April 21, 2021
20566

Ms. Amanda Lessard, Planning Director<br>Town of Windham Planning Board<br>8 School Road<br>Windham ME, 04062

## Windham Public Safety Rénovation and Expansion Project

Dear Ms. Lessard:

Thank you for the review comments in your e-mail dated April 12, 2021. Attached are updated plans reflecting the review and comments with additional information.

Review Comments and Responses:

1. The site plan should show the entire parcel.

Response: We have updated the cover sheet and created an overall site development plan.
2. How does the proposed plan alter the site plan approval of the Community Park that shows grading and stormwater infrastructure in proximity to your proposed developed areas, a sidewalk connection to the public safety building parking area, and a UGE connection to the building for lighting the proposed basketball court?

Response: We have superimposed the Community Park over our plan and provided an integrated plan between the two projects. The projects only overlapped in a small area along the fringes of each project. We have modified our grading plan accordingly. The stormwater remains unchanged for each project. We have also added a conduit to the plan for the future basketball courts. Some minor adjustments we made to the walking path to allow for a connection to the expanded public safety building.
3. An existing conditions plan - it's difficult to see the existing aerial photo on the plan cover sheet. I'm having difficulty determining any difference in the developed area approved in 1988 (both extent of the existing parking area and site grading compared with the proposed plan. A graphic that better illustrate the changes would also likely be helpful for the board. The photometric plan does a better job noting the expansion of pavement but I'd like to see the same for grading.

Response. To better illustrate the comparison to the 1988 plan we have expanded the plans to depict the entire project site. The proposed project primarily expands into the current apparatus parking along the southerly side of the fire station. We are adding a small area of pavement to replace the apparatus parking. The existing parking lots for fire and police will not be changed other than the area shown on the plans for the evidence building. Proposed paving areas are shaded for better definition and clarity.
4. The 1988 site plan shows a Vehicle Wash Septic Field in an area behind the proposed addition. Does this existing or was it never installed?

Response: We have added the location of the septic field from the prior approved plans and field reviewed the general area. We were unable to locate any records of the actual construction but did observe two manholes that are possibly septic tank covers. Our proposed work has been designed to not interfere with the area of the septic field as a precaution.
5. Ground floor elevation drawings for the proposed evidence storage buildings.

Response: We have included the architect's plans for the building.
6. Is any lighting proposed on the exterior of the evidence storage building? The building is not shown on the plan.

Response: Supplemental to our original submittal, we have added the building and lights to the photometric plan and have included the updated plan in this submittal.
7. Please elaborate on the changes to the parking - I see the site plan Note 8 lists 52 passenger vehicles parking spaces and 10 apparatus parking spaces. How does this complete to the current? Is it adequate to serve the use?

Response: We have added a parking table to the site plan comparing existing to proposed parking. The parking remains essentially unchanged except for a few spaces to be removed in the location of the evidence building. The addition is needed to address existing space constraints with little change in current staffing. We did review the parking as part of the facility programming and the amount of parking provided was determined to be adequate for the use.
8. An approval block for the Planning Board signature is not on the plan (no need to revise at this time, but will be needed for Board Signature).

Response: Since we were updating the plan to address other review comments, we went ahead and added the signature block to the site plan.

Thank you for the review comments and we look forward to meeting with the Planning Board on the $26^{\text {th }}$ of April.

SEBAGO TECHNICS, INC.

Sincerely,


Sr. Vice President, Strategy and Client Development

Cc: Barry Tibbets, Town Manager
Valerie Paquin-Gould, Great Falls Construction



A EAST ELEVATION



