



Shukria Wiar <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>

---

## 24 St. Lawrence Street - Final Traffic Comment

---

Tom Errico <thomas.errico@tylin.com>

Fri, Feb 9, 2018 at 5:06 PM

To: Shukria Wiar <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>

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

Hi Shukria – I have reviewed the application materials and I find the project to be acceptable from a traffic engineering perspective. I would note that the driveway width, apron detail and separation to the nearest driveway to the north meet City Technical Standards. On-site parking and circulation is also acceptable.

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

Twitter | Facebook | LinkedIn | Google+

"One Vision, One Company"

## MEMORANDUM



**TO:** Shukria Wiar, Planner  
**FROM:** Lauren Swett, P.E. & Loren Joyce, E.I.T.  
**DATE:** February 1, 2018  
**RE:** 24 St. Lawrence Street, Level III Site Plan Application

---

Woodard & Curran has reviewed the Level III Site Plan Application for the proposed development located at 24 St. Lawrence Street in Portland, Maine. The project involves the demolition of an existing building containing two (2) single family units and construction of a five (5) unit condominium with a six (6) car parking garage at the ground level.

### **Documents Reviewed by Woodard & Curran**

- Level III Site Plan Application and attachments, dated October 9, 2017, prepared by Acorn Engineering, Inc. on behalf of Kelly & Walter Williams.
- Plan Sheets 1-14, dated October 6, 2017, prepared by Acorn Engineering, Inc. on behalf of Kelly & Walter Williams.

### **Comments**

- 1) In accordance with Section 5 of the City of Portland Technical Manual, a Level III development project is required to submit a stormwater management plan pursuant to the regulations of MaineDEP Chapter 500 Stormwater Management Rules, including conformance with the Basic, General, and Flooding Standards. We offer the following comments:
  - a) Basic Standards: Plans, notes, and details have been provided to address erosion and sediment control requirements, inspection and maintenance requirements, and good housekeeping practices in accordance with Appendix A, B, & C of MaineDEP Chapter 500.
  - b) General Standards: The project will result in a de minimis increase in impervious area of approximately 543 square feet. As such, the project is not required to include any specific stormwater management features for stormwater quality control. We encourage the Applicant to review the City's Stormwater Service Charge Credit Manual (available online) to evaluate whether they may want to incorporate stormwater quality treatment measures that qualify for a future Stormwater Service Charge credit.
  - c) Flooding Standards: The project will result in a de minimis increase in impervious area of approximately 543 square feet. As such, the project is not required to include any specific stormwater management features to control the rate or quantity of stormwater runoff from the site.
- 2) General Comments:
  - a) A backflow preventer should be provided on the foundation drain connection to the sewer.
  - b) Per Chapter 2 of the City's Technical Manual, when services 8 inches or greater in size are connected to the main, they should be connected via a manhole structure.
  - c) Notes should be added to the plan to coordinate retirement of existing services with the respective utilities. It is noted that for the retirement of a sewer service, a permit is required, and the Sewer Maintenance Division must be on site for the work.
  - d) The Applicant has received an Ability to Serve approval letter from the Portland Water District. The Applicant should ensure that any changes to the utility plan are reviewed again by PWD as necessary. It's noted that the layout and location of gate valves and tapping sleeves does not appear to be in accordance with the PWD standards.

## Planning and Urban Development Department Planning Division



**Subject:** R-6 Small Infill Design Review – 24 St. Lawrence Street

**Written by:** Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer

**Date of Review:** Friday, March 16, 2018

A design review according to the *City of Portland Design Manual* Standards was performed for the proposed new construction of a multi-family dwelling at 24 St. Lawrence Street. The review was performed by Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer, Shukria Wiar, Planner, along with Jeff Levine, Department Director, all within the Planning Division of the Department of Planning & Urban Development. The project was reviewed against the *R-6 Small Infill Development Design Principles & Standards* (Appendix 7 of the Design Manual) as well as the *Two-family, Special Needs Independent Living Units, Multiple-family, Lodging Houses, Bed and Breakfasts, and Emergency Shelters* (Section I of the Design Manual).

### Design Review Criteria:

The project was reviewed with the Alternative Design Review which has the following criteria:

- A. Proposed design is consistent with all of the Principle Statements
- B. The majority of the Standards within each Principle are met
- C. The guiding principle for new construction under the alternative design review is to be compatible with the surrounding buildings in a two-block radius in terms of size, scale, materials, and siting, as well as the general character of the established neighborhood, thus Standards A-1 through A-3 shall be met.
- D. The design plan is prepared by an architect registered in the State of Maine.

### Findings of the Design Review:

The proposed design **does not pass** all of the criteria of the R6 Alternate Design Review – please refer to comments below.

- **Label the materials on the elevations; clarify discrepancy between materials on elevations and renderings**
- **Provide a design narrative that explains how the proposal meets the design standards.**
- **Project exceeds the 60% lot coverage**

### Design Review Comments (*red text denotes principles or standards that are not met*):

#### Appendix 7: R-6 Infill Development

*Principle A Overall Context* –**Not Met** – see below.

- *A-1 Scale and Form*: **The building scale is larger than most buildings on this street which is exacerbated by the placement of the circulation on the front and by creating a broad front façade without a proportionate open space buffer on the sides.** Of the larger multi-family buildings in the neighborhood, usually the scale is mitigated either by building only 3 stories or if building 4 stories, a narrower, vertical proportion is used. In

- those rare instances where a larger scale, wider building has been built, the scale is mitigated by keeping wider setbacks as a buffer and through elements such as bay windows, balconies and porches, varied rooflines, and/or massing changes at the street. Some scale mitigation has been achieved by varying the massing, lowering the height where possible, and varying materials. **Staff suggests that massing and programmatic changes should be made to mitigate the bulk and scale of this project – the roof form could be modified to further reduce the scale impacts. It appears the proposed project exceeds the maximum Lot Coverage.**
- *A-2 Composition of Principal Facades:* The façade composition, though providing local symmetry and windows to accentuate the massing variation, **does not follow the typical two or three-bay composition.** The façade composition is largely impacted by placement of all the circulation at the front façade with no living space facing the street. **The current façade composition places hierarchy at the corner with a “tower” but that does not correspond to the main entrance of the building.**
  - *A-3 Relationship to the Street:* The street wall is maintained and building placement in relationship to St. Lawrence Street is consistent with the neighboring properties. **The project deviates from the pattern of building placement on the lot and the spacing of the residential fabric in this neighborhood.** The ground floor is raised a whole story which is higher than typical residential development patterns but common for contemporary projects – this elevated living space is created by the ground floor garage. There is no living space on the ground floor beyond the entrance foyer.

*Principle B Massing – Not Met* – There is **concern about the bulk and mass of the building** compared with the size of the lot and the established patterns on the surrounding streets. **The building is larger in scale than what is found in the context in both height and width of the building.** The massing is reflective of the program arranged to place all circulation facing the street. The project does vary the massing which is encouraged.

- *B-1 Massing:* **The proposed mass is wider on the street than the typical building context.**
- *B-2 Roof Forms:* The proposed flat roof form is in keeping with the traditional multi-family building types found in the context.
- *B-3 Main Roofs and Subsidiary Roofs:* Met – there is a clear main roof form.
- *B-4 Roof Pitch:* The standard requires that mono pitched roofs shall not have a pitch of less than 7:12.
- *B-5 Façade Articulation:* The project employs a covered and recessed entry.
- *B-6 Garages:* The garage is attached, the door is slightly set back from the front façade and includes living space above. The garage door is less than 40% of the building width.

*Principle C Orientation to the Street – Partially Met* – The project appropriately provides a sense of transition and privacy for the residential uses, **however, the ground floor minimally reinforces a sense of the public realm** –there is a recessed, covered entry facing the street **but no ground floor living space to enhance the pedestrian friendliness and sociability of the streetscape as desired in this principle statement.**

- *C-1 Entrances:* The main entry is emphasized with the canopy and recess.
- *C-2 Visual Privacy:* Visual privacy is adequately addressed; all living spaces are above the ground floor.
- *C-3 Transition Spaces:* The project uses a canopy and a vestibule for transition space.

*Principle D Proportion and Scale* – Partially Met – **The proportion of the front façade is not one typically found in the context which is usually a discernable vertical proportion.** Individual building elements are human-scaled.

- *D-1 Windows:* The majority of windows are rectangular. Windows in the stair towers are square, but the other window type has a vertical proportion, **though different size and proportion from what is found in the context.**
- *D-2 Fenestration:* The project appears to meet the 12% fenestration requirement and appropriately scaled to the massing of the building. The front façade is predominantly circulation space, rather than living space - this program rationalizes the use of smaller, square windows.
- *D-3 Porches:* Not applicable

*Principle E Balance* – Met – The building façade composition creates a sense of balance with good use of overall and local symmetry and articulation of façade materials.

- *E-1 Window and Door Height:* The majority of window and door head heights align along a common horizontal datum.
- *E-2 Window and Door Alignment:* The majority of windows shall stack so that centerlines of windows are in vertical alignment.
- *E-3 Symmetricality:* Primary window compositions are arranged symmetrically around discernable vertical axes.

*Principle F Articulation* – Met – Articulation is provided through material and trim texture, changes in façade planes, and recessed entry with canopy.

- *F-1 Articulation:* The design uses dimensional trim and the texture of the material to provide surface articulation and visual interest.
- *F-2 Window Types:* Two window types are used.
- *F-3 Visual Cohesion:* The visual cohesion of the façade is good.
- *F-4 Delineation between Floors:* The ground floor is delineated with a different material and trim board. Otherwise, the windows and board provide some delineation of the upper floors.
- *F-5 Porches, etc.:* The stoop and canopy are well integrated into the overall design.
- *F-6 Main Entries:* The main entry is emphasized with prominent placement facing the street, the use of a canopy, and a recess. **The secondary entrance should continue to be subsidiary to the main entrance, but could be a nicer door with glass or similar considering its placement so close to the street.**
- *F-7 Articulation Elements:* It appears the rake of the roof meets the 6” requirement; the trim details are not clear but trim is provided at the windows, ground floor, and cornice; offsets in the principal façade are at least 12”.

*Principle G Materials* – Information Needed – **There is a discrepancy between the materials depicted in the elevations and the renderings. Provide material labels on the elevations.** The material choices are contextual and fine-grained. Material placement should be used to help mitigate the scale of the building.

- *G-1 Materials:* The residential context is predominantly clapboards with occasional shingle or brick. The shingle and clapboard are fine-grain materials in keeping with the context. Brick at the ground floor is logical and grounds the building. **Staff question the use of brick on the four-story “tower” as being too heavy.** Clapboard or shingle is recommended.

- *G-2 Material and Façade Design:* The materials are appropriately placed according to their nature, except there is some concern about carrying the brick for the full four stories at the corner of the building. The material placement helps break down the façade composition, however, the ground floor delineation and change in material does emphasize the width of the building.
- *G-3 Chimneys:* Not applicable.
- *G-4 Window Types:* Two window types are used on the front façade.
- *G-5 Patios and Plazas:* Entrance areas use brick and concrete.

***(i) Two-family, Special Needs Independent Living Units, Multiple-Family, Lodging Houses, Bed and Breakfasts, and Emergency Shelters (red text denotes standards that are not met):***

*Standard 1 – Partially Met* – See R-6 comments above.

*Standard 2 – Partially Met* – The building sits close to the street with a slight front yard setback buffer consistent with residential architecture in this neighborhood. However, the established pattern on this street is the building placed uphill with a sideyard driveway downhill. This spacing is very common in the R-6 context – the proposed project occupies the full width of the lot with building and places the driveway and garage in the center of the lot.

*Standard 3 – Met* – The project provides balcony space for each dwelling unit.

*Standard 4 – Met* – The project has a high level of fenestration and the provision of balconies also contributes to residents’ access to light and air. Storage is provided within each unit.

*Standard 5 – Met* – The parking is structured and screened from view. The garage door meets the zoning for maximum width.

*Standard 6 – Not Applicable*

---

---

**MEMORANDUM**

---

---

**To:** FILE

**From:** Shukria Wiar

**Subject:** Application ID: 2017-242

**Date:** 3/22/2018

---

**Comments Submitted by: Robert Thompson/Fire on 2/5/2018**

This building will be required to be sprinkled. Sprinkler connection to be at the front of the building.

**Comments Submitted by: Robert Thompson/Fire on 2/5/2018**

Street address shall be marked on the street side of the structure and shall be as approved by the City E911 Addressing Officer.

**Comments Submitted by: Robert Thompson/Fire on 2/5/2018**

Fire Department access to the proposed building is sufficient.

**Comments Submitted by: Robert Thompson/Fire on 2/5/2018**

There are adequate fire hydrants in the area.

**Comments Submitted by: Robert Thompson/Fire on 2/5/2018**

The new building shall not affect the egress or required fire department access for the neighboring building