



O'Leary-Burke Civil Associates, PLC

CIVIL ENGINEERING | REGULATORY AND PERMIT PREPARATION | LAND SURVEYING | CONSTRUCTION SERVICES | LAND USE PLANNING

February 26, 2024

Terry Hass
Assistant Zoning Administrator
City of Essex Junction
2 Lincoln Street

RE: Site Plan Application – Franklin South, LLC
8 Railroad Street, Essex Junction, VT 05452

Dear Terry:

We are writing on behalf of Franklin South, LLC c/o Gabriel Handy to apply for site plan review of a proposed 4 story apartment building. The building has a total of 39 units comprised of twenty-one (21) one-bedroom and eighteen (18) two-bedroom units along with a community space. The project is located on an existing 0.49-acre parcel located in the Village Center District. The lot will be accessed by an existing curb cut on Railroad Street. This project received conceptual plan approval on September 21, 2023.

On-site parking is provided via twenty-one (21) at-grade garage parking spaces and eight (8) outdoor parking spaces. The proposed parking includes two van accessible handicapped spaces, totaling twenty-nine (29) parking spaces. Additional street parking is available on Railroad Street. The 39-unit apartment building will contribute an estimated 11 peak PM trips.

The building will utilize municipal water and sewer connections. The flows associated with the proposal include 6,300 GPD of wastewater and 7,560 GPD of water. The building will connect to existing stubbed water and sewer services on Railroad Street installed as part of the City Crescent Connector Project. The building will be served by a 6" CL 52 DI water service and a 6" SDR 35 sewer service.

Stormwater will be managed through a network of drainage basins including a yard drain and a catch basin. The stormwater system will tie into an existing catch basin on Railroad Street. The site is designed to effectively convey and collect stormwater in order to minimize runoff to neighboring parcels. The project is under the half-acre impervious threshold for a state stormwater discharge permit.

The project received comments from the City of Essex Junction Community Development Department and City Engineer Jeffrey Kershner. We have addressed those comments and have provided responses below in red.

Re: Responses to City of Essex Junction Planning and Zoning Final Submittal Comments

1. Several submitted drawings appear to have a scaling issue, as the measurements shown on the drawing do not match the scale bar. The Site Plan is indicated to be at a scale of 1" = 20' in the title block and on the barscale. However, at 20 scale, the barscale only measures ± 97.5 feet instead of 100 feet. This apparent scale issue occurs on sheets 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7.

Understood, we have fixed the mentioned scale issue.

2. The building footprint on pages 2, 3, 6, and 7 shows the building exterior to be a continuous line interrupted by one jog. However, the architectural elevations and plans show a series of smaller jogs in these faces which are not represented in the other drawings. Please update all drawings of the building footprint to show the correct shape of the building.

The footprint has been updated to represent the correct shape.

3. At least one site plan should identify and measure the buffer space between the building and the adjacent residential property line on Gains Court.

A dimension has been added to show the buffer space between the building and adjacent residential property line.

4. Although the cover letter for this submission states that there will be bicycle parking for 39 bicycles, the current plans do not provide sufficient details. Note that the bike storage area does not necessarily have to be indoors or be in a temperature-controlled area. We suggest that you consider the attached layout for a secure caged area within the parking lot as a way to conserve indoor space. Whatever layout you ultimately prefer, please show the location and equipment details of the bike storage area on the plans.

Please see Sheet A101 which depicts indoor bicycle storage capable of storing and locking 40 bicycles.

5. The site plan showing the parking area should show the location of all structural columns, the dimensions of parking spaces, the opening to the four parking spots at the rear of the property, and the width of the isle between parking spaces to ensure each meets the requirements for minimum parking standards.

Please see additions to Sheet 2 – Site Plan showing said dimensions. We are showing typical 9'x18' parking spaces, a 24' drive aisle, and a 24' exit to the rear 4 parking spaces. As the structure is supported by columns the at-grade parking can utilize the entire 60' building width shown, and therefore meet the parking requirements. The location of structural columns is also shown.

6. On the landscape plan, the icons in the key identifying the types of trees are small and difficult to make out. Please rescale the left most column of the key larger to be more legible at full scale.

Please see Sheet 7 – Landscape Plan. The symbols have been scaled up for easier identification.

7. Trumpet Vine is listed on the landscape plan on the pergola structure. This is an invasive species that should be substituted with an alternative vine.

Please see Sheet 7 – Landscape Plan. The trumpet vine has been replaced with Dutchman's Pipe.

8. Include details for snow management and the design of the pergola at the entrance.

As most of the parking is below the building, we are only considering snow removal for the two outdoor parking areas totaling approximately 3,320 SF. A snow storage area has been designated and is shown on Sheet 2 – Site Plan. Like other properties in this area, snow will be hauled off site in the event of excess snow that can't be stored on site. Please see Sheet 7 – Landscape Plan for a detail of the proposed pergola.

9. The floorplan shows only cursory information. Please provide a more complete floor plan showing the general layout of the building. This should include, but is not limited to- doors, windows, bathrooms, kitchens, a scalebar, some indication that it is for floors 2-4, and the width of the interior hallway. In addition, please include a floorplan of the ground floor.

Please see Sheet A101 showing a more complete floorplan of the proposed building with the features mentioned.

10. During conceptual site plan review, we identified the location of the dumpster and the circulation of garbage trucks as a potential issue. Section 605 of the Municipal Code prohibits mechanized trash pickup before 7:00 am, by which time, pedestrian and motor traffic volumes on Railroad St will likely be significant, making reverse maneuvers difficult. Please provide details on how you expect garbage trucks to maneuver on the plans and provide written confirmation from your preferred trash hauler that they are able to service your property within the time limits set in Municipal Code Section 605.

The garbage trucks will enter via the adjacent lot through the proposed access easement, collect waste and turn around within the parking area. Please see the email correspondence with Joe Sinagra of Myers Waste confirming they are capable of collecting the waste and will not do so until after 7:00 am.

Re: Response Memo to Hamlin Consulting Engineers Final Submittal Comments

General

1) The applicant will need to request and obtain water and wastewater allocations for this project from the City for the proposed 6,930 gallons per day of wastewater flow and 8,400 gallons per day of water flow.

A water and wastewater allocation request is included in this submission.

2) We recommend a condition of approval of this project requiring the submission of record drawings for site utilities to the City of Essex Junction upon completion of construction, in both AutoCAD and PDF format. The City would also like to request this information be provided in shapefile format in Vermont State Plane US Survey Feet, NAD83(2011).

Understood.

3) There appears to be a scale issue with the PDF plan images as submitted. The Site Plan is indicated to be at a scale of 1" = 20' in the title block and on the barscale. However, at 20 scale, the barscale only measures ± 97.5 feet instead of 100 feet. This apparent scale issue occurs on sheets 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7.

Understood, we have fixed the mentioned scale issue.

4) The Site Plan appears to depict a slightly different footprint than that shown on the Architect's plan. The applicant should provide clarification and revise the plans as needed.

The plan has been revised to match the architect footprint. See Sheet 2 – Site Plan.

5) The Site Plan depicts a "Proposed 12' access & utility easement". The applicant should provide draft easement documents prior to final approval of this project. Final executed easement documents will be required prior to issuance of a Zoning Permit for this project.

A draft easement has been provided and is attached.

6) The Site Plan shows "Proposed overhead power service" to existing buildings on the Siegriest, Hanco, and Engel properties. While we understand these properties are currently served by existing overhead power service, the LDC requires that "*New and redevelopment projects shall install utilities underground.*" If existing overhead power services are to be removed, the plans should be revised to replace them with underground services.

The proposed power has been modified. The existing utility poles serving Hanco and Engel will remain as existing overhead power. Therefore, the only service changing is the service to the Siegriest parcel which is proposed to be served off the utility pole on Railroad Street. As the existing overhead power on Railroad Street was not converted to underground as

a part of the Crescent Connector project, we do not believe that it is necessary to run that short of a service underground.

Site Layout – Roadways, Drives, Parking, and Walkways

1) Notwithstanding General Item #3 above, the plans depict an approximately 20' wide entrance drive beneath the building and leading to the exterior parking areas. The LDC requires a minimum 24' wide entrance drive and travel aisle in parking areas for two-way traffic. The applicant will need to request a waiver from the DRB to allow a reduced entrance and aisle width.

The LDC requires a residential driveway to have a width of 12' min – 20' max therefore we are holding 20' in the front and side entrances. The travel aisle expands to 24' where parking is shown on both sides and leading to the exterior parking area in the back. If the DRB determines dimensional parking standards are applicable to the entrance, the width was approved during conceptual review, and we request a waiver for 20 feet (As stated above we do not feel a waiver is required).

2) The proposed plan provides a total of 29 parking spaces on the site between the exterior parking areas and parking beneath the building. Per the LDC, the proposed 39 units would require a total of 43 parking spaces; one per dwelling unit and one guest space for every 10 dwelling units. The applicant will need to request a parking waiver to allow a total of 29 on-site parking spaces for the 39 units. The application notes existing onstreet parking along Railroad Street, existing off-site parking in the "Handy Lot" behind the Firebird restaurant, and access to public transportation in support of the reduced parking count.

Section 604 (f) of the Land Development Code states the following regarding the Village Center Zoning District, "Due to the unique characteristics of this District no minimum parking requirements are established." Findings of Fact and Decision (Section F) of the Conceptual Site Plan Application states "The DRB considers the planned parking to be acceptable in accordance to Section 604.F." We have since added one (1) additional parking space.

3) The plans depict the exterior short-term bike racks placed in the lawn area in front of the proposed building. Per Section 703.L.1(d) of the LDC, the short-term bike racks should be "*securely anchored to the ground and on a hard, stabilized surface...*". The plans should be revised accordingly.

Please see changes made to the short-term bike rack on Sheet 2 – Site Plan. The bike rack is shown on a stabilized surface as required in Section 703.L.1 (d) of the LDC.

4) The plans should be revised to include curb and sidewalk details for the replacement and restoration work related to the installation of the new drainage pipe connection to the existing catch basin along Railroad Street. These details should comply with the LDC requirements as this work will occur in the City right-of-way.

Please see curb and sidewalk details on Sheet 5 – Roadway & Storm Details.

Grading & Drainage

1) We understand that this project involves less than 0.5 acres of impervious area. However, the applicant is requested to provide copies of drainage computations and a copy of the HydroCAD file (if available) for the project to the City. The City utilizes this information to demonstrate compliance with the City's MS4 permit.

We have attached a report of our HydroCAD file showing pre and post construction drainage. Our proposal collects runoff on-site and distributes it to the existing network on Railroad Street. There is currently no stormwater management on the property.

2) The plan depicts a new 12" drainage pipe to be connected to the existing catch basin located along Railroad Street. This will necessitate removal and replacement of portions of the recently constructed roadway, curbing, and sidewalk as part of the Crescent Connector Roadway project. The plans should be revised to include a detail of the proposed connection to this existing structure. In addition, the plans should be revised to include the specific limits of disturbance to roadway, curbing, and sidewalk, as well as details of the restoration of these features.

See detail for existing catch basin connection on Sheet 5 – Roadway & Storm Details. The limit of disturbance is shown for the proposed drainage pipe. The limits of disturbance are shown representing the 5-ft trench that will be dug to install the proposed drainage pipe and tie into the existing catch basin on Railroad Street.

3) The plans should be revised to provide inlet protection for the existing catch basin along Railroad Street during construction.

See note added to Sheet 6 – EPSC Plan.

4) The plans should be revised to require cleaning of the existing catch basin along Railroad Street upon completion of construction, as well as the on-site catch basin.

See note added to Sheet 2 – Site Plan.

5) The plans should be revised to provide inlet protection for the proposed yard drain during construction.

See note added to Sheet 6 – EPSC Plan.

6) A Snow Management Plan detailing how snow storage and/or removal will be handled at the site should be submitted for review and approval.

As most of the parking is below the building, we are only considering snow removal for the two outdoor parking areas totaling approximately 3,320 SF. A snow storage area has been designated and is shown on Sheet 2 – Site Plan. Like other properties in this area, snow will be hauled off site in the event of excess snow that can't be stored on site.

Water

1) The plans depict the proposed new water service crossing the new sewer service prior to entry into the proposed building. While the plans do include a “*Sewer/Water Separation Detail for Crossings*”, we recommend the addition of a note on the Site Plan regarding the required vertical separation between these utilities at the crossing. We note the sewer service will be installed at a depth of approximately 6’ in the vicinity of this crossing.

See note added to Sheet 2 -Site Plan.

2) The Thrust Block End Area detail presented on sheet #4 presents square foot bearing area values less than those required by the LDC on page D-8. This detail should be revised accordingly.

See updated detail on Sheet 4 – Water & Sewer Details.

Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control

1) The plans should be revised to provide inlet protection for the existing catch basin along Railroad Street during construction.

See note added to Sheet 6 – EPSC Plan.

2) The plans should be revised to require cleaning of the existing catch basin along Railroad Street upon completion of construction, as well as the on-site catch basin.

See note on Sheet 2 – Site Plan.

3) The plans should be revised to provide inlet protection for the proposed yard drain during construction.

See note added to Sheet 6 – EPSC Plan.

4) The Landscaping Specifications on the Landscape Plan specifies stabilization with seeding & mulching prior to November 1. This section should be revised to require stabilization with seeding and mulching prior to September 15.

See updated Landscaping Specifications on Sheet 7 – Landscape Plan.

Lighting

1) The Lighting Plan specifies 15' pole mounted lights. The Typical Light Pole Detail depicts a 15' tall pole installed on a 2' tall concrete light pole base, for a total mounting height of 17. The LDC requires a maximum mounting height of 15' in the Village Center (VC) district. This detail should be revised accordingly. In addition, the applicant should confirm that the lighting analysis was performed with the proposed pole mounted fixtures at a height of 15' and not 17'.

The Typical Light Pole detail has been revised to depict the correct total height of 15', the lighting model is consistent with this therefore no change is required.

2) The Lighting Plan depicts less than 0.2 footcandles of illumination in the exterior parkings area on the north and east sides of the proposed building. The Lighting Plan should be revised to provide a minimum of 0.2 footcandles per the LDC requirements.

The proposed lighting shows a minimum of 0.2 footcandles in all areas.

3) Based on the Lighting Plan, it appears that there will be light spillover onto the adjacent property to the north from the proposed pole mounted light. Per the LDC requirements, "lighting devices may not produce direct or reflected glare on adjoining properties or streets." The Lighting Plan should be revised accordingly.

The proposed lighting has been modified to prevent light spillover onto the adjacent property to the North. Please see Sheet 3 – Lighting Plan for these changes.

4) There is minimal to no proposed lighting indicated in the area of the bike racks and walkway to pergola. Per Section 703.L.1(d) of the LDC, the short-term bike racks should be "...well-lit to promote usage and enhance security...". The plans should be revised accordingly to provide illumination of the walkway and bike rack area.

An additional 9' downcast building mounted light has been added above the walkway containing the pergola. This will promote bike rack usage and safety.

Please find the following information attached. If you have any question or need additional information, please let us know.

- 1) Plan Set;
 - a. One (1) 24"x36" copy
 - b. Six (6) 18"x24" copies
- 2) Water and Sewer Allocation Request
- 3) Draft Easement Document
- 4) HydroCAD Report
- 5) Service Confirmation from Myers Waste

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Noah Palker". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Noah Palker



O'Leary-Burke Civil Associates, PLC

CIVIL ENGINEERING | REGULATORY AND PERMIT PREPARATION | LAND SURVEYING | CONSTRUCTION SERVICES | LAND USE PLANNING

April 10, 2024

Terry Hass
Assistant Zoning Administrator
City of Essex Junction
2 Lincoln Street

RE: Site Plan Application – Franklin South, LLC
8 Railroad Street, Essex Junction, VT 05452

Dear Terry:

We are writing in response to comments received from City of Essex Junction Planning & Zoning and the City Engineer received on 4/5/2024. Responses were required by 4/10/2024 in order to be included in the DRB review on April 18th. Please find our responses below in red.

Re: Responses to City of Essex Junction Planning and Zoning Final Submittal Comments

1) Several submitted drawings appear to have a scaling issue, as the measurements shown on the drawing do not match the scale bar. The Site Plan is indicated to be at a scale of 1" = 20' in the title block and on the barscale. However, at 20 scale, the barscale only measures ± 97.5 feet instead of 100 feet. This apparent scale issue occurs on sheets 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7. **This issue has not been addressed.**

This issue has been addressed for both the paper set and pdf set of plans.

4) Although the cover letter for this submission states that there will be bicycle parking for 39 bicycles, the current plans do not provide sufficient details. Note that the bike storage area does not necessarily have to be indoors or be in a temperature-controlled area. We suggest that you consider the attached layout for a secure caged area within the parking lot as a way to conserve indoor space. Whatever layout you ultimately prefer, please show the location and equipment details of the bike storage area on the plans. **This issue has not been sufficiently addressed in Submittal 2. Please indicate the equipment specs or model for the bike parking you intend to install in the bike room.**

The indoor bicycle storage room will utilize the "Ultra Space Saver Single" to mount, store, and lock bicycles on the wall. Detailed specifications of this product are included with this application.

5) The site plan showing the parking area should show the location of all structural columns, the dimensions of parking spaces, the opening to the four parking spots at the rear of the property, and the width of the isle between parking spaces to ensure each meets the requirements for minimum parking standards. **This issue has not been sufficiently addressed in Submittal 2. The width of the structural columns is not indicate, and may the useable width of the parking spaces and aisle. Please indicate the actual useable width of the parking spaces and aisles with the columns in place.**

A note has been added on SH 1 – Site Plan indicating that the structural columns are 16" in diameter. The parking has been revised slightly to account for the 8" of column encroachment. The width of each parking space neighboring a column is now the full 9'.

11) Plan Sheet 2 indicates one existing utility pole to be removed, but continues to indicate overhead power along Gaines Court. Please clarify the power along Gainé Court serving the houses is being buried or not as this would impact the choice of trees there.

Please refer to Sheet 2 – Site Plan. The second utility pole down Gaines Court and the attached overhead power will be removed as indicated. The third and fourth utility poles will remain as indicated and will continue to serve the houses via overhead power. For the overhead line on Gaines Court will be fed from the rear via the underground layout shown and

approved by Green Mountain Power. A note has been added to Sheet 2 – Site Plan, indicating the existing services to the Hanko and Engel homes will remain overhead.

12) The plan shows 2 species being planted along that border Autumn Fire Hornbeam 7' W x 23'T and Sweet Gum Slender Silhouette 6'W x 60'T. Please clarify whether this screening is for the garage or for the apartment units above.

The Autumn Fire Hornbeam grows wider and will be effective in screening the garage, while the Sweet Gum Slender Silhouette grows taller and will be effective in screening the apartments.

13) The plans appear to include the \$10000 cost to bury utilities as a landscape expense. City Staff is of the opinion that any underground utilities otherwise required by the Land Development Code, should not be counted towards the 2% landscaping requirement.

Understood. The \$10,000 designated to utilities has been reallocated to landscaping. This includes the addition of two (2) Autumn Fire Hornbeam, three (3) Sweetgum Slender Silhouette, and five (5) Arborvitae Nigra. This brings the total proposed landscape cost to \$72,100 which exceeds the required \$71,714.

14) The Tree Advisory Committee notes that Gray Dogwood is a wild naturalizing plant is likely not suitable for the buildings front. If the applicant wishes to re-consider this species, please update the landscaping plant accordingly.

The applicant is "Ok" with the selection of Gray Dogwood, but would be open to a recommendation of an approved equal from the Tree Advisory Committee.

Re: Response Memo to Hamlin Consulting Engineers Final Submittal Comments

General

1) The applicant will need to request and obtain water and wastewater allocations for this project from the City for the proposed 6,930 gallons per day of wastewater flow and 8,400 gallons per day of water flow. **The applicant submitted a sewer allocation request. We are unsure if a water allocation request has been submitted. On this request, the applicant indicated that the previous 3-bedroom single family home had 420 GPD of sewer and water flows. We do not concur with these values and feel the existing flows should be 210 GPD for sewer and 360 GPD for water. Therefore, the additional allocations for this project would be 6,510 gallons per day for wastewater and 7,620 gallons per day for water. Revised allocation request(s) should be submitted for review and approval.**

Both sewer and water allocation were requested on the "City of Essex Junction Sewer Allocation Request Form". No water allocation request form exists on the City website. It was discovered through correspondence with City/Town of Essex Assessor Karen Lemnah, the

existing structure was a 3-bedroom, 3-bathroom, 3-kitchen (i.e. a triplex). Therefore, the flows would be 140 GPD for each 1-bedroom unit, and therefore 420 GPD total. The description on the allocation request should have said triplex rather than 3-bedroom single-family home. As the flows were correct and the allocation was approved, a revised form is included with the proper language. Additionally, please find said email correspondence with City/Town Assessor regarding the existing triplex.

3) There appears to be a scale issue with the PDF plan images as submitted. The Site Plan is indicated to be at a scale of 1" = 20' in the title block and on the barscale. However, at 20 scale, the barscale only measures ± 97.5 feet instead of 100 feet. This apparent scale issue occurs on sheets 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7. **Same comment. The applicant indicated that they "fixed the mentioned scale issue." However, it appears that this submission of plans has a similar scale issue with the PDF plan images as submitted.**

This issue has been addressed for the PDF set of plans.

Site Layout – Roadways, Drives, Parking, and Walkways

1) Notwithstanding General Item #3 above, the plans depict an approximately 20' wide entrance drive beneath the building and leading to the exterior parking areas. The LDC requires a minimum 24' wide entrance drive and travel aisle in parking areas for two-way traffic. The applicant will need to request a waiver from the DRB to allow a reduced entrance and aisle width. **The applicant has stated "The LDC requires a residential driveway to have a width of 12' min – 20' max therefore we are holding 20' in the front and side entrances. The travel aisle expands to 24' where parking is shown on both sides and leading to the exterior parking area in the back. If the DRB determines dimensional parking standards are applicable to the entrance, the width was approved during conceptual review, and we request a waiver for 20 feet (As stated above we no [sic] not feel a waiver is required)." Section 705.B.2 of the LDC indicates that "For the purpose of determining curb cuts, all multi-family dwellings shall be reviewed as commercial curb cuts." Section 705.C requires that all commercial curb cuts be a minimum of 24' wide for two traffic lanes. Accordingly, the applicant will need to provide supporting information and request a waiver from the DRB to allow a reduced width.**

Section 703 C of the Conceptual Site Plan Approval Findings of Fact states, *"The proposed vehicular entrance under the building is less than 20' in width, which is below the specified minimum in the LDC, but likely workable for a small, urban parking lot with limited traffic volume."* Considering the size and traffic volume mentioned, we would like to request a waiver for a reduced access width of 20' which the DRB supported at Conceptual Plan Review.

3) The plans depict the exterior short-term bike racks placed in the lawn area in front of the proposed building. Per Section 703.L.1(d) of the LDC, the short-term bike racks should be *"securely anchored to the ground and on a hard, stabilized surface..."*. The plans should be revised accordingly. **The plans have been revised in response to this comment. The applicant has stated that "The bike rack is shown on a stabilized surface as required in Section**

703.L.1(d) of the LDC.” The plans should be revised to provide a detail for the stabilized surface and proposed bike racks.

Multiple details have been added to Sheet 7 – Landscape Plan to provide more information regarding the short-term bicycle parking. An Inverted-U Rack detail has been added to provide a visual representation of the type of rack to be installed. A Bike Rack & Stabilized Surface Detail has been added to show the profile view of the proposed bike rack and surface with the required spacing. Bike Rack & Stabilized Surface Specifications have been added to highlight the Location & Serviceability requirements stated in section 703 L (d) of the Land Development Code.

Grading & Drainage

1) We understand that this project involves less than 0.5 acres of impervious area. However, the applicant is requested to provide copies of drainage computations and a copy of the HydroCAD file (if available) for the project to the City. The City utilizes this information to demonstrate compliance with the City’s MS4 permit. **The applicant provided a copy of the HydroCAD file for the project. Based on our review of the plans and these computations, the applicant is proposing no stormwater management as part of this project. Runoff is being collected and conveyed to the City storm drainage system. The computations submitted show that the post-development runoff exceeds the pre-development for all storm events, which is not in compliance with the LDC. The City would like to see the design incorporate infiltration/filtration and extended detention strategies to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, the applicant should provide information regarding roof drainage and how it is collected, conveyed, and treated.**

Please see the updated HydroCAD model for the WQv, 1-Year, 10-Year, and 25-Year event which shows the proposed stormwater management system. The system was improved by incorporating infiltration basins surrounding the yard drain and catch basin. By raising the rim elevations of the structures, we were able to utilize natural infiltration and provide less water entering the structures. Additionally, the 6” SDR 35 storm pipe connecting the yard drain to the catch basin will be perforated in a stone trench, allowing for further infiltration and filtration upon collection. Utilizing extended detention and infiltration allowed the system to produce a post-development runoff that is less than the pre-development runoff for the two, ten, and twenty-five year storm events. Water from the eastern half of the roof will be pitched towards and conveyed to the catch basin in the northeast corner of the site. Water from the western half of the roof will be pitched towards and conveyed to the yard drain in the southeast corner of the site.

2) The plan depicts a new 12” drainage pipe to be connected to the existing catch basin located along Railroad Street. This will necessitate removal and replacement of portions of the recently constructed roadway, curbing, and sidewalk as part of the Crescent Connector Roadway project. The City staff and Public Works Department would prefer not to have the recently constructed elements of the Crescent Connector Roadway project disturbed and therefore

request that the applicant seek alternatives to this proposed connection to this existing catch basin. **Same comment. The applicant has not provided information describing any consideration for alternatives that avoid disturbance to the newly constructed roadway, curbing, and sidewalk as part of the Crescent Connector Roadway project.**

It should be noted that this comment previously requested “The plans should be revised to include a detail of the proposed connection to this existing structure. In addition, the plans should be revised to include the specific limits of disturbance to roadway, curbing, and sidewalk, as well as details of the restoration of these features.” There were additional comments to provide inlet protection and cleaning of the existing catch basin on Railroad Street prior to construction along with a request for a draft easement from the abutting landowner. These items were addressed in the previous submittal. A longer infiltration component has been incorporated for no discharge in the WQv event. The overflow proposed will likely only be used during large events when the ground conditions are frozen. The area of disturbance will only be behind the curb and adjacent to the underground power service relocation shown.

3) Notwithstanding Item #2 above, the plans should be revised to include a detail of the proposed connection to the existing catch basin structure. In addition, the plans should be revised to include the specific limits of disturbance to roadway, curbing, and sidewalk, as well as details of the restoration of these features. These details should comply with the LDC requirements as this work will occur in the City right-of-way. **The plans have been revised to include a detail of the proposed connection to the existing catch basin structure and to depict the limits of disturbance to the curbing and sidewalk, with details provided. The plans should be further revised to include a typical trench detail for the proposed HDPE storm drainage pipe.**

Please see Sheet 6 – Roadway & Storm Details for a typical storm sewer trench detail.

Lighting

2) The Lighting Plan depicts less than 0.2 footcandles of illumination in the exterior parkings area on the north and east sides of the proposed building. The Lighting Plan should be revised to provide a minimum of 0.2 footcandles per the LDC requirements. **Same comment.**

The lighting plan has been modified to increase the coverage in the outdoor parking areas to the north and east sides of the proposed building to fully cover all parking spaces. The minimum footcandle shown is 0.2, nothing less is depicted on the plan.

3) Based on the Lighting Plan, it appears that there will be light spillover onto the adjacent property to the north from the proposed pole mounted light. Per the LDC requirements, “lighting devices may not produce direct or reflected glare on adjoining properties or streets.” The Lighting Plan should be revised accordingly. **Same comment.**

The lighting plan has been modified to prevent any lighting trespass onto adjacent properties. As shown on Sheet 3 – Lighting Plan, the limits of proposed lighting are not producing any light on adjacent properties.

4) There is minimal to no proposed lighting indicated in the area of the bike racks and walkway to pergola. Per Section 703.L.1(d) of the LDC, the short-term bike racks should be “...*well-lit to promote usage and enhance security*...”. The plans should be revised accordingly to provide illumination of the walkway and bike rack area. **The plans have been revised in response to this comment to add an additional light fixture on the building “above the walkway containing the pergola.” This did provide illumination for the bike rack area. However, it appears that there may be light spillover onto the adjacent property to the south, which we note is Gaines Court.**

The lighting plan has been modified to prevent any lighting trespass onto adjacent properties. As shown on Sheet 3 – Lighting Plan, the limits of proposed lighting are not producing any light on adjacent properties.

An additional comment was given by Community Development Director Chris Yuen via email on 4/10/2024: *“Is there any plan to include EV Charging accommodations? If so, please include them in the site plan. EV charging isn't currently required by the municipality, but I think the Vermont Commercial Building Energy Standards (CBES) may have some EV charging requirements that you'll need to meet anyway.”*

Please see note on Sheet 1 – Site Plan, under Parking Calculations section which states, *“Per CBES table C405.11, 8% of parking spaces shall contain level 1 electric vehicle charging.”*

Please find the following information attached. If you have any questions or need additional information, please let us know.

1. Plan Set;
 - a. One (1) 24”x36” copy
 - b. Six (6) 18”x24” copies
2. Water and Sewer Allocation Request
3. HydroCAD Report (WQv, 1-Year, 10-Year, 25-Year)
4. Indoor Bicycle Storage Specification
5. Email Correspondence With City/Town Assessor

Sincerely,



Noah Palker, E.I.

Noah Palker

From: Noah Palker
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 10:28 AM
To: Noah Palker
Subject: RE: 8 Railroad Street Plan - OBCA #2022-48 1 OF 2

From: Joe Sinagra <joe@theredcanfamily.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2024 9:29 AM
To: Karl Marchessault <karlm@olearyburke.com>
Cc: Noah Palker <NPalker@olearyburke.com>
Subject: RE: 8 Railroad Street Plan - OBCA #2022-48 1 OF 2

After reviewing what was sent over, Myers Waste can in fact pick up the container and will not do so until after 7am
Please let us know if you have any other questions

Joe

Joe Sinagra
Sustainability Director
Myers Container
310-4236

From: Karl Marchessault
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2024 11:42 AM
To: Joe Sinagra (joe@theredcanfamily.com) <joe@theredcanfamily.com>
Subject: FW: 8 Railroad Street Plan - OBCA #2022-48 1 OF 2

Good morning Joe – Thanks for taking the phone call this morning. Could we get someone to review this plan. One of the comments we have is to have a hauler determine if a truck can access the dumpster area. The parking configuration is set back easterly to allow for the truck to back up and turnaround. The second component is that pick up will occur after 7 am. Could you review and provide feedback on these two items. Call or email with any questions.

Karl Marchessault, P.E.
Project Principal
O'Leary-Burke Civil Associates, PLC
13 Corporate Drive
Essex Junction, VT 05452
Phone (802) 878-9990
Fax (802) 878-9989