



March 8, 2017

Mr. Scott Hastings  
Assistant Town Planner  
186 York Street  
York, Maine 03909-1314

RE: Response to Town and Engineering Letter Comments  
Union Bluff Hotel Addition and Parking Structure  
8 Beach Street  
York, Maine  
CLD Reference No. 14-0133

Dear Scott:

On behalf of the Union Bluff Hotel, CLD Consulting Engineers Inc. is submitting responses to both the Planning Board Memo, dated March 2, 2017, as well as the peer review letter from Ransom Engineering, dated March 6, 2017, and the Stormwater Manager's comments via email on March 7, 2017. Comments for the original letters were in reference to the Union Bluff Site Plan Application package submitted February 23, 2017, depicting a hotel addition and new parking structure. Below you will find our responses to comments outlined in each letter, for use at the March 9<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting. We offer the following for your consideration:

### **RECOMMENDATIONS (Per Planning Department staff Memo)**

#### **3. Substantive Review and Deliberation**

##### **A. Dimensions**

a. **Lots** – Current the property in question is two lots. This proposal includes the merger of these lots into one lot.

*Yes, the lots will be merged as part of this development.*

b. **Setbacks** – Per §5.2.2 of the zoning ordinance the setbacks for YBVC, with public water and sewer, are: front – 0', side 5', and rear 10'. When a property has frontage on multiple streets the Zoning Ordinance allows a property owner to pick what is the front lot line. Based on previous approval Beach Street is the front of the lot. While Beach Street turns, it remains the front of the lot for its whole length. §2 defines side lot lines (Lot line, Side) as lot lines that intersect with the front lot line and rear lot lines (Lot Line, Rear) as all lot lines that are not front or rear.

- Front Setback: The proposal is in conformance with the front setback requirements.

*Yes, thank you.*

- Side setback: Portions of the parking structure appear to be within the 5' side setback along Seabury Ave.

*The layout of the proposed parking structure complies with Section 17.3.4.3 of the York Zoning Ordinance. No portion of the proposed parking structure is more non-conforming than the existing hotel building along Seaberry Lane. Part of this layout decision was to maintain a greater vegetated buffer along the adjoining property line with Lot 0024-0036.*



Mr. Scott Hastings  
CLD Reference No. 14-0333  
March 8, 2017  
Page - 2

- Rear Setback: In the corner of the lot formed by Lot 0024-0036 and Freeman Street, the parking structure is within 10' of the rear property line along the boundary with lot 0024-0036.

*Property lines which adjoin Lot 0024-0036 are interpreted to comply with side yard setbacks, as they are neither front nor rear property lines. The parking structure, therefore, maintains the 5' side yard setback along all property lines with Lot 0024-0036.*

- The beginning of the ramp to the parking area is within the rear setback from Freeman Street. If this portion of wall is only serving to hold the earth supporting the ramp and is under 4 feet tall it can be considered a retaining wall. Retaining walls that are less than 4 feet tall are exempt from setback requirements per §5.1.5.2 of the zoning ordinance.

*Yes, the wall of the ramp running parallel to Freeman Street was intentionally designed to remain under 4' tall, so as to comply with Section 5.1.5.2.*

- b. **Height** – The height limit for this property, provided the proposed building has a peaked roof, is 40'. Without a peaked roof the height limit is 35'. The application is in compliance with these requirements.

*Yes, thank you.*

**B. Parking** – §15.1.1.2 of the zoning ordinance includes the following parking requirements:

- 1.25 spaces per hotel room, or 75 spaces for the proposed total of 60 rooms
- 1 space per 3 seats of restaurant space and one space per employee, or 68 spaces for the 205 existing seats and 15 spaces for employees. §15.2.A reduces this by half to a total of 42 spaces.

This results in a total parking requirement of 117 spaces. The proposal shows a total of 103 spaces on site. The Union Bluff owns a 42 space parking lot at 416 Ridge Road. This lot was approved as off-site parking for the Union Bluff in 2007. This brings the total available spaces to 145, in excess of the required number.

*After reviewing staff comments within, we agree to the total required parking space count of 117, rather than 125 as indicated on the submitted plans. This will be corrected on the final submission plan set.*

**B. Design** – This property is governed by the York Beach Village Center Design Standards. The Board should review these standards and be prepared to discuss how the application meets them.

- The applicant has not provided external material information. The elevation drawings appear to depict materials similar to existing on the building addition and stone or stone-like materials on the parking area. This would meet the requirements of the design standards.

*The owner's design team will be happy to discuss this at the March 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.*

- The massing and design of the building are consistent with the existing building and surroundings. The varied façade and roof elements directly relate to the recommendations of the Design Standards. The parking structure is designed to fit behind the building as much as possible and to work with the slope of the ground.

*Yes, thank you.*



Mr. Scott Hastings  
CLD Reference No. 14-0333  
March 8, 2017  
Page - 3

- C. Lighting** – Little information has been submitted as to the lighting of the parking area. While the narrative does not mention them in its list of exterior lighting, the plan appears to depict lights on the posts at the edge of the parking structure. These posts are very close to the adjacent lot lines and may be in violation of §6.1.5 requiring that no strong light extend beyond the lots lines.  
*A lighting plan will be submitted for the Planning Board's review.*
- D. Landscaping and Screening** – The landscaping plan shows a thick hedge in compliance with §6.1.8.3 along the property lines with Lot 0024-0036. The plan also shows landscaping along the lot lines around the parking area as required by §6.1.8.4. Plantings are provided on the parking deck. The applicability of the requirement to have trees in parking areas is questionable when applied to a parking structure. It is clearly not feasible to plant large trees on a parking deck. If the board feels that this would require a waiver it would be reasonable to grant that waiver.  
*Yes, planting around the structure was looked at closely. The owner's design team will be happy to discuss the feasibility of plantings on the parking deck at the March 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.*
- E. Traffic** – The applicant has submitted a trip generation report to Public Works.  
*Yes, we look forward to receiving comments from the Public Works Department.*
- F. Stormwater and Erosion** – Drainage and Erosion Control plans have been submitted to the Town Engineer.  
*Yes, we have received these comments, and responses may be found later in this document.*
- G. Department Review** – The application has been submitted to the Fire, Police, and Public Works Departments and to the Water and Sewer Districts. A response from the Police department has been received with no concerns.  
*We have received comments from the York Water District and the York Sewer District. We have responded to each entity expressing the owner's intent to provide requested information and work with them to make the proposed utility connections.*
- H. Performance guarantee and Financial Capacity** – The applicant has not provided any information as to a performance guarantee or financial capacity. Both are required for approval. The Board can choose to make this condition of approval.  
*A letter from Kennebunk Savings Bank, stating the owner's financial capacity to perform the project, was submitted to Planning Department staff via email on March 7<sup>th</sup>.*
- I. Waivers** – The applicant has requested a waiver to §6.3.32 of the Site subdivision Regulations which require a high intensity soil survey. This is a reasonable request and can be granted by the board.  
*Yes, thank you.*

#### **COMMENTS (Per Ransom Consulting, Inc. letter)**

##### Plan Comments

1. Sheets C3 and C4 show stormwater sheet flowing across the public sidewalk in the front lawn area. There is a proposed storm drain running through this area that can easily have additional field inlet connected to it that would collect the stormwater before it flows over the sidewalk and into the street. This is an icing concern.  
*We can appreciate the concern for not creating an icing concern on the sidewalk within the public right of way. This was taken into consideration while grading the site, and*



Mr. Scott Hastings  
CLD Reference No. 14-0333  
March 8, 2017  
Page - 4

*specifically the front lawn area and adjacent public sidewalk. Due to utility installation and construction activities, the public sidewalk will most likely need to be reconstructed. The proposed slope of the sidewalk is shown to be 3.3% or greater, with a cross slope of 2%. These slopes should minimize the potential for standing water, and, therefore, icing concerns, on the public sidewalk. If the implementation of a field inlet becomes essential, that can be accommodated; however, it is our opinion that the slopes around this area are too steep to effectively collect stormwater.*

2. Sheets C3 and C4 appear to show that the Pavilion Area will be sheet flowing to the stairs or the ADA ramp. Sheet C5 shows a Drain Manhole in the Pavilion Area that could intercept the flow if the area was regraded. This reduces the icing on the stairs and ramp. *The grading intent for the pavilion area is to direct stormwater flow to the perimeter planting areas; not just for shedding of stormwater, but for watering of plantings. Once the stormwater reaches the perimeter planting areas it will infiltrate into the ground and be collected by underdrains, which lead to DMH#1. Additional spot elevations will be added to the drawing set to better depict this intent. Please note that the surface of the pavilion is pervious, and if sheet flow was to occur it would be during medium to larger storm events.*
3. Sheet C5 shows FSMH 1 with a rim elevation of 15.50 though it is located between a 16 and 18 contour. *The rim of FSMH#1 was intentionally indicated to be 15.50 so that the metal frame and cover would be buried 1-1.5 feet below the planting bed elevation; allowing for proper soil depth to maintain plant root structure. Additionally, given the close proximity of the structure to the walkway it was decided to keep the frame and cover buried.*
4. Sheet C5 shows FSMH 2 with a rim elevation of 19.50 though it is located between a 20 and 21 contour. *The rim of FSMH#2 was intentionally indicated to be 19.50 so that the metal frame and cover would be buried 1-1.5 feet below the planting bed elevation; allowing for proper soil depth to maintain plant root structure. Additionally, given the close proximity of the structure to the walkway it was decided to keep the frame and cover buried.*
5. Sheet C5 shows the sewer service crossing the proposed storm drain near FSMH 1. Without knowing the exiting elevation from the building, a conflict cannot be determined. *The invert elevation of the 15" HDPE storm drain pipe at the crossing with the sewer service is 11.35+/- . At a 2% slope the sewer service invert at the crossing will be 10.2+/- therefore not creating a conflict. If sewer service elevations change, the slope can be adjusted or a sewer chimney can be installed at connection with the main. Regardless, coordination with the York Sewer District will be initiated when connecting to the main. On a related matter, we have analyzed the crossing elevations of the sewer main and the 15" HDPE storm drain pipe at the crossing just east of SMH#5477 and there is no anticipated conflict.*

#### Stormwater Report Comments

1. Tables 1 and 2 should be modified to show the "Change".



Mr. Scott Hastings  
CLD Reference No. 14-0333  
March 8, 2017  
Page - 5

*The two tables identifying the 2- and 100-year Storm Events summaries will be modified to represent the 'Change' between pre- and post-development flow and volume values.*

2. The Conclusions state an increase in the peak stormwater discharge rate for Analysis Points 1 and 2. However, the tables show a decrease for Analysis Point 1.

*The conclusion section of the drainage report will be modified to state that only Analysis Point 2 shows an increase in peak stormwater discharge; while Analysis Point #1 shows a decrease. The end result still remains the same; that out-letting peak discharge from both Analysis Points 1 and 2 directly to the box culvert, without implementing detention, will prevent surcharging of the box culvert during storm events.*

#### General Comments

1. The applicant may want to consider backflow prevention on the drains entering FSMH  
1. The tidal action has been known to come up that high and has been higher with wave surges.  
*Installing backflow prevention on the outlet of FSMH1 is a good idea, and will be implemented.*

#### COMMENTS (Per Stormwater Manager's email)

1. The plan proposes that three of the four manhole drains will have Fabco Stormsafe Manhole pre-treatment cartridge inserts installed. I would suggest the following language be included in the final approval. "Post-construction requirements should include inspection of the Fabco cartridge inserts and filters once a year, and after a significant storm event. A written report of inspections and maintenance is to be submitted to the Stormwater Manager on or before July 1 of each year." *We will add this language to the site plans for the purpose of establishing an inspection and maintenance plan.*
2. I have a concern with sheet flow exiting the parking ramp. Will stormwater run-off be diverted to a catch basin?  
*There are currently 2 existing catch basins at the bottom of Seaberry Lane. We indicate installing a High Velocity Inlet grate on the eastern existing catch basin to more effectively collect gutter flow in large storm events. We are happy to further review the details of stormwater runoff with the Stormwater Manager and Planning Board to satisfy their concerns.*
3. There is a typo on Sheet D-5 under Dust Control Practices. Reference is made to the New Hampshire Stormwater Manual, Volume 3. It should be the "Maine Erosion and Sediment Control Practices Field Guild for Contractors".  
*We will correct the note under Dust Control Practices on Sheet D5 to reference "Maine Erosion and Sediment Control Practices Field Guild for Contractors".*



Mr. Scott Hastings  
CLD Reference No. 14-0333  
March 8, 2017  
Page - 6

I look forward to the opportunity to present this project to the Planning Board at the March 9, 2017, meeting. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (207) 363-0669 x320 or [rickd@cldengineers.com](mailto:rickd@cldengineers.com).

Very Truly Yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rick S. Dolce', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Rick S. Dolce

FSD:kb