
28annah Street

1 message

Jean Fraser <jf@portlandmaine.gov>
To: Tom Greer <tgreer@walsh-eng.com>

Thu, May 17, 2018 at 11:33 AM

Hello Tom

Yesterday at the Dev Rev meeting reviewers finalized the preliminary comments on this project. The application is very thorough but there are several items that need further discussion/revision as noted below:

- *Design of the new building (B1 Design Standards):*
 - Please see the attached Design Review Memo; we have some concerns regarding the roof and entrance design;
 - Please also submit elevations that have the calculations for the average grade, show the average grade and show the heights at the corners (needed to confirm this meets zoning).
- *Landscaping (Site Plan, B1 Zone and B1 Design Standards):* We welcome the retention of the large existing trees along the boundaries, but revisions are needed to:
 - Widen the area beneath the trees along the front to 6 feet to ensure that the trees/shrubs survive and buffer the parking; we would support an increase in % of compact parking spaces (or narrowing of some spaces) and removal of one parking space (near front to west) to achieve this;
 - A densely landscaped buffer/ architectural quality fencing is required along the rear boundary that abuts the residential zone (see site plan ordinance) - the existing proposals show little planting and a chain link fence at this location and do not meet the standards.
 - As part of the treatment along the boundary with residential, please clarify the enclosure for the patio; (as a comment and not a review comment, we note that the patio location is on the north side and immediately behind a large building and will be very dark)
 - Fencing on the architectural plans differs from the site plan. Revised plans for the Planning Board should be consistent, with all fencing shown on the site plan and labeled as to height and materials (please also clarify boundary treatment along both side boundaries).
- *Parking lot layout:* The layout of the parking lot needs to be revised to address the following:
 - Pedestrian access from sidewalk to residents entrance;

- Servicing requirements for the retail/commercial use, including for deliveries & waste collection (?dumpsters);
- Safe and protected placement of the pole lights, which should be shown on the site plan.
- *Sidewalk:* As part of the previous parking agreement the small section of sidewalk abutting the site was to be upgraded to create a continuous sidewalk. Occupants of your development will be using this sidewalk, so please clarify what arrangements are being made for this improvement to be made at the same time as the site is developed?
- *Mechanical Units:*
 - The site plan ordinance states:
 - (i) *All heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment (HVAC), air handling units (AHU), emergency generators, and similar equipment shall meet applicable state and federal emissions requirements and shall comply with the following:*
 - (a) *Be located to the interior of the site, away from abutting residential properties;*
 - (b) *Be screened from view from any public street and from adjacent sites by structure walls, evergreen landscaping, fencing, masonry wall or a combination thereof.*
 - In light of this ordinance requirement, please relocate the mechanical units/compressors (the architectural plans show them differently than the site plan, but both have them within the residential zone and near the boundary with residences) and specify what enclosures will be provided (also to limit noise as there is a noise limit in the B1 zone of 55dBA).

If you consider that a meeting with reviewers would be helpful please let me know. We will confirm the PB meeting date when we receive revised plans and the associated "response to comments" letter. Please also send me a copy of your Neighborhood Meeting invitation and notes etc when available.

Thank you
Jean

--

*Jean Fraser, Planner
City of Portland
874 8728*



PLAN CORRECTIONS REPORT PL-000030-2018 FOR CITY OF PORTLAND

PLAN ADDRESS: 28 Vannah Avenue
Portland, 04103

PARCEL: 129 F011001

APPLICATION DATE: 03/28/2018 **SQUARE FEET:** 0.00 **DESCRIPTION:** 8 Unit Building; 7 residential, 1 commercial

EXPIRATION DATE: **VALUATION:** \$0.00

CONTACTS	Name	Company	Address
Agent/Representative	Tom Greer	Walsh Engineering Associates, Inc.	1 Karen Drive, Suite 2A Westbrook, ME 04092

Corrections Required

Civil Engineering - Third Party Reviewer

Lauren Swett

v.1.00 - Not Resolved

Correction: General

The Applicant has noted that water and sewer ability to serve verification is pending.

Corrective Action: Provide utility ability to serve verification when available.

Correction: General

The Applicant should review parking lot grading. Spot grades are shown in the pavement to the north and south of the ADA parking spaces, however it is not clear if these are existing or proposed grades. No drainage infrastructure is provided, so it is unclear how drainage exits the parking lot based on these spot grades.

Corrective Action: Update grading plan.

Correction: General

The construction management plan should be updated to note that contractors may not utilize on street parking during construction.

Corrective Action: Provide updated construction management plan.

Fire

Robert Thompson

v.1.00 - Not Resolved

Correction: General

Fire Department access to the building is sufficient.

Corrective Action: N/A

Correction: General

This project shall not affect the emergency escape capabilities of any existing building. *(See update in 6.6.18 email)*

Corrective Action: N/A

Correction: General

There are adequate fire hydrants in the area.

Corrective Action: N/A

Correction: General

The entire building shall be sprinklered.

Corrective Action: N/A

Planning

Jean Fraser

v.1.00 - Not Resolved

Correction: Exceeds Required Parking

The compact parking space nearest the entrance should be removed as if it occupied by a standard length car it will partially block the driveway. Since the parking count exceeds zoning requirements by 10%, this space could be lost or relocated.

(see update from Tom Errico, Traffic Engineering Reviewer dated 6.7.18)

Corrective Action: N/A

Conditions Required

Planning and Urban Development Department Planning Division



Subject: B-1 Design Review – 28 Vannah Avenue
Written by: Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer
Date of Review: Thursday, May 31 2018

The project at 28 Vannah Avenue was reviewed according to the *City of Portland Design Manual* standards by Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer, Jean Fraser, Planner, and Nell Donaldson, Senior Planner, against the *B1 Commercial Business Zones Standards* (Section (d) of the Design Manual).

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

- Provide information about the material selection and label materials on the elevations
- Clarify discrepancies between site plan and architectural plans – especially for fences, pads, and mechanical systems

(d) B-1 Commercial Business Zones

Standard (1) a. Urban Street Wall – Building placement is near the property line and maintains the desired street wall with a landscape buffer.

Standard (1) b. Mixed Uses – Building includes office and residential uses.

Standard (1) c. Building Entrances – The office entrance is directly accessible from the street while the residential entrance is to the side and faces the parking lot. **The Site Plan was revised to provide a direct pedestrian access to the residential entrance from the sidewalk as required by the standard.**

Standard (1) d. Windows – Windows are provided along street frontage as required – high level of fenestration. **VT of .7 or greater is required.**

Standard (1) e. Façade Character – Office entrance and use faces the street and the office storefront is adjacent to the street.

Standard (1) f. Building Design – Building design conveys its commercial/mixed use nature. Use of office-front is consistent with commercial buildings on this street. **Staff question the use of a gable roof when such large dormers are also being introduced, especially since the building is so wide that the proportion of the gable moves away from the residential character. The building form is top-heavy with the large dormers and the eave at the second floor.** Staff recommend a flat roof, which would be appropriate for a three-story, mixed-use building type, as well as appropriate given the width and proportion of the building overall and does not preclude the use of articulation and detail to add visual interest. **At the very least, the second story eave should be removed which contributes to the top-heavy feel of the form.** The office use is differentiated on the façade through the use of the office-front windows, the change of material, and the trim delineating the ground from the upper floors. These elements are

adequate in conveying the different uses – a gable roof is not necessary to convey the residential use or to try and fit into the residential context which happens to include a variety of roof forms (including flat roofs). Staff find the design of the office entry to be too formal for the overall character of the building and the neighborhood character – this should be revised, possibly to simplify the columns and the pediment roof.

Standard (1) g. Building Materials – Staff requests more information about the proposed materials in order to evaluate the proposal. The project appears to use clapboard of two different reveals with panel as an accent – these would be appropriate material choices. The surrounding context uses clapboard and brick primarily.

Standard (1) h. Building Scale – Building is three stories with a gable/dormer roofline. There is a two-story mixed-use building between this site and the residential buildings on the street. The existing scale of commercial and mixed-use buildings on Vannah Ave is typically one story or two to three stories for mixed-use with the majority of buildings being too short compared with the street width. Therefore, staff support new development that is appropriately scaled (meaning taller) for the street and for a mixed-use urban corridor and finds three stories meets the standard (as well as the zoning). In addition, this project has some massing variation at the third floor that varies the height of the building at the street.

Standard (1) i. Landscaping and Buffers – Parking is to the side of the property and is screened from view from the street by a fence and understory planting. The abutting properties are screened using a fence.

Jean Fraser <jf@portlandmaine.gov>

28 Vannah Avenue

1 message

Robert Thompson <rmt@portlandmaine.gov>

Wed, Jun 6, 2018 at 10:53 AM

To: Jean Fraser <jf@portlandmaine.gov>

Hi Jean,

I've reviewed the proposed site plan for this project, as well as the proximity and construction features of the building to the right of this proposed project. Based on my findings, I've determined the construction of this building, and associated utilities, will not impede the means of escape from the neighboring building.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any further questions or concerns.

Thank you,
Mike

--

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

28 Vannah Street - Preliminary Traffic Comments

1 message

Tom Errico <thomas.errico@tylin.com>

Thu, Jun 7, 2018 at 9:09 AM

To: Jean Fraser <jf@portlandmaine.gov>

Cc: "BHYMAN@portlandmaine.gov" <BHYMAN@portlandmaine.gov>, Keith Gray <kgray@portlandmaine.gov>, Jeremiah Bartlett <JBartlett@portlandmaine.gov>, "Jeff Tarling (JST@portlandmaine.gov)" <JST@portlandmaine.gov>

Hi Jean – I have reviewed the revised preliminary plans and offer the following traffic comments.

- The proposed project is not expected to generate a significant amount of new traffic and thus is not expected to impact safety and mobility in the study area.
- Given site conditions, that the project nearly meets City requirements, and some compact parking spaces exceed City dimensional requirements, I support a waiver from the City's Technical Standards for the number of compact spaces on the site.
- It is recommended that the compact space near the driveway entrance be lengthened by 2 feet and the CMP pole guy wire be adjusted accordingly.
- The applicant should provide details for how truck deliveries will be accommodated.
- It appears the parking aisle width does not meet City standards to the rear of the parking lot. The applicant should provide a formal waiver request with supporting documentation.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Best regards,

Thomas A. Errico, PE
Senior Associate
Traffic Engineering Director