



May 20, 2022
21429

Maureen O'Meara, Town Planner
Town of Cape Elizabeth
320 Ocean House Road
P.O. Box 6260
Cape Elizabeth, Maine 04107

**Subject: Carr Woods Condominium Development - Deep Brook Road
Major Subdivision and Resource Protection Permit Review**

Dear Maureen:

We have received and reviewed an April 29, 2022 submission package for the subject project. The package included the following items:

- April 29, 2022, Landscape Plan East and as prepared by Barry J Hosmer;
- April 29, 2022, Landscape Plan West as prepared by Barry J. Hosmer;

General Comments–

1. There are large areas of ledge that exist along the property lines of the project. The applicant should clarify how they intend to meet the Cape Elizabeth requirement for a buffer between abutting properties in areas of ledge where planting cannot occur (i.e., will a fence be installed?)
2. The plans propose a mixture of deciduous and evergreen tree varieties and species throughout the project that suits the region of Southern Maine and Cape Elizabeth. The tree species selected seem to create a buffer that will screen the abutting properties as the trees mature. The trees proposed shall integrate into the existing forested areas to provide a naturalized screening over time.
3. The landscape plan has many overlapping and crossing callout lines that make the plan difficult to read. To avoid confusion, overlapping line conflicts should be reviewed by the designer to improve the clarity of the plans.
4. The designer should clarify if there are existing trees within the Carr Lot (existing house) and the wetland area delineated adjacent to the Carr Lot. No Existing trees are shown in this area. The designer should also clarify how the buffer requirements are being met along the southern border of the project in this location.
5. There are areas of the plans that call out the specific existing tree diameter and the type (evergreen or deciduous), some are only labeled with the diameter of the tree and some existing tree symbols do not have any callouts. The designer should provide consistent labeling of the existing trees or provide clarification as to why there are different labeling and callouts for the existing trees.

Landscape Plan Comments–

1. As a minor comment, adjust the sheet numbers for Sheet 1 to indicate "1 of 2"
2. Provide clarification on the extent of the tree protection fence delineation. The tree protection line on the south side of the project is unclear. Specifically, the area surrounding the Carr Lot and adjacent wetlands. In addition, match the line type for the tree protection fencing to the north (Bold).
3. Differentiate between the edge of the wetland line and the tree protection line on the south side of the subdivision.

4. We are unclear as to whether the slopes and basins located at Station 6+00 on Sheet 1 of 2 are intended to be planted. The designer should clarify the landscape treatments for this basin and specifically, define whether a seed mix is required for the basin.
5. Adjust the "PM" callouts at Soil Filter #3. The location of the callout makes it difficult to differentiate between where the "PM" plantings and the "PG" plantings are to be located around this basin.
6. The tree protection line callout (nearest Station 10+00 north side) does not point to the tree protection line. This callout should be adjusted for clarity.
7. Label the BMP located on the northside of the road closest to Station 11+00. The designer should clarify the treatment of the slopes (i.e., loam and seed, or another seed mix).
8. The callout for the (2) NS located on the southside of Soil Filter # 1 appears to be located on top of a ledge outcrop. The designer should adjust this location or provide clarification as to how these two trees will be planted. This area seems to have a large gap in the planted buffer due to the ledge. The designer should clarify how a buffer is to be created in areas of ledge.
9. The note specifying the NEWP seed mix for underdrain soil filter #1 is cut off. The designer should adjust the notation so it is not cut off.
10. For the area behind Units 8/9 and 10/11, the designer should clarify the callouts for the "TP-5", "TP-7", and "PR". As shown, it is difficult to discern which tree type is which in this location.
11. The callout stating, "*trees to be preserved (Typ.)*" – located behind units 6/7 does not point to any trees. The designer should clarify this callout.
12. For the area behind Units 8/9 and Unit 10, there are (2) trees that conflict with a protected existing tree. These proposed trees seem to be planted on top of the existing tree. The designer should adjust the proposed tree location to alleviate the conflict.
13. No label was found for trees located behind Biofiltration basin #3 (which is behind Units 13/14). The designer should label or clarify the label for these (10) trees.
14. It appears that (1) LSM in front of Unit #12 is located on top of a sanitary sewer service line. The designer should relocate this tree. While no other utility conflicts were observed during our review, the designer should continue to review the plans as they are developed with the engineering design plans to ensure that no other utility conflicts arise before the next resubmission of the project design.

We trust that these comments will assist the Board during their deliberations on this project. Should there be any questions or comments regarding our review, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

SEBAGO TECHNICS, INC.



Henry A Hess, RLA
Maine Licensed Landscape Architect

HAH:hah

cc: William A. Gerrish, Northeast Civil Solutions
Jay Reynolds, Public Works Director
Barry J. Hosmer ASLA, Landscape Architecture Land Planning.