



Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

82 Hanover Street - Final Traffic Comments

Tom Errico <thomas.errico@tylin.com>

Thu, May 10, 2018 at 2:02 PM

To: Helen Donaldson <HCD@portlandmaine.gov>

Cc: Jeremiah Bartlett <JBartlett@portlandmaine.gov>, "Hyman, Bruce" <bhyman@portlandmaine.gov>, "kgray@portlandmaine.gov" <kgray@portlandmaine.gov>, "Jeff Tarling (JST@portlandmaine.gov)" <JST@portlandmaine.gov>

Hi Nell – I have reviewed the application materials and offer the following final traffic comments as a status update of previous comments.

- A MaineDOT Traffic Movement Permit (TMP) is required for the project based upon trip generation estimates. Accordingly, the Applicant will be submitting a TMP Application with the intent of scheduling a traffic study scoping meeting. The study is likely to include, at a minimum, the Hanover Street intersections with Portland Street and Kennebec Street and the Marginal Way/Hanover Street intersection. I noted that a financial contribution towards the implementation of transportation system improvements in the project vicinity may be required and would be considered as part of the traffic study.

Status: A Traffic Movement Permit Scoping meeting was held on April 23, 2018. A Traffic Assessment was prepared by Bill Bray, PE that summarized traffic and safety impacts from the project in the vicinity of the site. The Assessment documents Existing Traffic Volumes; Safety; Site Trip Generation; Future Traffic Volumes and Intersection Operations. The following summarizes the outcome of the Traffic Movement Permit review:

- **Following adjustments for shared land-use trips within the site and multi-modal trips, the project is expected to generate 149 Weekday PM peak hour trips and 197 Saturday peak hour trips.**
 - **The intersections in the immediate vicinity of the site (Hanover Street/Kennebec Street, Parris Street/Kennebec Street, Hanover Street/Portland Street, Parris Street/Portland Street) will have sufficient capacity to accommodate the new project traffic.**
 - **Outside the immediate project area, Marginal Way intersections experience capacity, multi-modal and safety challenges. Pursuant Chapter 305 of the MaineDOT Rules and Regulations Pertaining to the Traffic Movement Permit, the Applicant shall make a \$23,000 contribution towards implementation of the Marginal Way Master Plan. This requirement is to address traffic and pedestrian issues at the Marginal Way intersections with Preble Street/Elm Street, Hanover Street and Forest Avenue.**
- The site plan design will likely result in vehicle encroachment for the parking spaces abutting the 6-foot sidewalk along Kennebec Street. Redesign of the parking lot layout or provision of barrier treatment should be considered to prevent encroachment.

Status: I continue to recommend implementation of a design treatment or redesign of the parking area such that encroachment onto to sidewalk is prevented. I would note that I do not support the Applicant's suggestion that the curb will prevent compact size vehicles from encroaching onto the sidewalk. It seems unlikely that the parking area can be managed 24 hours a day to ensure that only low clearance vehicles are using the spaces. It is my understanding that Planning staff is working on a Condition of Approval for addressing this issue.

- The project site plan includes several driveways and conditions do not meet City Technical Standards for number of driveways. The Applicant shall provide documentation in support of a formal waiver request for the number of driveways. Reduction in the number of driveways or intended function should be considered.

Status: Technical Manual, Section 1.7.2.8 notes that no more than two driveways shall be permitted for ingress and egress purposes to any commercial site. The project is providing two one-way driveways servicing the parking lot along Kennebec Street. The project will be modifying the existing driveways to the overhead doors for limited vehicle use and will have little to no vehicle traffic within Lancaster Street. Given that the Lancaster Street area and the overhead door driveways will have little vehicle traffic, I support a waiver for the number of driveways.

- The project will require off-site parking to satisfy peak parking demand. I would note that shared parking opportunities with nearby businesses, particularly those that have offsetting time of day parking demand characteristics would be acceptable.

Status: The Applicant will be required to provide sufficient parking for the initial phase of the project and conduct a parking monitoring study to quantify parking supply requirements for future phases. The Applicant has estimated a parking supply of 51 parking spaces for the initial phase. I find this estimate to be reasonable given the parking analysis conducted by the Applicant. The Applicant has proposed accommodating parking requirements from the 39 parking spaces on-site and accommodating at least 12 parking spaces at the Schotterback & Foss site. I find this approach to be reasonable with the following conditions:

- **The Applicant shall conduct a Parking Demand Study following the occupancy of Phase 1 with the methods of the Study to be reviewed and approved by Planning Staff.**
- **The Applicant shall provide information on parking management and adequacy of conditions at the Schotterback & Foss site for the additional vehicles prior to a Certificate of Occupancy.**

- Any changes that increase public on-street parking supply cannot be used for meeting the projects parking requirements.

Status: The Applicant is no longer proposing use of on-street parking spaces for satisfying parking requirements. I have no further comment.

- The proposed parking lot does not meet City Technical Dimensional Standards. The applicant shall provide supporting documentation as part of a formal waiver request.

Status: The Applicant has conducted vehicle turn analyses and I find the parking layout to be acceptable. I would note that I support reducing the parking aisle width to 19 feet to address sidewalk encroachment issues. I have no further comment.

Additional Comments

- **Technical Manual, Section 1.7.2.7 notes that along local streets, access driveways to corner lots shall be located a minimum of 35 feet from the intersection of the projection of the right-of-way lines to the centerline of the driveway. The proposed project will provide curb cuts that are approximately 30 feet from the Hanover Street/Kennebec Street and Parris Street/Hanover Street intersections. Given that the driveways are restricted to one-way circulation, the driveways are located on low volume and speed roadways, and it nearly meets City standards, I support a waiver from the City's corner clearance standard.**
- **Technical Manual, Section 1.14 notes that in parking areas of over 10 parking spaces, no more than 20% of parking spaces shall be compact in size. The proposed project is providing 49% of the 39 parking spaces on site to be designed as compact spaces. Given site constraints (the existing building and the Kennebec Street Improvement project limit design space), the width of the parking spaces comply with standard parking space dimensions and the need to accommodate on-site parking, I support a waiver.**

5/10/2018

City of Portland Mail - 82 Hanover Street - Final Traffic Comments

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Best regards,

Thomas A. Errico, PE
Senior Associate
Traffic Engineering Director

TYLIN INTERNATIONAL

12 Northbrook Drive

Falmouth, ME 04105

+1.207.781.4721 main

+1.207.347.4354 direct

+1.207.400.0719 mobile

+1.207.781.4753 fax

thomas.errico@tylin.com

Visit us online at www.tylin.com

[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Google+](#)

"One Vision, One Company"



Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

final comments on 82 Hanover - last call

Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>
To: Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

Thu, May 10, 2018 at 4:42 PM

Hi Nell,

My only remaining comment is that the connection from the parking lot to the Catch Basin in Hanover Street will not be allowed by the City. Based on the feedback from Brad, and my review of the plans, their options would be to increase the size of their underdrain and tie the basin to that so that it drains back towards Parris Street, or they could regrade that area, remove the basin, and allow the drainage to go into the street where it will be collected by the City's basins in the street.

If you need anything else, let me know.

Thanks,

Lauren

From: Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2018 4:37 PM
To: Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>; Jeff Tarling <jst@portlandmaine.gov>; Bruce Hyman <bhyman@portlandmaine.gov>; Keith Gray <kgray@portlandmaine.gov>; Robert Thompson <rmt@portlandmaine.gov>
Subject: final comments on 82 Hanover - last call

[Quoted text hidden]

Notice: Under Maine law, documents - including e-mails - in the possession of public officials or city employees about government business may be classified as public records. There are very few exceptions. As a result, please be advised that what is written in an e-mail could be released to the public and/or the media if requested.



Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

draft conditions of approval

Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>
To: Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

Fri, May 11, 2018 at 12:54 PM

Looks good! No CB connection anymore. You should be able to take out that condition.

Lauren

From: Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 12:37 PM
To: Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>
Subject: Fwd: draft conditions of approval

There's not a chance you could look at this and let me know if you're good, could you? Then we'd be able to eliminate this condition!

Nell

----- Forwarded message -----

From: William Savage <wsavage@acorn-engineering.com>
Date: Fri, May 11, 2018 at 12:21 PM
Subject: RE: draft conditions of approval
To: Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>, Michael Barton <michael.corbett.barton@gmail.com>
Cc: Sam Lebel <slebel@acorn-engineering.com>

Nell,

Two revised plans that eliminate the following comments/conditions.

Updated the drive aisle to be 19 ft in width.

The applicant shall revise the Grading & Drainage Plan to eliminate the proposed connection into the catch basin in Hanover Street for review and approval by the Department of Public Works; **We took Lauren's advice and increased the size of the underdrain and eliminated the connection to Hanover.**

- Will



Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

final comments on 82 Hanover - last call

Robert Thompson <rmt@portlandmaine.gov>
To: Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

Fri, May 11, 2018 at 10:08 AM

Hi Nell,

The newest plan looks good to me, shows what was requested.

Thank you,
Mike

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Robert M. Thompson
Division Fire Chief
Portland Fire Department
(207) 874-8400
rmt@portlandmaine.gov

Planning and Urban Development Department Planning Division



Subject: B-7 Design Review – 82 Hannover Street
Written by: Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer
Date of Review: Tuesday, May 8 2018

The alterations to the building at 82 Hanover Street was reviewed according to the *City of Portland Design Manual* standards by Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer, against the *B7 Bayside Mixed Use Urban District Standards* (Section (f) and Appendix 4 of the Design Manual).

Design Review Comments: *(questions and unmet standards in red)*

(f) B-7 Bayside Mixed Use Urban District Zone

b. Design Standards: All major and minor development reviewed under the provisions of the Bayside B-7 zone shall be **designed to support the development of this urban neighborhood as a dense, mixed-use, pedestrian friendly neighborhood** in accordance with the standards contained in the Bayside Design Standards, promulgated by the Planning Board, and contained in the Appendix 4 of this section.

Principle A Urban Design – The project reuses an existing building and the building relationship to the street will not change.

- **A-1 Sense of Place:** The increase in window openings, additional doors, canopies, and mixed-use activity will contribute to this standard to encourage sense of place, foot traffic, and neighborhood amenity. The project meets the standard regarding adaptive reuse and respecting the “patina” and age of the existing neighborhood fabric.
- **A-5 Pedestrian Environment:** The design and landscaping of the sidewalk could mitigate the impact of the surface parking lot between the street and the building on Kennebec Street.
Applicant added a guardrail and screen between the sidewalk and surface parking.

Principle B Access and Circulation – Streets and sidewalks in Bayside shall be designed to encourage a pedestrian friendly, walkable environment. The goal is to create streets that are scaled and designed for pedestrian and bicycle use; are well landscaped;

- **B-9 Streetscape Design:** The landscape design is limited to the corners of the surface parking. **Applicant added a guardrail and green screen to better meet this standard, however, staff question the viability of plantings in such small volume of soil with impervious surface surrounding it. If there is not room for landscape/plantings, a screen wall is a better option.**
- **B-11 Lighting:** The Technical Manual is under revision – the Bayside Medium fixture is required on those sidewalks not covered by cobrahead lighting. Spacing is shown per Technical Manual and staff direction but lights should be in black color, LED 3000 K – Sheet C41 detail for Bayside Medium light should be revised to reflect black color, LED 3000 K.

Principle C Parking, Loading, and Service Areas – *Parking, loading and service areas shall be designed and located so as to present an attractive façade to neighboring use, to minimize their visual presence in the neighborhood, and to minimize the impact along pedestrian oriented streets and residential areas.*

- **C-6 Surface Lots:** This standard requires that areas devoted to surface parking shall be screened from public rights of way with design elements such as planting, fencing, grade changes, and/or walls. A landscape border is required around all surface parking lots. Landscaped islands are also required. **Given the limited space between the surface parking and sidewalk, a screened or fence would also serve this intent.**

Principle D Open Space and the Public Realm – Not applicable – no publicly accessible open space is proposed.

Principle E Architectural Design

- **E-1 Architectural Design:** Not applicable – adaptive reuse.
- **E-6 Entrances:** The main entrance will be emphasized with glass and a canopy. The primary entrance is not allowed to be oriented to a parking lot – this project is constrained by existing conditions, however. Multiple tenant entries facing all sides of building/street. Tenant entries are emphasized with canopies and blade signs.
- **E-7 Windows:** Windows are being increased in size on some facades. **Transparency is required on the ground floor – applicant confirmed this will be the case.**
- **E-8 Storefronts:** Doors are proposed at frequent intervals. **Glass will be transparent.**
- **E-9 Back Sides of Buildings:** The project increases the amount of transparency and activity on all facades, thus improving the current situation and better meeting this standard. Entrances should be highly visible to help navigate the building.
- **E-10 Rooftop Appurtenances:** **Current submission does not indicate rooftop mechanicals - Any new rooftop appurtenances proposed shall be consolidated physically or visually with screening. They should be designed to appear as an integral part of the architecture of the building. Applicant response says “All rooftop appurtenances will be located on the roof a minimum of 25’ from the roof edge to eliminate visibility from street level. They will also be consolidated as much as possible.”**
- **E-11 Fences and Walls:** If walls/fences are proposed for screening, the standard requires high quality, durable materials. See standard for further elaboration.
- **E-13 Transparency:** **Applicant responded that new glazing will be minimally tinted and have a VT of .7 or greater.** Opaque or spandrel glass is not allowed at the pedestrian level.
- **E-16 Signage** – **Signage was revised to show tenant signage on the blade sign only as requested by staff.** A master sign plan is required for review that meets the requirements of this standard. Future tenant signs will be held to the B-7 sign standards.