

PEER REVIEW
LETTER

May 20, 2022

York Planning Board
DeCarlo Brown, Land Use Planner
Town of York
186 York Street
York, Maine 03909

Application: Facility and Parking Expansion — York Paddle Tennis Club, Inc.
28 Mill Lane (Tax Map 89 Lot 37D)

Site Plan Review - Preliminary

Review Status: New Application (Sketch Plan reviewed 8/2021)

Board members and Mr. Brown,

The following information has been provided for preliminary and final plan review:

1. Application form dated 7/29/2021
2. Project Narrative dated July 2021 and associated application information, including location, soils and FEMA maps and abutter's list.
3. Plan entitled: *Site Plan, York Paddle Tennis Club, Inc, 28 Mill Lane – Tax Map218, Lot 28, York Maine, 03909*. Prepared by Civil Consultants, 7/29/2021 (Proposed Expansion Site Plan and Existing Conditions Plan.
4. With review of the above information and the Town's Zoning ordinance and the Site Plan and Subdivision regulations, and in collaboration with civil engineers Gorrill Palmer, I offer the following comments on compliance with the Town's ordinances.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 4± acre parcel includes existing pickle ball courts and platform tennis courts with a small club house and gravel parking managed by the York Paddle Tennis Club. The site is located in the General Development -1 (GEN-1) zoning district, with a portion lying within the shoreland overlay districts. The site has no access to public water or sewer. The property abuts a tributary of Smelt Brook. The applicant is seeking to expand the facility with a phased development plan to include

parking lot expansion to accommodate 42 spaces; additional tennis courts, new well and septic; and additional pickleball courts in the third phase.

REVIEW SUMMARY/HIGHLIGHTS

The application is before the Planning Board as required by the Zoning Ordinance (Sec. 18.15) for review of non-residential development (site plan). The following is a summary of the review comments:

1. The application appears to be substantially complete with the exception of the items noted below..
2. The impetus for this application is the inability for Code Enforcement to issue a building permit to expand the parking lot late last year since it would be greater than 25 parking spaces. This requires Planning Board Site Plan Review per Sec. 18.15.B.1.A.2.
3. A traffic assessment has been prepared and provided to the Director of Public Works.
4. A sound study has been prepared and submitted for the Board's consideration.

COMPLETENESS REVIEW

The applicant has submitted a checklist for submittal information required by Preliminary Plan Review Section 6.3 (Site/Subd Regs). The following information has not been submitted or in need of clarification:

1. 6.3.14 Regarding historic and archaeological resources... Request letters have been submitted and a response from MHPC only, no letter from the Historic District Commission has been submitted.
2. 6.3.24 A Private Sewage Disposal - When sewage disposal is to be accomplished by subsurface wastewater disposal systems, test pit analyses, prepared by a Licensed Site Evaluator shall be provided... Not submitted.
3. 6.3.32 A high intensity soil survey signed and sealed by a Maine Certified Soil Scientist, indicating the suitability of soil conditions for the uses proposed shall be submitted. The applicant requesting a waiver.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE TOWN'S ORDINANCES

ZONING ORDINANCE

1. General Development 1 (Sec. 4.1.2). Under the Recreation & Amusement Use Category it appears the current and proposed activities are permitted without any Article 4 restrictions or conditions.
2. Shoreland Overlay Zone: The plans depict the shoreland overlay zone subdistricts per the Town's GIS mapping. Considering the wetland delineation and review of the GIS mapping

the wetland located to the rear of the property appears to be in excess of 4 acres in size, making the area 250 feet from its upland edge subject to the Shoreland Overlay District. The plans should reflect this, and coverage calculations revised.

3. Setbacks: The existing platform tennis court and pickleball courts are located within the 100-foot wetland setback, with the latter being located in the 30-foot side setback as well. Code Enforcement has communicated that the structures received valid building permits and the structures are essentially grandfathered.
4. Impervious Surface Ratio. As outlined in the ordinance, these requirements will need to be demonstrated with calculations and plans. The Plan includes calculations for the base zone and should be revised to reflect the overlay zone.
5. Non-residential Performance Standards (Sec. 6.1). The applicant has prepared a narrative for the Board to consider standards are addressed. A sound study has been submitted to address Noise (6.1.2). Catalog cuts of proposed lighting fixtures provided to address Glare (6.1.5 and Article 10-H Outdoor Lighting). Plans depict landscaping and fencing along Mill Lane’s frontage to address Setbacks and Screening (6.1.8). The following are comments concerning these specific provisions:
 - a. 6.1.2 Noise. Noise shall be limited in a manner consistent with the Town Noise Ordinance. The submitted noise study concludes that for the exception the southern property line (adjacent to existing pickle ball courts), the proposed development conforms to the Town’s Noise Ordinance. The study recommends a sound barrier wall 6 feet in height along the south perimeter of the existing pickle ball courts.
 - b. Glare. No land use or establishment shall be permitted to produce a strong, dazzling light or reflection of that light beyond its lot lines onto neighboring properties, or onto any town way so as to impair the vision of the driver of any vehicle upon that town way. Though the catalog cuts for the fixtures are helpful, a photometrics plan at the same scale as the site plan and reflecting all light fixtures should be submitted along with how the proposed light conforms to Article 10-H Outdoor Lighting. There appears to be no lighting proposed for the parking lot. Unless there is sufficient ambient light from the premises, this should be reconsidered, and the parking area included in the photometrics.
 - c. 6.1.8 Setbacks and Screening. Sec. 6.1.8.5 requires a landscape buffer strip of at least 15 feet wide between parking and a public street. Only 11-1/2 feet is provided that includes a fence. The site design appears to be able to accommodate the full 15 feet. Other subsections require specific planting requirements that should be provided in a landscape plan with more details and specificity prior to final approval. If preservation of trees are planned to count towards these requirements the existing

trees should be surveyed located and locations depicted the grading plan so determination of likelihood of surviving can be made.

- d. Fencing proposed within the setback needs to be less than 8 feet to conform to Article V Dimensional Standards. The Plans should reflect this along Mill Lane’s frontage.
6. Parking (Sec.15). It does not appear that the type of activity proposed is anticipated by the off-street parking requirements under Sec. 15.1.1.2. There are 42 parking spaces proposed. The applicant suggests that the number of players that can use the facility at full capacity (9 courts x 4 players) is what the number of required parking spaces, in this case 36. It would be helpful to have the applicant submit the ITE parking demand for the land use code that is used for the traffic assessment. That along with understanding the overlap between scheduled games/reservations and any employees and spectators that are anticipated would provide the Board what it may need to make a determination as anticipated by Sec. 15.1.1.3.
7. Traffic Study: The Board and applicant may want to consider an analysis by a professional traffic engineer, along with the Director of Public Works, to assist with the above item, as well as to quantify the current facility’s demand. This would likely be important information for the future build-out and sufficient parking. The applicant has submitted to the Director of Public Works the traffic assessment for his review.

SITE PLAN AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

The applicant with their subsequent application will need to address those standards that are applicable to the proposed development.

8. A peer review from Gorrill Palmer for engineering and traffic related comments is provided in the attached May 18, 2022 email.
9. Phasing. The applicant has clarified that it is intended to construct all proposed development in one phase though due to budget constraints, this may not happen.
10. Existing Vegetation. The Town’s ordinances indicate that screening parking and mitigating the effects of exterior lighting are important objectives, especially in non-residential development. It seems prudent, when the site may afford existing mature vegetation that may be used towards screening, which is the case here, efforts should be made to preserve existing trees and understory along Mill Lane to at least the minimum depth required. Significant trees and mature shrubs should be located by survey and information used on the site and grading plans to inform the overall design. In areas where this is not feasible and/or the vegetation is an insufficient screen, supplemental plantings should be planned.
11. Solid Waste Disposal. The applicant has not determined this. At a minimum there should be a dumpster located in a suitable area on the plan.

12. Is the limits of disturbance the proposed erosion control berm denoted on the plan? If so, it should be noted as such and a limit of disturbance should be clearly denoted on the plans.
13. It is not clear what the surface is between the parking area and the back of the premises (e.g. the limits of the proposed and existing courts). Is it all to be gravel or are there vegetated areas within this area?
14. Are there plans to provide some separation, perhaps a low split-rail fence, between the parking and the area of the courts?
15. Gravel parking will likely result in realizing fewer actual parking spaces where pavement markings to identify spaces is not possible. If maximizing parking spaces is important, which it appears it may be, bituminous parking would serve as a better surface. At a minimum, it is recommended that the accessible parking proposed is provided on bituminous pavement for logistical reasons.
16. Boundary Survey should be reflected in the title of the Existing conditions Plan.

WAIVER REQUESTS

The following waivers are requested. The Board should review the application for the rationale provided for each request.

1. Section 6.3.32 - A high intensity soil survey signed and sealed by a Maine Certified Soil Scientist.

CONCLUSION

The preliminary plan application submitted is substantially complete with the outstanding items noted above. If it's considered complete the Board should determine if a site walk will be required and hold a public hearing. The Board should review application and determine conformance with ordinances and if it concurs with the review comments made, and if any changes will be required prior to considering preliminary approval.

Feel free to contact me with questions.

Best regards,



Christopher Di Matteo
Licensed Landscape Architect
cdimatteo@longmeadowpla.com
207.604.4245

Subject: 3281.30 York Paddle-Pickleball - Peer Review Comments
Date: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 at 2:52:39 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Will Haskell <whaskell@gorrillpalmer.com>
To: DeCarlo Brown <dbrown@yorkmaine.org>, Christopher DiMatteo <cdimatteo@longmeadowpla.com>
CC: Randy Dunton <rdunton@gorrillpalmer.com>, James Attianese <jattianese@gorrillpalmer.com>
Attachments: image001.png

Hi DeCarlo and Chris,

We reviewed the following materials that were downloaded from the Applicant. We assume that you will forward these to the design engineer/applicant or incorporate into your comments.

- York Paddle-Pickleball Site plan-Prelim Application, prepared by Civil Consultants, dated May 9, 2022

We have reviewed the materials for conformance with the technical engineering portions of the Town of York Ordinance and generally accepted civil engineering standards and offer the following comments:

1. Add silt fence along the proposed disturbed area adjacent to the ditch at Mill Lane.
2. Provide stabilized construction entrance at the new entrance drive (or exit). Also provide a detail.
3. Show inlet and outlet aprons at entrance/exit drive culverts.
4. Is the culvert at the proposed entrance drive needed? It looks like a high point. The listed inlet and outlet inverts are the same.
5. The existing culvert crossing Mill Lane has an outlet invert of 8.5, the proposed inlet of the culvert at the exit drive is also 8.5.
6. The existing culvert crossing Mill Lane is 18" in diameter, the proposed downstream culvert is called out as 12" diameter. We recommend that the downstream culvert diameter be increased to 18" diameter.
7. We recommend that the existing entrance (labeled to be relocated) be removed (along with the existing culvert) and regraded as a ditch.
8. The northerly level lip spreader appears to concentrate flow with the angled shape.
9. Provide elevations for the level lip spreaders.
10. Describe the intent with the southerly level lip spreader? This spreader appears to direct flow across the gravel parking lot to the roadside ditch. There are numerous concerns with this.
11. Where will the existing OH utility pole be relocated?
12. Dimension the drive widths, drive aisle width, parking spaces, curve radii.
13. Provide turning movement figures showing that emergency vehicles can navigate the 90 degree corners in entry and exit drives.
14. We have concerns with managing the parking on an unstriped gravel parking lot. Describe how this will be accomplished.
15. The parking calculations on Sheet L1 call out 41 proposed spaces. 42 spaces are provided.
16. Per ADA, at least one of the accessible spaces shall be van accessible. With angled spaces, the van space shall have the access aisle on the passenger side.
17. Provide additional spot grades at the ADA parking spaces to ensure compliance with ADA requirements.
18. Consider paving the ADA parking spaces and access aisle to provide a safe accessible

surface that can be easily maintained.

19. Will the space outside of the parking area be vegetated? What will prevent cars from parking outside the parking lot limit.
20. Are gravel paths proposed from the parking area to the courts/building? Provide an accessible route from the ADA parking spaces to the club house/pavilions. Consider whether accessible routes need to be provided to the courts?
21. Can a ramp be added to the deck to provide accessible access to the club house and paddle ball platforms?
22. The project results in a slight increase in runoff, given that the attenuation behind the level lip spreaders was not accounted for. It appears that the project is likely to have an insignificant impact to downstream properties.
23. The site plan and the description in the Traffic Assessment do not appear to match. This leaves the question as to which one is correct. It appears that the description of a resulting nine courts once the project is complete appears to be correct, but the difference is between what they say is existing and proposed. The description should be revised so that the existing and proposed matches the site plan.
24. The trip generation provided is based on the ITE 10th Edition. The ordinance requires the latest Edition, which is the ITE 11th Edition. The Trip Generation provided also identifies the peak hour as the AM, which is believed to be the PM peak hour. The trip generation also does not provide the peak hour of the generator. The trip generation should be based on the 11th Edition of the ITE and not the 10th. The trip generation calculations should present calculations for: Weekday, AM & PM peak hours of Adjacent Street, AM & PM peak hours of the Generator. All of these may not be available, but the ones that are should be provided.

Thank you,

William C. Haskell | Principal



707 Sable Oaks Drive, Suite 30 | South Portland, ME 04106
207.772.2515 x235 (office) | 207.318.7052 (mobile)
www.gorrillpalmer.com