



PLAN CORRECTIONS REPORT PL-000153-2018 FOR CITY OF PORTLAND

PLAN ADDRESS: 208 Fore St
Portland, Maine 04101

PARCEL: 029 N008001

APPLICATION DATE: 6/1/2018

DESCRIPTION: Construction of a 7-story, 37-unit residential building with commercial space on the first floor

REPORT DATE: 8/10/18

CONTACTS

Name

Company

Agent/Representative

Michael Tadema-Wielandt, PE

Terradyn Consultants, LLC.

Corrections Required

Civil Engineering - Third Party Reviewer

Lauren Swett

- 1 A significant retaining wall is proposed adjacent to the driveway. A geotechnical evaluation should be provided with consideration of the wall design in this area, and a wall design stamped by an engineer will be required.
- 2 The Applicant should provide additional design details for the proposed green roof.
- 3 The proposed driveway grades are very steep. The Applicant should address whether the significant changes in grade at the top and bottom of the ramp are acceptable for vehicles at these locations.
- 4 The Applicant is proposing to install a new catch basin in the street (CB-2), and has shown the building roof drain and sump pump connecting to this catch basin. Stormwater from the site should not tie directly to the catch basin, and should instead connect with a wye to the stormdrain pipe to be installed in the street. Additionally, please clarify what the sump pump will be draining. If this is parking drainage, the sump pump should discharge to an oil/water separator and to the sewer.
- 5 The silt fence on the sides of the property should be extended to the sidewalk to ensure that there is no erosion of sediments onto adjacent properties.
- 6 The Applicant's construction management plan figure identifies the driveway as the area used for "material storage and laydown." No other laydown areas are identified, and a construction entrance through the proposed fence has not been shown. Please address the timing of the use of this space relative to the grading and installation of columns in the area. The plan should show the construction entrance. In addition, the construction fence is shown at the outside edge of the sidewalk in front of the building. Temporary pedestrian access around the project site (i.e. crosswalks to opposite side of street and appropriate signage) should be provided.
- 7 The driveway entrance to the basement-level parking is very steep, with a trench drain at the base of the driveway prior to the garage entrance. Please provide a detail of the trench drain and ensure adequate size for collection of stormwater. It is noted that the trench drain is connected to the basement drainage sump. The Applicant should address how this sump system will work, in particular address the capacity to ensure that there will not be a back-up in the winter when there are freezing temperatures. An ice/snow management plan should be developed for the driveway.

Planning

Christian Roadman

- 1 Provide scale bar on pervious diagram
- 2 Potential Bradbury Court easement does not appear to be maintained on site plan. Please clarify / explain this approach, or revise plans to provide adequate access
- 3 Provide manufacturer's information on mechanical parking system
- 4 Provide a stamped and signed subdivision plat

- 5 Note snow storage areas on site plan
- 6 37 residential units require 37 street trees or approved alternative (including payment into City street tree fund). Please confirm applicant intends to pay \$14,800 (37 x \$400) or identify alternate approach
- 7 Applicant could consider obtaining long-term parking leases with adjacent lots or accessing the site via one of the surrounding properties to facilitate a different parking / driveway design.
- 8 Ensure decks do not encroach more than 2' into setback requirements – see especially proposed decks on the west side of the building
- 9 Application documents state that bicycle parking (storage) will be handled internally, but no such room or infrastructure is identified on site / floor plan. An exterior rack, or racks, also seem warranted given the building's proposed program and location
- 10 Please consider potential storm surge impacts in the proposed project and potential ensuing impacts on underground parking (<https://coast.noaa.gov/floodexposure/#/map>).
- 11 All proposed lighting shall be full cutoff and shall be in compliance with Section 12 of the City's Technical Manual
Confirm proposed lighting, especially proposed light sconce, conforms to full cut-off requirement
- 12 Application notes intention to pay fee instead of providing three required parking spaces. Please confirm this is still the case.
- 13 Roof extension above bonus floor may not conform to zoning requirements; this item requires further review / input from zoning staff
- 14 Provide average site grade documentation / calculations, as well as spot elevation grades for building corners. This is necessary to confirm propose building conforms to height standards
- 15 Significant concern exists regarding proposed 19.4% driveway slope. Please consider alternate options.
- 16 Loading / servicing areas are not clear, especially considering the location of the trash room and retail uses. Can applicant provide clarity regarding intended retail uses?

Transportation/Planning

Bruce Hyman

- 1 Widen sidewalk along project extent shown on Sheet C-3.0.
The sidewalk width shown is to be widened by removal and resetting/new curb to create as near to 7' minimum sidewalk for the extent shown on Sheet C 3.0 Site Plan. The curb-to-curb width is to be adjusted to 31', allowing for on-street parking on the opposite side (19' to centerline) and a 12' curb-to-centerline on the project side.

1. Street Address shall be clearly marked on the front of the building and building sign as approved by the Fire Department.
2. There are adequate fire hydrants in the area.
3. If the existing overhead utilities are relocated underground, as indicated in the submitted documents, the Fire Department is satisfied with building access.



To: Christian Roadman Planner, Planning & Urban Development Department

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

Date: August 7, 2018

Subject: 208 Fore 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 made available as part of the development.

As an alternative to providing workforce housing units, developers shall pay a fee-in-lieu of some or all of the units. The fee for affordable units not provided shall be \$100,000 per unit, adjusted annually in the same way as the fee under Division 29 for Housing Replacement. The calculation of dwelling units not provided will be calculated on a fractional value to one tenth. For example, if a developer prefers to pay a fee-in-lieu on a proposed 37unit project, the developer would be required to pay 3.7 times the adjusted fee of \$104,699. The in-lieu fee shall be paid into the Housing Trust Fund as defined in Sec. 14-489, on or before the date upon which a certificate of occupancy is issued.

The project located at 208 Fore Street proposes the creation of 37 dwelling units of owner-occupied housing. The Applicant has chosen to fulfill the inclusionary zoning requirements by paying a fee-in-lieu. The proposed project would thus be required to pay a total fee of \$387,386 into the City's Housing Trust Fund in-lieu of the creation of actual housing units for workforce households. Should at a later date any change in total unit count be considered, a revised proportional fee-in-lieu payment will also be required. As such, the project has met the minimum requirements set forth in Sec. 14-487.

Staff recommends the Board Approve this Conditional Use provided the Applicant agrees to pay a fee-in-lieu of \$387,386 into the City's Housing Trust Fund before a Certificate of Occupancy may be issued. The Applicant and the City may enter into a written agreement to codify this requirement and a Certificate of Compliance may be issued by the Planning Authority at the Applicant's request once the full payment has been received by the City.

Sincerely,

Victoria Volent
Housing Program Manager

208 Fore Street - Preliminary Traffic Comments

Tom Errico <thomas.errico@tylin.com>

Thu, Aug 9, 2018 at 3:53 PM

To: Christian Roadman <croadman@portlandmaine.gov>

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

Hi Christian – I have reviewed the application materials and offer the following preliminary traffic comments.

- The applicant shall conduct a trip generation estimate during the weekday PM peak hour for use in determining a monetary contribution amount for future improvements to Franklin Street.
- Given project details, the project would not be expected to have a significant impact on traffic mobility and safety. I will provide final comments on this following review of the trip generation estimate.
- Sight distance measurements from the proposed driveway shall be provided.
- Details on the mechanical parking system shall be provided.
- I have reviewed the current driveway configuration and do not support the use of a median island (a design that is for a suburban context rather than urban) for entry and exit movements. I would also note that the 9-foot one-way alternating flow concept is not acceptable.
- Information on truck deliveries for the commercial uses shall be provided.
- The driveway grade is a significant concern and would note the following:
 - From a design perspective, the driveway design seems to meet general engineering guidelines. The applicant should confirm that the grade-break transitions do not create vehicle/pavement scuffing.
 - I am concerned with the interaction between vehicles exiting the site on a steep grade and pedestrians on the sidewalk. When considering many factors particularly acceleration on a steep incline and building corner sight obstruction, pedestrian safety is a concern. While the project includes a system to keep the ramp ice/snow free, a challenging driving environment will be present. Greater detail is required on driveway operations particularly sight distance for motorists leaving site.
 - As noted above the project will be installing a system to ensure the driveway will not have snow and ice. Maintenance of this system will be critical to ensuring safe conditions. Information on the system should be provided.

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"

Development Review Checklist

IS-FBC

Level I / Level II / **Level III** / Master Plan
 Project Name: _____
 Address: __208 Fore Street_____
 Description: Alteration / Addition / **New Construction**
 Date Received: __8/7/18_____
 Planner: __Caitlin Cameron_____
 Subdistrict UN / **UT** / UA

IS-FBC: Building Design Standards (BDS)

	Complies	More Info	Does Not Comply	N/A	Comments
BUILDING DESIGN STANDARDS (BDS)					Review (8/2/18) Caitlin Cameron, Deb Andrews, Christian Roadman
1. Neighborhood Context					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The project is located next to surface parking lots and across from a contemporary building. Therefore, the project relationship to the context is evaluated as seen in long views to India Street, Commercial Street, and especially the historic fabric in the neighboring Eastern Waterfront District – this project will be visible behind those buildings and from India Street. The project meets the intent around spatially defining the street wall (where currently there is very little), reinforces the distinction between public and private space (the sidewalk is quite narrow here), and promotes active ground levels. Where revision is requested is finding ways to tether the project to its context and provide more concrete references and relationships to that fabric within view – some of this is accomplished through the vertical proportions of the brick portions of the building, there are clear fenestration patterns, and delineation of floors, the horizontal details serve as a contemporary interpretation of lintels.
Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Because the building is not immediately adjacent to existing fabric, contextual

					relationship is most strongly established with through fenestration patterns, articulation, and material choices rather than scale, form, or massing. The more rectilinear, brick portions of the building relate to the simple, traditional brick buildings nearby with flat roofs, regular window patterns, and vertical proportions. In this case, the scale is larger than those older buildings in the context. Where this project differs from the context characteristics is the complexity of form and roof form. Staff advise the material palette be revised to a red brick, warm tones to better relate the building to its context given that the form differs from the traditional patterns.
2. Massing & Proportion					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The building is maximizing the allowed scale and height, therefore, scaling elements are critical – the project uses storefront, massing variation, building overhangs, and articulation to provide that sense of enclosure, human scale to the larger masses. The project does not use traditional scale, proportions but also does not have any buildings immediately adjacent allowing more flexibility.
Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The rectilinear, brick portions of the building relate in form and proportion to the context (though bigger in scale). The scale of the building is mitigated through massing variation that also creates vertical proportions in the building façade.
Standard 2.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
3. Articulation & Composition					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The design creates visually interesting facades, accommodates pedestrian scale and comfort, avoids long stretches of blank walls, and includes some scale patterns that relate to adjacent buildings (lintels, fenestration patterns). Articulation elements also correspond to massing changes and uses.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Structure is expressed, articulation elements and material placement correspond to

					massing and façade plane changes; ground floor is clearly expressed; blank facades avoided.
Standard 3.1: 3 required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Expression of structure; projections include balconies, roof overhang; some entries recessed; changes in materials; changes in plane and reveal at windows. Glass railings questionable here – more fine-grain and compatible detail needed.
Standard 3.2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Building appears to use at least 1" variation in material transitions.
Standard 3.3: Blank Wall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Blank wall is less than 30'
4. Fenestration					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project successfully provides active, visible ground floor interaction with storefront; Double-height glazing does not appropriately reflect the building uses.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	High level of transparency at street interface; variety of detail and articulation provided to give relief and visual interest and depth to the façade; window patterns provide rhythm to the façade but uses a contemporary scale, spacing, and dynamic pattern creating the visual interest; storefront appropriate for conveying use on ground floor; revise double-height storefront.
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	What is VT of glass? .61 VT min required
Standard 4.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vision glass used throughout

	Complies	More Info	Does Not Comply	N/A	Comments
5. Building Materials					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Project uses human-scale material modules such as brick, panel, storefront.
Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Revision is requested to relate the materials to the surrounding context – the context is defined by simple material palettes and a predominance of red brick. The lower floors use high quality, durable materials except for the case of the fiber cement panel – address the durability concerns with fiber cement close to the ground . Ground floor successfully uses storefront, depth of material and reveals, building overhangs to provide sense of enclosure, scale.
6. Building Entries					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Entries provided on all street facade.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Residential entrance should be distinct from the retail entrances. More emphasis needed on residential door.
Standard 6.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Principal entrance (residential) faces Fore St.
Standard 6.2 (UA only)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 6.3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Entrances direct to sidewalk.
Standard 6.4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Active uses all have direct door to street.
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"/>	Setback far from front facade
Standard 6.7: Frequency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	At least one entry is required on Fore façade (1 UT)
7. Roof Lines					
Intent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Circulation tower is minimized in the design. Where will rooftop mechanicals be located? These must be integrated within a complete architectural form.
Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally, sense of termination provided except for India Street view; Simplify and

					integrate building systems – long views to this building must be considered.
Standard 7.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	More information requested regarding rooftop systems. Building systems shall be incorporated into the building form – some systems do not appear to be integrated.
Standard 7.2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Roof forms follow massing, but is complex and would not be considered simple from some views.
8. Structured Parking					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The impact of the garage is minimized by being underground.
Guidelines	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The structured parking is underground and has no exposure on the facades.
Standard 8.1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 8.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other than the ramp, the garage is concealed
Standard 8.3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Standard 8.4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Garage does not appear to be convertible to active space – underground, low ceilings



Christopher C. Branch, P.E.
Director of Public Works

Date: July 26, 2018

Re: Wastewater Capacity Authorization

Address: 208 Fore Street
Applicant: Ted Hovivian, 56 Bogart Street, LLC

Planner: Christian Roadman

Anticipated Wastewater Flow:

Estimate of Anticipated Design Flows				
Development	Unit Size	Number of Units	Gallons per Day per Unit	Total Gallons per Day
Proposed flow				
Employees at place of employment with no showers	# Employees	4	12 GPD/Employee	48
Multiple Family Dwelling Units	1-Bedroom	13	120	1560
Multiple Family Dwelling Units	2-Bedroom	11	180	1980
Multiple Family Dwelling Units	3-Bedroom	13	270	3510
Net Change				+ 7098
*Values based on STATE OF MAINE: SUBSURFACE WASTEWATER DISPOSAL RULES, most recent edition				

Comments:

The Department of Public Works, which includes the Water Resource Division, have reviewed and determined that the downstream sewers from the project address have the capacity to convey the estimated dry weather wastewater flows which will be generated from this development.

If the City can be of further assistance, please contact me at all 874-8840 or brad@portlandmaine.gov

Sincerely,
CITY OF PORTLAND

Bradley A. Roland, P.E.
Senior Project Engineer

CC:

Jeffrey Levine, Director, Department of Planning and Urban Development, City of Portland

Stuart O'Brien, Planning Director, Department of Planning and Urban Development, City of Portland

Barbara Barhydt, Development Review Services Mgr., Dep't. of Planning and Urban Development, City of Portland

Keith Gray, City Engineer/Engineering Manager, Portland Department of Public Works

Nancy Gallinaro, Water Resources Manager, Portland Department of Public Works

Ben Pearson, Compliance Coordinator, Portland Department of Public Works

John Emerson, Wastewater Coordinator, Portland Department of Public Works

Lauren Swett, Woodard & Curran, DPW Development Review

Scott Firmin, Director of Wastewater, Portland Water District

Charlene Poulin, Wastewater Chief Operator – Systems