

# Development Review Checklist

IS-FBC

Level I / Level II / **Level III** / Master Plan  
 Project Name: Shipyard  
 Address: 86 Newbury Street  
 Description: Alteration / **Addition** / New Construction  
 Date Received: 7/3/18 Prelim / Final  
 Planner: Caitlin Cameron

Subdistrict **UN** / UT / UA

	Complies	More Info	Does Not Comply	N/A	Comments
<b>PURPOSE</b>					
General Guiding Principles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Most principles met – Newbury Street needs more design iteration to develop a consistent street character with blocks across the street. Fore Street façade needs revision to meet purpose statement 3
Subdistrict Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UT Hancock, Fore, Mountfort; UN Newbury
<b>GENERAL DEV. STANDARDS</b>					
(a) Prohibited Uses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(b) Siting Standards					
Mid-Block Permeability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Frontage Req. – Additional Building Length	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UT Mountfort = 200’ with massing variation UT Hancock = 114’ Hotel with 2 modules
Setbacks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Small Lot < 35’	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Side Yard less than 5’	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Special corner treatment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Attached Buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Landscaping & Screening					
Surface Parking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
1 <sup>st</sup> Lot Layer - Height	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
1 <sup>st</sup> Lot Layer – Perm.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Other Lot Layer - Height	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

	Complies	More Info	Does Not Comply	N/A	Comments
(c) Height Standards					
Height Bonus - Eligible?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UT eligible streets – 1 bonus story allowed; Height not to exceed 77' from average grade
Height Bonus – Conditions Green Roof + Pervious = 50% lot	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff request additional info – <b>revise diagram 50% pervious lot area to accurately reflect the landscape plan and staff request to remove the landscape areas on Newbury Street, Ch 32 compliance and calculations, details, and green roof maintenance agreement.</b>  50% Lot Area = 46,887sf req; ?? proposed 50% Roof Area = 35,631sf req; <b>24,817sf proposed</b>
(d) Parking Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>SUBDISTRICT DIMS REQ.</b>					
<b>Siting Standards</b>					
Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Buildings on Hancock and Mountfort streets have a principal façade oriented to the street. Office building oriented to Mountfort Street. Hotel oriented to Hancock Street. Residential buildings are oriented to Newbury Street <b>but lack principal entries.</b>
Corner Condition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UN is dominant subdistrict on Newbury Street; UN/UT streets, applicant is allowed to decide building orientations.
Lot Coverage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Under 90% required
<b>Frontage Requirements</b>					
Building Length	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UN – residential buildings all 50' UT Fore – less than 100' Shipyards building to remain as existing length
Additional Bldg Length	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UT Mountfort – 200' with massing variation UT Hancock – less than 200' with 2 modules with active doors.
Fenestration Req. (UA)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Setbacks</b>					
Principal Building					

Front Yard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5' max for UN street; 10' max for UT streets; staff suggest extending sidewalks into front yard where feasible. <b>Front yard max of 5' is exceeded for residential buildings</b> ; front yard max of 10' is exceeded on Newbury Street for office; building because building has met 200' max building length.
Side Yard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	At least 10' on all side yards.
Side Yard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Exceptions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Rear Yard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No rear yards
	<b>Complies</b>	<b>More Info</b>	<b>Does Not Comply</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Building Entries</b>					
Frequency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Newbury = 1 required per building; 2 buildings provided; <b>2 missing (waiver requests)</b> Mountfort = 2 required; <b>1 provided (waiver request)</b> Fore = 1 required; <b>0 provided (waiver request)</b> Hancock = 1 required for residential building; 1 provided; 2 required for Hotel, 2 provided
Principal Entry Orientation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Each street has a principal entry <b>except Fore St (waiver request)</b>
Principal Entry Elevation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	All entries appear to be at grade; <b>Is retail entry on Hancock at grade?</b>
<b>Height Standards</b>					
Principal Building					
Height	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Newbury = UN 45' max – <b>show average grade for those individual buildings. Some buildings appear not to meet the height max.</b> Hancock, Mountfort, Fore = UT 65' max
Stories	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3 stories on Newbury; 7 stories on Mountfort/Fore (more info needed for bonus story); 6 stories on Hancock
Stepbacks (UT, bonus)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	15' stepbacks provided for bonus floor

Accessory Building(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Parking Standards</b>					
Surface Parking Location	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No surface parking
Garage Door Setback	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No doors, opening set back from front façade on Hancock and Fore streets
Garage Door Opening	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Opening on Hancock is 40' but not a door

## IS-FBC: Building Design Standards (BDS)

	Complies	More Info	Does Not Comply	N/A	Comments
<b>BUILDING DESIGN STANDARDS (BDS)</b>					Review (7/16/18) Caitlin Cameron, Deb Andrews, Christian Roadman; HP Advisory review on 5/16/18 and 6/6/18
<b>1. Neighborhood Context</b>					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Be mindful of the transitional nature of the site – especially on Newbury and Mountfort streets. The large office building needs to be contextual with the small-scale, residential streets and blocks that surround it. The façade composition and material placement can be used to transition this office use and larger scale – Planning Board and staff request that the scale of the Fore St building be mitigated with articulation. Newbury Street residential buildings will be good scale for transition from residential buildings across the street. Hancock Street is mostly mid-rise buildings – hotel is appropriate scale and has active frontage.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally, staff are satisfied by the proposal. Staff and HP board had additional suggestions for the residential buildings – <b>façade planes should be articulated with elements such as regular, symmetrical bay windows, entries and articulation of entries, window proportions should be taller as found in context.</b>

<b>2. Massing &amp; Proportion</b>					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Office building uses massing variation to moderate the scale in relationship with the smaller scale residential buildings surrounding. The residential buildings could use more variation in the massing – perhaps a recessed plane on the front at entries, plane change for flat roof vs. gable roof.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 2.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2 modules on Hancock for hotel building
<b>3. Articulation &amp; Composition</b>					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met on Hancock Street. <b>Planning Board and staff commented on the lack of articulation on Fore St – remains to be addressed.</b> Residential buildings add scale and activity with storefronts, entries.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Façade plane changes, overhanging cornices, massing variation. For the residential buildings with retail below – <b>retail treatment should follow standard design for storefront with a base and transom; Residential articulation should be addressed through façade relief rather than roof “pop-ups” – regular/symmetrical bays are the preferred method for these facades.</b>
Standard 3.1: 3 required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hotel: expression of structure, material changes; canopy at entry; lintels, trim, cornice Shipyards: windows added; expression of structure; <b>more emphasis on door</b> Residential 1: façade plane change; expression of structure at ground floor; trim and cornice line Residential 2: bay window; expression of structure at ground floor; trim and cornice line – <b>more bays if possible.</b> <b>Residential 3: covered entry; trim and cornice line – add bays</b> Office Mountfort: recessed entry, canopy, expression of structure, changes in material type, patterns in material Office Fore:
Standard 3.2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Standard 3.3: Blank Wall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UN: 15' max. length UT: 30' max. length
<b>4. Fenestration</b>					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Regular pattern of windows, consistency
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 4.1 (UA only)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 4.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 4.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	.61 VT required' met
Standard 4.4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Spandrel provided within curtain wall at floors – sun shading or other articulation measures required.

	Complies	More Info	Does Not Comply	N/A	Comments
<b>5. Building Materials</b>					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In the case of the residential and hotel buildings and brick portions of the office building – these intent statements are met. <b>Quality and scale intent is not met with EIFS and curtain wall detail.</b>
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hotel building has appropriate mix of brick and industrial references. <b>What kind of clapboard is proposed for residential buildings? Concern about fiber cement clapboard durability close to the ground. EIFS does not meet the standards for quality and durability.</b> Curtain wall was scaled back but lacks <b>articulation as commented by staff and Planning Board.</b>
<b>6. Building Entries</b>					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Most facades include active entries. <b>What is the nature of the office door on Newbury?</b>
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some revisions requested regarding residential entries – prominent and legible from the street. This was accomplished in Building 3. <b>Retail entries should face street on Building 2. More prominent residential entry gesture to street.</b>
Standard 6.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Principal entry for hotel on Hancock, for office on Mountfort, for residential buildings on Newbury. <b>Fore Street does not have an entrance and would require a waiver; one of the residential buildings does not have a street-facing door.</b> Office entry was revised to be more in scale with the building/more emphasis with canopies, glazing.
Standard 6.2 (UA only)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 6.3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 6.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met on the hotel/retail façade; Brewery; office building; Not met by residential Building 2 which has active ground floor space without a direct door. Side residential doors are connected to sidewalk with paths.
Standard 6.5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Standard 6.6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Slight setback; No garage doors
Standard 6.7: Frequency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	See zoning checklist and waiver requests; HP and staff review find that the residential buildings would benefit from entries on the street or that are much more legible from the street. Building 3 was revised to bring entrance facing the street.
<b>7. Roof Lines</b>					
Intent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Roof forms are not integrated design - Roof mechanical systems are <b>not integrated into a complete architectural form. Concern regarding placement and design integration, long views.</b>
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicant responded to HP board request to vary the residential roof forms and introduce a front-end gable to relate to the buildings across the street. Staff feel that flat roofs are appropriate for multi-family buildings. <b>The new “pop-up” on the third residential building is not contextual and exceeds the height limits. Overall forms do not take into account rooftop appurtenances.</b>
Standard 7.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Rooftop systems are treated as an afterthought – not integrated into roof forms or overall design. Residential roof systems are large and prominent in relationship with the scale and roof forms of those buildings.</b>
Standard 7.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>8. Structured Parking</b>					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The impact of the garage is minimized because it is internal to the lot and concealed by active building uses.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The structured parking is buried behind other buildings. Garage uses precast siding material to coordinate with the building base.
Standard 8.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 8.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 8.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 8.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	





Caitlin Cameron &lt;ccameron@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

---

## 86 Newbury - Shipyard 2nd workshop comments

---

**Lauren Swett** <lswett@woodardcurran.com>  
To: Caitlin Cameron <ccameron@portlandmaine.gov>  
Cc: Christian Roadman <croadman@portlandmaine.gov>

Thu, Jul 19, 2018 at 11:51 AM

Hi Caitlin and Christian,

The Applicant has addressed all of my comments in some form. The remaining outstanding items:

- Ability to serve approval – they have updated their requests to the utilities based on the updated site layout, but are still waiting for final approval.
- They have addressed stormwater O&M in their stormwater report, but will be providing a stormwater agreement under separate cover.
- A construction management plan figure has been provided, but the written plan has not.
- Additional design information on the green roof will be provided once building design has been completed.

The 4 comments I had originally that relate to these items will remain as unresolved in Energov. The others I had have been resolved, but I'm adding the following:

- The Applicant is waiting for additional information on the existing sewer line in Mountfort Street. They are planning to do test pits, per their plans, but have also requested as-built information from the City. Clarification of the proposed connection on Mountfort Street is needed – the note on the grading plan states that the proposed SMH 1 will receive “12” SD and existing sewer”. The Applicant should clarify if this means the line will include existing sewer from their building. If yes, separate connections should be provided for sewer and stormdrain.

Let me know if you have any questions, or need anything else from me.

Thanks,

Lauren

**From:** Caitlin Cameron <ccameron@portlandmaine.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 18, 2018 2:41 PM  
**To:** thomas.ericco@tylin.com; Peverada, John <jbp@portlandmaine.gov>; Hyman, Bruce <bhyman@portlandmaine.gov>; Tarling, Jeff <jst@portlandmaine.gov>; Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>; Robert Thompson <rmt@portlandmaine.gov>; Keith Gray <kgray@portlandmaine.gov>  
**Cc:** Christian Roadman <croadman@portlandmaine.gov>  
**Subject:** 86 Newbury - Shipyard 2nd workshop comments

[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.



Caitlin Cameron &lt;ccameron@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

---

**PL-45-2018: Shipyard Redevelopment: Site Plan Review**

---

**Bruce Hyman** <bhyman@portlandmaine.gov>

Thu, Jul 19, 2018 at 2:43 PM

To: Caitlin Cameron &lt;ccameron@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Christian Roadman &lt;croadman@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Cc: Tom Errico &lt;thomas.errico@tylin.com&gt;, Keith Gray &lt;kgray@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Caitlyn C Abbott &lt;cabbott@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Jeremiah Bartlett &lt;jbartlett@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Good afternoon, Caitlin and Christian,

The following are my comments on the Site Plan (C-101) and Grading Plan (C-103) revised plans dated 7/3/18 for the Shipyard Redevelopment for the purposes of the Workshop next week. Further comments may also be forthcoming.

My comments are the following:

- Pedestrian easements are needed for the full width of sidewalk being provided along the Newbury Street and Mountfort Street frontages
- The set of steps shown for Building A on Hancock Street are to be relocated out of the public ROW
- The Site Plan continues note 'Remove and Replace' granite curb along all street frontages - this needs to be updated to reflect the predominant use of new curb (and consolidated existing curb, if done) for a consistent, quality curb line treatment
- The Site Plan needs to show the street lighting treatments proposed (and shown on other sheets)
- The curbing symbols for Vertical Curb, Takedown Curb and Flush Curb needs to be applied consistently so an accurate appraisal of the design plan can be conducted -
  - In the proposed pocket park opposite the Abyssinian Church, please clarify the curb treatment illustrated (states "Flush Vertical Granite Curb")
- The full design of the driveway to be reconstructed on Fore Street is to be shown - a waiver may be required if the driveway width is 33' feet as indicated
- It is suggested to straighten the slight curved jog in the curb line opposite Middle Street on Hancock Street
- The raised granite tree wells on Hancock Street are to be replaced with tree grates to provide a consistent treatment as that on the lower portion of Hancock Street
- The alignment of the crosswalk across Mountfort St and the configuration of the curb ramp serving it on the west side of Mountfort Street are to be reconsidered for directness of travel along Fore Street and ADA-accessibility of the curb ramp (consider ramping down the sidewalk and having the ramp serve as the landing area - the current design would prove very difficult for a wheelchair user traveling Fore Street)
- The physical space provided for the bike racks in the two pocket parks along Newbury Street and the office building entrance on Mountfort Street appears quite insufficient for the number of parking spaces shown - the spacing between racks needs to be a minimum of 36" on center (48" preferred) with 24" of clear space on each unobstructed end and 30" minimum on an end when mounted near a wall or building. Additional individual bike racks (Bike Hitches or Downtown Racks) should be located within the sidewalk along Hancock Street in proximity to active building entrances.
- The tree well on Fore Street closest to Mountfort Street is to be eliminated - the remaining two tree wells are to be placed adjacent to the curb line
- The proposed location of the Handicapped Parking spaces on the ground floor are to be reconsidered per ADA-requirements for proximity to building entrances - in general, "Accessible spaces must connect to the shortest accessible route to the accessible building entrance or facility they serve (<https://adata.org/factsheet/parking>)" - some of the H/C parking may be needed closer to the hotel lobby, for instance, and should not have to cross the parking garage entrance - it is unclear how, or if, H/C parking requirements are being met for other parking garage levels and site uses (such as the office building).

Previous comments touched upon the need for updated Site Details which have not been provided in this newest plan set.

Do not hesitate to contact me if you or the applicant have any questions.

Best regards,

Bruce

--

Bruce Hyman  
Transportation Program Manager  
Transportation DivisionDepartment of Planning & Urban Development  
[389 Congress Street](#)  
[Portland, Maine 04101](#)  
(207) 874-8717 phone[bhyman@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:bhyman@portlandmaine.gov)  
<http://www.portlandmaine.gov/1363/Transportation-Division>  
*Yes! Transportation's Good Here ....*



Caitlin Cameron &lt;ccameron@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

---

## 86 Newbury Street - Preliminary Site Plan Traffic Comments

---

Tom Errico &lt;thomas.errico@tylin.com&gt;

Fri, Jul 20, 2018 at 9:23 AM

To: Caitlin Cameron &lt;ccameron@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Cc: Christian Roadman &lt;croadman@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Bruce Hyman &lt;bhyman@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Keith Gray &lt;kgray@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Jeremiah Bartlett &lt;JBartlett@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, "Jeff Tarling (JST@portlandmaine.gov)" &lt;JST@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Hi Caitlin – I have reviewed the application materials and I offer the following traffic comments regarding site plan details.

- The project site exceeds the number of driveways allowed by the City's Technical Standards (Two are permitted and four are proposed). I generally support the waiver but would like specific details on the truck delivery requirements (including vehicle turning templates for the proposed configuration between Hancock Street and Newbury Street) that warrant the one-way two driveway configuration for the residential units.
- The location of the driveway on Fore Street does not meet corner clearance to Mountfort Street. Given that this driveway is an existing condition and traffic volumes entering and exiting the site would not be expected to increase significantly, I support a waiver from the City's Technical Standards.
- The parking garage parking layout requires a waiver for aisle width. The City standard is 24 feet and the project is proposing 21 feet. The applicant provided a generic letter noting the adequacy of this proposed layout. I would suggest that the applicant provide specific site examples (in Maine or nearby) for review. Additionally, I will conduct a review of parking facilities in the area to assess adequacy of the project and dimensions.
- The applicant has conducted a parking demand analysis according to ITE Parking Generation rates adjusted for time-of-day usage, Shared Use Reduction (6% reduction), and Other Modes Reduction (10% for Hotel and 15% for Others). According to the analysis, the proposed land uses will generate a peak parking demand of 354 parking spaces. I generally find the method to be reasonable, but need to review adjustment factors and parking rates in detail.
- The applicant should provide dimensional details and vehicle turning templates for the Fore Street driveway. Additionally, vehicle turning templates for truck movements internal to the site and details on management of deliveries should be provided.
- Sight distance measurements from the proposed driveways should be provided.
- The construction management plan needs additional detail as it relates to restricted movements (one-way streets) and sidewalk closures. I need to coordinate this item with DPW staff and will provide direction in the future.

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

7/20/2018

City of Portland Mail - 86 Newbury Street - Preliminary Site Plan Traffic Comments

+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](http://www.tylin.com)

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

"One Vision, One Company"



Caitlin Cameron &lt;ccameron@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

---

**PL-45-2018: Shipyard Redevelopment: DRAFT Transportation Demand Management Plan**

---

Bruce Hyman &lt;bhyman@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Fri, Jul 20, 2018 at 10:50 AM

To: Caitlin Cameron &lt;ccameron@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Christian Roadman &lt;croadman@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Good morning, Caitlin and Christian,

The following are my comments on the DRAFT TDM Plan dated July 6, 2018:

- Per the ordinance provisions governing TDM, the draft TDM Plan applies to the Vet's First Choice (VFC) and Cambria Hotel components of the proposed redevelopment of the Shipyard site
- The draft TDM Plan provides a good framework for defining the transportation context for the site and mix of uses/tenants, transportation/traffic and parking demand, TDM trip and parking reduction targets and TDM strategies to meet those targets
- 
- The draft Plan provides a robust menu of TDM strategies for both employees (VFC and Cambria) and hotel guests
- The pricing of parking, and how that is pricing structured and applied, is proven to be one of the most effective ways to influence travel behavior in
  - it is unclear at this time how parking costs for employees of VFC and Cambria and hotel guests will be applied - there are provisions, for instance, for VFC employees to "cash out" their parking but it is unclear how strong an incentive this will be - it is anticipated that parking will be "free" to VFC employees (as it currently is at its downtown Portland sites) and the "cash out" will be equivalent to the cost to VFC of the parking
  -
- The extent of bus transit pass subsidies for VFC and Cambria employees is undecided ("Partial or full subsidy" stated) but transit incentives includes an unknown one-time incentive to give up parking for transit
- 
- The current vehicle trip and parking reduction targets are quite modest but call for adjustment after the first year as part of the monitoring program - it is suggested that higher initial targets be established with strengthened pricing strategies
- The draft Plan contains a good plan for Monitoring, Data Collection and Reporting

As stated earlier, the draft TDM Plan provides a solid framework within which to create a strong package of effective strategies to reduce vehicle trips and parking demand but require fine-tuning to match TDM targets to a package of strategies that are geared toward meeting or exceeding those targets.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you or the Board have any questions.

Best regards,

Bruce

--

Bruce Hyman  
Transportation Program Manager  
Transportation Division

Department of Planning & Urban Development  
389 Congress Street  
Portland, Maine 04101  
(207) 874-8717 phone

[bhyman@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:bhyman@portlandmaine.gov)  
<http://www.portlandmaine.gov/1363/Transportation-Division>  
*Yes! Transportation's Good Here ....*



To: Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer, Planning & Urban Development Department

From: Victoria Volent, Housing Program Manager, Housing & Community Development Division

Date: July 10, 2018

Subject: 86 Newbury Street – Inclusionary Zoning Conditional Use

---

All developments of ten (10) units or more are conditional uses subject to Planning Board review on the condition that they comply with the requirements set forth in Division 30, Section 14-487 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Division 30, Section 14-487, Ensuring Workforce Housing, requires at least ten percent (10%) of the dwelling units in the development shall meet the definition of Workforce Housing units for sale or for rent. The ordinance under Section 14-487 e 3 also requires the number of bedrooms in the workforce units shall be at least 10% of the total number of bedrooms in the development.

The development located at 86 Newbury Street proposes the creation of 10 rental units consisting of two (2) studio units, six (6) one-bedroom units, and two (2) two-bedroom units. As dwelling units for rent, the designated Workforce Unit will be restricted to households earning up to 100% of Area Median Income (AMI). Based on the requirements outlined in Section 14-487, the development is required to provide a minimum of one (1) workforce unit with one (1) bedroom. The Applicant has elected to provide one (1) Workforce Unit, on-site, consisting of one (1) two-bedroom unit to satisfy the ordinance's minimum requirements. As such, the project has met the minimum requirements set forth in Section 14-487.

Staff recommends the Board Approve this Conditional Use provided the Applicant and the City enter into an agreed upon Affordable Housing Agreement (AHA) before a Building Permit may be issued.

The Affordable Housing Agreement will outline the details of the affordability restrictions placed on the Workforce Unit and will be filed as covenant to the property's deed with the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds before a Certificate of Occupancy may be issued.

Sincerely,

Victoria Volent  
Housing Programs Manager