GORRILL PALMER
An LJB Engineering Company

300 Southborough Drive, Suite 200, South Portland, ME 04106
(207) 772-2515 | GorrillPalmer.com

Engineering Review Memorandum

To: Brendan Summerville, Town Planner
From: Will Haskell, PE, Gorrill Palmer
Date: February 12, 2026
Subject: Preliminary Site Plan Application
Project: Woodbridge Common Mixed-Use Development (GP JN 132801)
Location: 7 Woodbridge Road, York, ME
Applicant: JMP Realty, LLC

Brendan,

Gorrill Palmer reviewed the following materials that were downloaded from the Applicant. We assume that you will forward our comments to the Applicant/Design Engineer or incorporate into your review comments.

1. Woodbridge Commons Preliminary Site Plan Application, dated December 19, 2026, prepared by Civil Consultants
2. Woodbridge Commons Multi-Use Development Plan Set (including 11 sheets), dated December 22. 2025, prepared by Civil Consultants

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. We have reviewed the waiver requests of the Site Plan and Subdivision Ordinance listed in the Application and provided comment on waiver requests of civil infrastructure standards. Final approval of all waiver requests shall be made by the Planning Board.

Roadway and Parking:

1. Access drive sight distance arrows are shown on Woodbridge Road, but no sight distance measurements are provided. Provide sight distance measurements at the intersection of Woodbridge Road which demonstrate compliance with Section 8.2.3 of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. Provide typical roadway section details which comply with Section 9.5.9 of the Site Plan and Subdivision Ordinance for work proposed in the Woodbridge Road right-of-way.
3. Provide a graphic which demonstrates a firetruck can access Building 4.
4. The perpendicular pedestrian ramp adjacent to Building 1 does not provide 4-feet of clear space above the ramp. Revise the ramp to meet ADA Standards. Provide a detail for the "perpendicular pedestrian ramp" if it remains proposed.
5. Add spot grades to the concrete sidewalk ramp near Building 2 which indicates the slope will not exceed 1:12.
6. Guardrail should be considered along the top of the proposed retaining wall between Buildings 3 and 4.

Stormwater:

7. Submit the full HydroCAD reports for the 2-year and 100-year, 24-hour storm events as these are the peak flow events required by Section 9.8.2 of the Zoning Ordinance. We will provide further review of the stormwater management system once the full HydroCAD report is submitted.
8. It appears that the surface elevation of the wetlands is approximately 62. Provide information on the seasonal high groundwater elevation and demonstrate that groundwater will not reduce the storage capacity of the R-Tank system and the stone reservoirs.
9. It is our understanding that a stone reservoir and underdrain system is proposed under the porous asphalt pavement, and R-Tanks are proposed below the standard asphalt pavement to provide additional storage. If this is the case, we recommend using alternate hatches to define the proposed stone storage areas and proposed R-Tank storage areas.
10. Pond 1P appears to represent the wetland cell that will be bisected by the proposed access drive. The cumulative storage of Pond 1P does not change from the pre-development to the post-development. It seems the construction of the driveway would require two pond nodes. Revise the model to reflect the proposed driveway and driveway culvert.
11. Ponds 11P, 21P, and 23P in the HydroCAD model represent the stone reservoir storage below the porous pavement. The custom stage data utilized in these ponds shows the crushed stone, choker stone, and porous pavement to all have a void ratio of 40%. Revise the void ratio to be representative of its associated material.
12. Based on the HydroCAD model, the underdrains associated with the stone reservoirs are capped with an orifice. The stone reservoirs are modeled with a restrictive orifice as the controlling outlet device; however, these restrictive orifices do not appear to be shown on the plans. Show the locations of the orifices on the plans and provide details of the underdrain orifices.
13. The driveway culvert which crosses the adjacent properties driveway is modeled in HydroCAD as a 12-inch culvert with 6-inch infill. It appears that the 6-inch opening is restricting the flow out of the wetland and is causing the existing culvert to overtop. We have concerns that if the existing culvert were to become clogged, the driveway at the adjacent property may flood. We recommend providing a note that the adjacent driveway culvert shall be cleaned, and the model be revised to not include the 6-inch infill within the 12-inch culvert associated with Pond 1P.
14. As the proposed driveway culvert will function as a wetland crossing, we recommend proposing an oversized pipe (>12-inches, as currently proposed) with a 6-inch embedment. Maine DEP would typically recommend a 36-inch pipe for this application, however we understand the limited cover would not allow for a pipe this large.
15. The Applicant is requesting a waiver of Section 9.8.6 – Minimum Pipe Size, which requires a minimum of 15-inch stormdrain pipe unless the Applicant demonstrates that 12-inch pipe is more appropriate. We have no technical concerns with reducing the pipe diameter within the closed stormwater management system to be less than 15-inches.

Post-Construction Stormwater Management:

16. The project is located within the Urbanized Area. It is not clear if the project will disturb one or more acres of land, therefore it is not possible to determine if the Post Construction Stormwater Ordinance will apply. A note has been provided on the Construction Details (Sheet L7) stating the project is required to comply with the Town's Post-Construction Stormwater Ordinance.

17. A Low Impact Design Statement has been provided per Section 9.8.13 of the Town's Site Plan and Subdivision Ordinance.
18. The limit of disturbance has been shown on the Grading and Erosion Control Plan. Provide a note that states, "Limits of disturbance will be visually delineated in the field prior to disturbance, and that a preconstruction meeting with Code Enforcement is required" per Section 6.4.15.1 of the Site Plan and Subdivision Ordinance.

Utilities:

19. A blow off for the water service is located beyond the proposed retaining wall. We recommend relocating the blow off to provide access from the parking lot surface.
20. The Applicant is requesting a waiver of Section 6.3.32 – High Intensity Soil Survey. As no on-site subsurface wastewater disposal or stormwater infiltration is proposed, we concur that a high intensity soil survey is not needed for this development. The Planning Board has the final decision on whether to grant waiver requests.
21. DMH #2 rim in storm drain structure schedule on sheet L3 appears to be incorrect. Please revise.
22. Provide detail for 2'x2' square precast drain manhole.
23. DMH #3 is called out as 2'x2' square manhole. Confirm that outlet pipe exiting at angle is feasible.
24. On Sheet L3 there is a precast concrete headwall called out just northerly of Building 4. Provide detail for this headwall.

Traffic:

Review of the Traffic Assessment was provided by Randy Dunton, PE, PTOE of Gorrill Palmer.

25. We concur with the Land Use Codes 220 & 712 for this development and the calculated trip generation.
26. We concur that this project does not meet requirements for a full traffic impact analysis.
27. The initial traffic assessment needs to be signed by a Maine License Professional Engineer.
28. Sight distance needs to be measured for the site driveway based on MaineDOT standards. Per Section 6.3.30 of the Site Plan and Subdivision Ordinance sight distance shall be provided for the Preliminary submission.

General:

29. On the Grading and Erosion Control Plan (Sheet L2) there is a 64 spot grade in the middle of the access drive that does not appear to be correct.
30. Is underdrain proposed behind the retaining wall?
31. The Applicant is requesting a waiver of 7.3.1.D – Steep Slopes to allow 3:1 slopes. We concur that 3:1 slopes are practical for the development. The Applicant has provided sufficient temporary and permanent stabilization notes and details to construct 3:1 slopes in a way that will not cause undue erosion or sedimentation downgradient of the slopes. The Planning Board has the final decision on whether to grant waiver requests.
32. Confirm Building 4 southwesterly corner, foundation footing, or roofline does not extend over the building setback.

33. The parking turnaround between Buildings 2 and 3 encroaches on the parking setback.
34. Provide permit application to US Army Corps of Engineers for wetland impacts.
35. Flag limits of work prior to construction to prevent unintended wetland impacts.

Please let us know if you want to review and discuss any of the comments.

Sincerely,

Gorrill-Palmer

Will Haskell, PE
Municipal Operations Leader, New England

Ben Nault, EI
Design Engineer

U:\Town of York Maine\0132801A.00 - PR York 7 Woodbridge Commons\C Corr Out\0132801_York PR_7 Woodbridge Commons_2026-02-12.docx