207.883.1000
(fax) 207.883.1001

NORTHEAST CIVIL SOLUTIONS, INC.
A DBE Certified Company
381 Payne Road, Scarborough, Maine 04074

SURVEYING • ENGINEERING • LAND PLANNING

www.northeastcivilsolutions.com