



To: York Planning Board
From: Lee Jay Feldman, Director of Planning, SMPDC
& Steve Bradstreet Civil Engineer, Ransom Consulting
Date: 4/23/2014
Re: Preliminary Review York Police Station 414 Ridge Road- Map & Lot 0094-0077

The Application

The applicant has submitted a Preliminary Plan application for review of the proposed Town of York Police Station. The proposed project consists of an 18,000 square foot building proposed to be a LEED Silver building, parking for 76 vehicles on the site and a pad location for a cell/telecommunications tower. The building will sit on the property within close proximity and direct access to Ridge Road, however; the applicant is also proposing to construct a new connector road from Ridge Road through to U.S. Route 1 with access just north of the structure formerly owned by Mr. Blinn.

In order to allow for access to all part of town, the applicant is proposing to access the York Beach community, as well as Route 1. To achieve this, a roughly 4,800 LF connecting road between these two points will be constructed within a new Right-Of-Way. The road has been designed to meet Town of York Collector Street standards; the road will have a paved width of 24 feet with 3 reinforced shoulders at each side. Turning lanes will be provided at the intersection with York PD New Public Safety Building & Connector Road Route 1, with two outward lanes extending approximately 200-feet onto the site. In addition, a six-foot wide paved shoulder is provided at the intersection approach, and a further three feet of unpaved reinforced edge. This will allow additional space for emergency vehicles to pass when the road is congested. The road structure will be typical bituminous pavement, with a section of 21" aggregate sub base, 3" crushed aggregate base and a total of 4" of hot bituminous pavement (1½" and 2½"). No curbing is proposed. Crossing culverts will be constructed at locations where the new road crosses the existing drainage features on the property. Where culvert crossings are located on delineated streams, the culverts are proposed to be oversized. An 8ft wide multi-use trail will be constructed along the new road alignment, connecting Ridge Road to the police station site. The sidewalk will be constructed with a minimum of 10" of crushed aggregate base and 2" of hot bituminous pavement. A stone dust pedestrian/bicycle path will be constructed through the remainder of the property,

connecting the police station to US Route 1. Stormwater treatment for runoff from the road is provided through the use of LID Best Management Practices (BMPs), including stormwater buffers, filter strips and bioretention cells. The roadway corridor includes an eight-foot wide multi-use trail that is separated from the vehicular roadway by a five foot wide grass esplanade. The multi-use trail is proposed to be paved from Ridge Road to the Police Station site to facilitate year-round pedestrian and bicycle access. From the police station to Route 1 the trail will be stone dust and will be suitable for the expected seasonal use of this connection.

Access and Parking

The police station will be accessed at two locations from the new through road. The westerly access will be for staff, cruisers and official visitors, and the easterly access will be for the public. The Town of York code requirement for parking for this type of facility is established as four spaces for every 1,000 SF of floor area. At 18,000 SF the resultant requirement is 72 parking spaces. All parking shall be 90 degrees to access aisles. Access on the new collector road is only proposed from Ridge road based on the application information at this time. At this time the applicant cannot access the Route 1 corridor since insufficient information is available to determine the level of traffic control will be required at the proposed intersection. This is due to the fact that applicant must provide additional study of the Route 1 access during the high vacation season. Staff needs additional counts and projected turning movements at the Route 1 intersection in order to determine the level of safety required at the intersection. The applicant has also not considered the additional traffic being considered in the upcoming summer counts and what effect it will have on traffic control at the Ridge Road intersection. If the applicant proposes to dead end the road at the police station than the traffic counts at Ridge Road will be fine. There are outstanding issues that the applicant must consider with this application relevant to traffic. Until these decisions can be made this application should not be approved.

Communications

The new facility will be served by three-phase power from the CMP system in Ridge Road. The new service will run underground from the street to the police station site. A pad-mounted transformer will be installed adjacent to the new Police Station with ongoing secondary service to the building. As part of the application there is a great deal of information relevant to the cell tower. The applicant should provide additional information regarding the height and design of the tower. The applicant is also showing an area for future consideration not part of this approval. If that is the case than this area should be removed from the plan so there is no confusion over what is being approved. The planning board may also want to consider requiring a balloon test or photo imagery to show the height of the cell tower for public consumption.

Sewer

Sewer service for the new Police Station will be provided by York Sewer District. A new gravity sewer extension will be constructed as part of this project. The new sewer will

connect to the existing system in Caddy's Way, across land recently purchased by York Sewer District. It will extend into the site, serving the new police station facility and continuing up the Connector Road to provide potential future sewer access to abutting property owners. Staff would suggest that the existing neighbors be asked if they are interested in adding the public sewer. If they do not want it staff would suggest that the new line be terminated at the Police Station.

Water

Water service to the site will be provided by the York Water District. A new 8" Ductile Iron diameter water main will be constructed between Ridge Road and the Police Station site to provide fire and domestic supply. York Water District has also indicated that a loop to the end of the main in Caddy's Way may be beneficial to overall system performance, and that consideration should be given to sizing the new main for expected future growth in the area. Domestic and fire services for the new facility will be tapped off the new service main. A fire hydrant will be installed in the roadway adjacent to the new building to provide external firefighting protection.

Stormwater

Stormwater from the newly developed areas of the site and roadway will be captured and treated in accordance with the State of Maine Chapter 500 Stormwater Law. Small Bioretention cells and vegetated buffers will be used to treat runoff from the new roadway. Filtering drip strips and bioretention cells in and adjacent to parking lots and around the building will treat runoff from these areas. In addition, a number of areas alongside the road are proposed to be utilized as Stormwater Buffers. These areas will be deed restricted. The stormwater management BMPs are primarily designed to treat runoff from developed areas for water quality. However, in addition to this primary function, they are also designed to slow and detain runoff so that flows to downstream resources are not increased. The proposed Connector Road will cross several drainageways that convey runoff from upstream areas to the west of the site, across the property in a generally easterly direction. Surface flows in these drainageways will be conveyed under the new road in a series of culvert crossings. The culverts will be sized to convey the peak design 100-year flood flow at each location. At two locations, the crossings are defined as natural streams. In these cases the culvert crossings will be oversized and constructed with a natural "bed" within the pipe to maintain the hydraulic conditions at either side of the crossing.

Landscaping & Lighting

A preliminary landscaping plan has been developed for the site around the new police station facility and supplements the existing vegetation that will remain around the site perimeters. Some additional plantings are also proposed around the new entrance to the Connector Road from US Route 1. The applicant should consider additional tree plantings in the area previously cleared as a laydown area behind the building on Route 1 (Blinn property) as a restoration to the laydown area. The applicant should further revegetate the areas used as laydown areas directly around the police station building itself to add additional buffers

between the station site and the York Wild Kingdom. In both cases tree selections should be compatible the soils in those areas.

Lighting for the police station parking lot is designed to provide safe and adequate lighting without intruding on adjacent properties, or the adjacent roadway. The applicant is proposing LED full cutoff lights which should not impact surrounding properties.

Review Issues

Traffic

The traffic assessment prepared by GPCEI does not include the construction of the Access Road to Route 1 (all movements from the Police Station enter and exit via Ridge Road and through traffic between Ridge Road and Route 1 is not permitted at this time). The Site Plan illustrates the construction of the Access Road fully between Ridge Road and Route 1 and thus the application materials are inconsistent from a program perspective. It would be my suggestion that the Site Plan materials be revised such that it only includes the construction of the Access Road to the Police Station with appropriate turnaround design provisions (cul-de-sac or hammerhead layout). This recommendation is base on the fact that acceptable traffic data for evaluating realistic peak season traffic impacts at the Route 1 intersection cannot be collected until the summer. An amended application or new application would then be submitted after a credible traffic study is completed, and if deemed acceptable, include the construction of the Access Road from the Police Station to Route 1.

The following comments reflect my review of conditions with the construction of the Access Road to Ridge Road ONLY.

Town's Approval Standards and Criteria

1.2 CRITERIA OF APPROVAL

1.2.5 Traffic. The development will not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed, and if the proposed development requires driveways or entrances onto a state or state-aid highway located outside the urban compact area of an urban compact municipality as defined by Title 23 §754, the Maine Department of

Transportation has provided documentation indicating that the driveways or entrances conform to Title 23 §704 and any rules adopted under that section;

Comment: Based upon the information contained in the traffic assessment, it is my professional opinion that the proposed project will not cause unreasonable congestion or safety issues.

1.2.19 Impact on Adjoining Municipality. For any proposed development that crosses municipal boundaries, the proposed development will not cause unreasonable traffic congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of existing public ways in an adjoining municipality in which part of the development is located.

Comment: No impacts are anticipated.

6.3.33 For Site Plans or Subdivision Plans involving 40 or more parking spaces or projected to generate more than 400 vehicle trips per day, a traffic impact analysis, prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer with at least 3 years experience in traffic engineering, shall be submitted. The analysis shall indicate the expected average daily vehicular trips, peak hour volumes, access conditions at the site, distribution of traffic, types of vehicles expected, effect upon the level of service of the street giving access to the site and neighboring streets which may be affected, and recommended improvements to maintain the required level of service on the affected streets. Trip generation rates used shall be the mean value reported in Table 3 of Development and Application of Trip Generation Rates, Kellercro, Inc. published by the Federal Highway Administration, January, 1985. (MAJOR)

Comment: A traffic assessment has been prepared for the project. It should be noted that the trip generation for the project was based upon employee information at the Police Station. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) does not provide data for a Police Station.

8.1.1 Provision shall be made for vehicular access to the development and circulation within the development in such a manner as to safeguard against hazards to traffic and pedestrians in existing streets and within the development, to avoid traffic congestion on any street and to provide safe and convenient circulation on public streets and within subdivisions. More specifically, access and circulation shall conform to the standards and design criteria in this Article, as well as Article 9.

Comment: Access to the development is well planned and meets Town Standards.

8.1.2 The vehicular access to the subdivision shall be arranged to avoid traffic congestion of existing local residential streets.

Comment: Not Applicable

8.1.3 Where a lot has frontage on two or more streets, the access to the lot shall be provided from the street where there is lesser potential for traffic congestion and lesser potential for hazards to traffic and pedestrians. In general, all new driveways should access from the new subdivision street, rather than an existing street, so as to minimize curb cuts on the more heavily traveled street.

Comment: Not Applicable

8.1.4 The street giving access to the development, and neighboring streets which can be expected to carry traffic to and from the development, shall have sufficient traffic carrying capacity and shall be suitably improved by the developer to accommodate the amount and types of traffic generated by the proposed development. No development shall increase the volume: capacity ratio of any street above 0.8 nor reduce the street's Level of Service to "D" or below, as defined by the most recent edition of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (published by the Transportation Research Board).

Comment: As noted in the traffic assessment, level of service 'B' conditions is projected at the Ridge Road intersection with the Access Road during the time period evaluated. Accordingly this standard is met.

8.1.5 Where necessary to safeguard against hazards to traffic and pedestrians and/or to avoid traffic congestion, provision shall be made for turning lanes, traffic directional islands, frontage streets, and traffic controls within public streets. Traffic control devices shall

conform to the most recent edition of the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD), unless otherwise specified in Subsection 8.4.

Comment: The intersection of the Access Road and Ridge Road provides for separate left and right lanes exiting the site. The applicant has evaluated warrants for a left-turn lane on Ridge Road. The analysis indicates a left-turn lane is not warranted. Accordingly, I find this standard to be met.

8.1.6 Access to the development shall be of a design and have sufficient capacity to avoid queuing of entering vehicles on any street.

Comment: The project has been designed to avoid queuing issues, accordingly I find this standard to be met.

8.1.7 Where topographical and other conditions allow, provisions shall be made for circulation access connections to adjoining lots of similar existing or potential use. These shall be required:

8.1.7.1 When such access connection will facilitate fire protection services; or

8.1.7.2 When such access will enable the public to travel between two existing or potential uses, generally open to the public, without the need to travel upon a street outside the development.

Comment: The Police Station driveways seem reasonable. The lot at the northeast corner of the Ridge Road intersection should have primarily access/egress movements via the proposed Access Road. The plans illustrate a future curb cut, but removal or turn limitations should be considered for the Ridge Road driveway.

8.1.8 All non-residential sites shall provide off-street loading facilities sufficient to meet the need of the use. The loading facility shall be located and designed so that delivery vehicles can be parked completely on site. The loading area shall not obstruct on-site traffic flow, but may allow for temporary use or blocking of some on-site parking spaces.

Comment: The site plan appears to meet this standard.

8.2 SITE PLAN DRIVEWAY DESIGN STANDARDS

8.2.2 Access design shall be based on the estimated volume using the access classification defined below.

- Low Volume Access Less than 25 vehicle trips per day.
- Medium Volume Access Any access that is not a low volume or a high volume access.
- High Volume Access Peak hour volume of 400 vehicles or greater.

Comment: Based upon the traffic assessment the project will generate 33 peak hour trips and therefore is classified as a Medium Volume Access

8.2.3 Sight Distances - Accesses shall be designed in profile and grading and shall be located to provide the required sight distance measured along the street in each direction. Sight distances shall be measured from the driver's seat of a vehicle standing on that portion of the exit with the front of the vehicle a minimum of 10 feet behind the curb line or edge of shoulder, with the height of the eye 3 ½ feet, to the top of an object 4 ¼ feet above the pavement. A sight distance of ten feet for each mile per hour of posted speed limit shall be maintained or provided. Where necessary, corner lots shall be cleared of all growth and sight obstructions, including ground excavation, to achieve the required visibility.

Comment: The traffic assessment assumes use of MaineDOT sight distance standards, which is 200 feet for a roadway with a posted speed limit of 25MPH. The applicant shall confirm that 250 feet of sight distance will be provided (the Town's standard).

8.2.4 Vertical Alignment - Accesses shall be flat enough to prevent the dragging of any vehicle undercarriage. Accesses shall have vertical of alignments which conform to current Maine Department of Transportation driveway standards. In addition, low volume accesses shall not have, at any point, a slope greater than 15%, and medium and high volume accesses shall not have, at any point, a slope greater than 8%.

Comment: This standard appears to be met.

8.2.6 Medium Volume Accesses

8.2.6.1 Angle of Intersection - Medium volume accesses may be either one-way or two-way operation and shall intersect the street at an angle as nearly equaling 90 degrees as site conditions permit. Under special site conditions, the Planning Board may waive this requirement to no less than 70 degrees.

Comment: One of the proposed driveways will intersect the Access Road at a 90 degree angle. The second driveway is close to a 90 degree angle and thus I find this standard to be met.

8.2.6.2 Curb Radius - Curb radius will vary depending on whether the access is one-way or two-way operation. On a two-way access the curb radii shall be no less than 15 feet and no more than 30 feet. One one-way accesses, the curb radii shall be no less than 15 and no more than 30 feet for right turns into and out of the site, with a 5 foot radius on the opposite curb.

Comment: The project proposes 25-foot radii and thus the project meets this standard.

8.2.6.3 Access Width - On a two-way access the width shall be no less than 24 feet and no more than 36 feet. However, where truck traffic is anticipated, the width may be no more than 40 feet. On a one-way access the width shall be no less than 16 feet and no more than 20 feet.

Comment: The project is proposing two 24-foot wide driveways and accordingly the project meets this standard.

8.3 ACCESS LOCATION AND SPACING

8.3.1 Minimum Corner Clearance - Corner clearance shall be measured from the point of tangency (PT) for the corner to the point of tangency for the access. In general the developer should provide the maximum practical corner clearance possible based on site constraints. Minimum corner clearances are listed below based upon access or minor street volume and intersection type.

Comment: The proposed driveway nearest Ridge Road is greater than 50 feet away and accordingly this standard is met.

8.3.2 Access Spacing - Accesses and street intersections shall be separated from adjacent accesses, streets and property lines as indicated in the table below, in order to allow major through routes to effectively serve their primary function of conducting through traffic. The distance shall be measured from the access point of tangency to the access point of tangency for spacing between accesses and from the access point of tangency to a projection of the property line at the edge of the roadway for access spacing to the property line.

Comment: The proposed driveways have separation in excess of 75 feet and no adjacent driveways are within 75 feet. This standard is met.

8.3.3 Number of Accesses - The maximum number of accesses onto a single street is controlled by the available site frontage and the table above. In addition, the following criteria shall limit the number of accesses independent of frontage length.

8.3.3.2 No medium or high volume traffic generator shall have more than two two-way accesses or three accesses in total onto a single roadway.

Comment: Two access drives are proposed and thus this standard is met.

General Comments on the Traffic Assessment and Site Plan

- As noted in the traffic assessment, the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual does not provide data for a Police Station. The applicant estimated traffic levels from projected staff levels. The applicant has estimated the AM peak hour to be the worst-case trip generating time period. The applicant should provide documentation on why the morning is the highest trip generation period. Given the level of traffic volumes expected, it is unlikely the conclusions of the assessment will change.
- Existing traffic volumes were based upon Saturday traffic counts conducted in the summer of 2010. While these volumes are somewhat old, I suspect they would not be significantly different and thus would not change the conclusions of the assessment. Town staff should confirm that area changes since 2010 have not significantly impacted traffic volumes on Ridge Road.
- The applicant used an AM peak hour trip generation estimate with an estimated Saturday PM peak hour volume on Ridge Road. This analysis likely provides a worst-case assessment of traffic conditions entering the site, but underestimates delay from the Access Road in the afternoon. While I don't expect the conclusions to change, the applicant should provide a response to this comment. While I suspect the Saturday time period is the highest volume time period, some documentation or feedback from the Town confirming this is suggested.
- Based upon the traffic volume estimate in the assessment, I concur that a left-turn lane is not warranted on Ridge Road at the Access Road. I would note that if the Access Road is connected to Route 1, the left-turn warrant analysis will need to be revised.
- The proposed Access Road typical section illustrates two 12-foot travel lanes. If there is expected use of the road by bicyclists, shoulder space should be provided. The provision of an 8-foot sidewalk should not preclude the need for on-road bicycle accommodations.
- If the 8-foot sidewalk is being designed to be a shared-use facility, the 8-foot width should be carefully reviewed. National standards suggest a minimum width of 10 feet. It is noted that in rare circumstances a reduced width of 8 feet may be used.
- The plans do not indicate the installation of STOP signs and STOP bars at the driveways and the Access Road approach to Ridge Road. It is also unclear what pavement markings will be implemented on the Access Road, particularly at the Ridge Road intersection.
- It is unclear how the sidewalk will transition from the Access Road to Ridge Road, particularly how it complies with ADA requirements.

Survey Consideration

Do to the issues that have come up regarding the adequacy of the survey information as well as conflicts raised by abutting property owners, the contract team engaged a third party surveyor Titcom Associates to review the existing data submitted as part of the application for an opinion regarding survey as a whole and the lack of a Survey Report on the plan. The following are the comments regarding both:

“I see no reason why the plan can not be accepted and approved as is, provided the client (the town) understands there is another survey that has a differing opinion regarding the location of the boundary lines. If I were the client I would like to have a report from the surveyor which outlines the reasons for the variance.

These situations arise from time to time and they are generally worked out in different ways:

- (1) The two surveyors meet and resolve their differences (i.e. one convinces the other they are right);
- (2) One of the landowners acquiesces to the opposing survey, preferably with a quit-claim deed releasing any interest in the area of conflict;
- (3) The land owners agree to compromise boundary line through an exchange of deeds; or
- (4) The matter is resolved in court (the least desirable route to go)”.

In regards to the lack of a Surveyors Report on the plan:

“It’s not unusual for two surveyors to arrive at different opinions where property lines are; I was surprised there aren’t any notes on the plan explaining the difference other than “area of boundary line discrepancy”. I don’t fault the selectman with having an issue with this; If someone prepared a plan for me showing conflicts in the boundary line I would want to have it cleaned up”.

“A surveyors report is generally done in cases where it is necessary to explain matters that are not fully explained on the plan; this seems to be an instance where a report would be helpful why the area of disagreement exists”.

Engineering Review

The engineering review has focused on the requirements of Articles 4 and 6. Comments will refer to specific article paragraphs where appropriate. Other comments are listed based on plan sheet numbering with remaining comments provided on the Stormwater Report. While these comments may be very detailed for preliminary review, Ransom feels that if these are not addressed now, they may be missed in the construction documents and may result in change orders costing the Town a lot of money.

Article 4 Site plan and subdivision regulations review

Paragraph 4.3.A.3

While it is understood that the application is the Town of York, the plans do not list them as the applicant.

Paragraph 4.4

Match lines shall be provided on plans requiring multiple sheets.

Paragraph 4.8

During the final approval process, the plans shall be provided with signature blocks for the planning board, town departments and water and sewer districts. Conditions of approval and requested waivers shall be placed on the plans.

Article 6 Submissions

Paragraph 6.3.2.F

A Locus Map shall be provided on the plan.

Paragraph 6.3.3.A.1

Road frontages for Route 1 and Ridge Road shall be shown on the plan.

Paragraph 6.3.3.A.4

Locations of ledge outcroppings shall be shown.

Paragraph 6.3.3.A.5

Land not suitable for development based on Paragraph 7.4.1 and Paragraph 7.4.2 shall be shown.

Paragraph 6.3.3.D.4

Zoning and flood plain boundaries shall be shown.

Paragraph 6.3.5.a

The capacity to serve letter from the York Water District (YWD) indicates that their engineers, Wright Pierce, need to review the plans.

Paragraph 6.3.5.b

The YWD has requested the sprinkler demand for fire protection.

Paragraph 6.3.5.d

The Fire Department's questions were addressed in an email response, but there is not a formal approval letter from the Fire Department.

Paragraph 6.3.5.e

See comments under Stormwater Management Report.

Paragraph 6.3.5.f

Refer to comments provided by TY Lin International.

Paragraph 6.3.5.g

The plans should include a Space and Bulk Requirement table to show that the parcel meets all standards including parking.

Paragraph 6.3.8

The applicant will need to address TY Lin's comments regarding the traffic impacts.

Paragraph 6.3.24.1

The plans refer to the sewer design by CLD Engineering, though those plans were not included for review.

Paragraph 6.3.25.1

The plans for the water main and service design need to be reviewed by York Water District's consultant, Wright Pierce.

Paragraph 6.3.27

The stormwater management report comments are presented separately at the end of this review.

Paragraph 6.3.28

Sewer, water, and stormwater utility comments are contained within the Plan Sheet Review to follow.

Paragraph 6.3.33

See 6.3.8 above.

Paragraph 6.3.34

Waivers shall be noted on final plans.

Plan Sheet Review

General Comments

1. Plans will require Planning Board signature block and all town departments and utilities must sign final plans.
2. All conditions of Approval must be noted on plans.
3. All waivers granted must be noted on plans.

Sheet CP101

1. The road geometry tables do not correspond with the plan.

Sheet CP102

1. The entrance grade off of Route 1 exceeds 2% for the first 75 feet as required by Paragraph 9.5.9 for a collector street. The applicant shall present justification for this exceedence.

2. The silt fence location is not consistent with the grading limits.
3. All Bioretention Cells shall be labeled.
4. Culverts shall be shown in profile with their size, material, length, and slope.
5. Pavement/curb radii shall be shown at the intersection.
6. Curve data needs to be provided on plans to determine if they meet the requirements of Paragraph 9.5.9.
7. The shaded area in the profile between Sta 2+25 and 3+60 needs to be explained.
8. The plan has an errant A1/CP501 cross reference.
9. The bioretention cells shown do not label the underdrain or catch basins and cannot be correlated with the details.
10. The shoulder filters with underdrain to not specify an outlet point.
11. A plan reference, A13/CG502 for riprap slope, does not indicate riprap.
12. All riprap aprons and plunge pools should be labeled on the plans and refer to details.
13. Right of way monumentation is not shown consistently and some appear to be missing.
14. Super elevation tables should be provided.

Sheet CP103

1. Many of the comments for CP102 apply to CP103.
2. The shoulder filter strip does not show any underdrain.

Sheet CP104

1. Many of the comments for CP102 apply to CP104.
2. The underdrain from Sta 31+25 to 36+25 is not labeled with inverts and pipe sizes.
3. The silt fence location is not consistent with the grading limits.

Sheet CP105

1. Many of the comments for CP102 apply to CP105
2. The shaded area in the profile between Sta 42+40 to 44+00 needs to be explained.

3. The underdrain from Sta 36+00 to 42+00 is not labeled with inverts and pipe sizes.
4. All culverts shall be labeled with size, material, length, slope and inverts.
5. The silt fence location is not consistent with the grading limits.
6. All riprap aprons and plunge pools should be labeled on the plans and refer to details.
7. The roadway drainage drains across the esplanade and sidewalk onto the Police Station site. The esplanade is not being used as a soil filter strip.
8. The stream culvert crossing retaining wall should be labeled and detailed.

Sheet CP110

1. The plan shows a future expansion (NIC) to the garage. Was the building addition taken into consideration within the stormwater management?
2. Will there be any fence between the Wild Kingdom parking lot and the Police Station?
3. The ADA parking reference D13/CO501 refers to the wrong detail.

Sheet CP501

1. The road Bituminous Pavement detail- D9, exceeds collector standards.

Sheet CP502

1. A super elevation road section should be provided.
2. A note on the road section refers to geometry tables for super elevation at curves, though no tables were found.
3. The road sections note a gravel shoulder, but loam is shown.
4. The dumpster slab should be detailed.

Sheet CP503

No comments.

Sheet CE001

No comments.

Sheet CE110

1. The silt fence location is not consistent with the grading limits.

2. The southeast area notes to strip loam, regrade, loam, seed, and stabilize with a temporary erosion control blanket. The area is not shown with any new grading. Why disturb this area just to revegetate it?
3. The silt fence is shown to encroach into the fenced area of the Wild Kingdom.

Sheet CE501

No comments.

Sheet CG110

1. The grading at the southwest corner of the Wild Kingdom parking lot indicates that the knoll within the parking lot being removed, yet no notes or erosion control is shown.
2. Stormdrain pipes shall be shown with lengths and slopes.
3. Bioretention Cell 9 shows no data for the catch basin and stormdrain outlet. There is no underdrain shown in the basin.

Sheet CG501

1. The Bioretention detail for B-6 inverts do not match the plan.
2. Bioretention cells B-8, B-100, and B-101 could not be found on the plans.

Sheet CG502

No comments.

Sheet ES101

No comments.

Sheet LP101

No comments.

Sheet LP501

No comments.

Sheet RC101

1. The planting plan refers to Stantec's plan for the upper and lower areas. The number of planting and locations are not shown.
2. Buffers B-4 and B-5 are not shown with a planting schedule. Stantec's report only address B-4.
3. Is there any plantings for B-1, B-2 and B-3?

Sheet RC102

1. What is the plan for restoring Wetland 3 and Buffer B-12?

Sheet CU101

1. This sheet refers to plans by CLD Engineering.
2. This plan should show matchlines.

Sheet CU102

1. The plan does not show underdrain on the right side as the note in the profile indicates.
2. This plan should show matchlines.
3. This sheet refers to plans by CLD Engineering.

Sheet CU103

1. This sheet refers to plans by CLD Engineering.

Sheet CU104

1. Should the shut off for the Police Station water service be on the Right of Way?
2. The Caddy's Way branch service refers to plans by CLD Engineering.

Sheet CU110

1. Where does the secondary electrical trench go out by the garage?
2. Note 3 refers to HDPE sewer force main. Where is this?

Sheet CU501

No comments.

Sheet CU502

1. All watermain and service details shall be approved by York Water District.

STORM WATER MANAGEMENT REPORT

2. In general, the calculations look accurate for the watersheds shown on Sheet C12- Post Development Watershed Plan. However, the watershed areas do not match the revised grading shown on CP102 and CG110 in regards to the bio-retention basins. The calculations need to be re-evaluated in these areas.
3. The Water Quality calculations do not represent all bio-retention basins. The new basins that were added near Route 1 and behind the Police Station garage need to be evaluated and calculations provided.

4. The water quality plan C122 does not match Sheet CP102.
5. The water quality plan C124 does not match Sheet CG110

Recommendation:

The applicant has work to do prior to submission for the Final approval. If the Planning Board is willing to approve the Preliminary application, we would recommend the following conditions be addressed for the final approval submission. The comments provided from the engineering review are not included in the conditions below as listed due to the amount of missing information pertinent to the engineering component. However; there is a condition listed which requires the applicant to revise the plans in order to address all of the information listed.

1. The applicant must decide how the access is going to be addressed. If the road is still proposed to be a full functioning street, Ridge Road to Route 1, then additional traffic counts and analysis must be done both at Route 1 as well as Ridge Road prior to the release of any permits for the project. The applicant can provide a phasing plan to the Planning Board outlining how the phasing of the road is going to be accomplished. The applicant can choose to build the road and not allow any access from Route 1 until the above information is submitted and further action taken to mitigate those issues to be identified at both intersections. The applicant could choose to redesign and not provide access to Route 1 which would allow the current information in the traffic impact study submitted to stand and the project be approved with a simple access road to the police station.
2. The applicant shall provide all of the required traffic control on a plan to indicate stop sign and stop bar locations if no other traffic control is necessary.
3. The plan Shall show a detail and identified location for ADA tip downs to transition from the proposed sidewalk to the police station entrances as well as at the Ridge Road terminus.
4. The applicant shall redesign the proposed sidewalks to be 10' providing a true multi use system for both bike and pedestrians use. The 10' width will meet the industry standard where the 8' path does not.
5. The applicant shall provide a revised planting plan indication how the area(s) previously cut and used as laydown areas plan to be re-vegetate in order to address these clear cut areas and areas previously impacting wetlands and buffers.
6. The applicant shall revise the plans to show the water line looped to Caddy's Way as recommended by the York Water District. The applicant should work those details out prior to final plan submittal.
7. The applicant shall revise the plans to eliminate the future expansion shown on the cell pad area. The applicant should also show a detail of the tower design itself.

8. The applicant shall provide a surveyors report in order for the planning board to have a better understanding of the conflict surrounding the survey information as part of the final submission.
9. The applicant shall revise the plans and address any and all issues raised in the Engineering Comments above as part of the final plan set submission