



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

Twitter | Facebook | LinkedIn | Google+

"One Vision, One Company"



Shukria Wiar <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>

24 St. Lawrence Street

Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>
To: Shukria Wiar <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>

Thu, Jun 21, 2018 at 11:36 AM

Hi Shukria,

I have reviewed the geotechnical evaluation provided for 24 St. Lawrence. I have no issues with what has been provided, pending their final foundation design and construction practices following what is described in the report, the project shouldn't cause any problems.

All of my other other prior comments have been addressed.

If you have any questions, or need any other information, let me know.

Thanks,

Lauren

Lauren Swett, P.E.*

Technical Manager

Woodard & Curran

[41 Hutchins Drive](#)

[Portland, Maine 04102](#)

Phone: (207)558-3763 (direct)

(207)219-3591 (cell)

(800)426-4262 (office)

Email: lswett@woodardcurran.com

*Licensed in Maine and Wisconsin

Commitment & Integrity Drive Results

www.woodardcurran.com



Shukria Wiar <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>

24 St Lawrence - Updated Geotech

Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>
To: Shukria Wiar <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>

Fri, Jul 13, 2018 at 10:02 AM

Hi Shukria,

I've taken a look at the updated Geotech report, and I don't have any comments.

Thanks,

Lauren

From: Shukria Wiar <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2018 8:54 AM
To: Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>
Subject: Fwd: 24 St Lawrence - Updated Geotech

[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.

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: Wednesday, July 18, 2018

A design review according to the *City of Portland Design Manual* Standards was performed for the revised proposal for 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 passes all of the criteria of the R6 Alternate Design Review – please refer to comments below.

Revisions include:

- Central parapet wall was returned on sides
- Bay details revised including cornice profile, panel, brackets
- Juliet balconies added to first two floors on front introducing a third window type to the front facade

Design Review Comments (*red text denotes principles or standards that are not met; Bold = new review comments*):

Appendix 7: R-6 Infill Development

Principle A Overall Context –Met – see below.

- *A-1 Scale and Form*: Context: Of the larger multi-family buildings in the neighborhood, 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 shifting the building to have a side driveway giving more space between this building and the neighbor, varying the massing, lowering the height where possible. In addition, the project was revised to bury the garage thus creating a three-story building, reducing the scale impact. The mass is varied with a plane change/massing variation at the front circulation core and the addition of a bay window in the central bay. The roof form is a flat roof with has some variation in the parapet to give hierarchy to the façade.
- *A-2 Composition of Principal Facades:* The façade composition was revised to be symmetrical and now follows the typical three-bay composition. The revised façade composition creates three vertically oriented bays and places hierarchy at the middle entrance bay. Previously, the façade composition was impacted by placement of all the circulation at the front façade with no living space facing the street – this was revised and living spaces now face the street on the upper floors above a half buried garage/basement level.
 - *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 now follows the pattern of building placement on the lot and the spacing of the residential fabric in this neighborhood. The ground floor was revised to be buried and is now raised a partial story more in line with typical residential development patterns. The floor plans and building height were revised to allow living space on the front façade.

Principle B Massing – Met – The building was revised to reduce the width on the street; though the building is wider than the traditional multi-family buildings, the project varies the massing to create more vertical proportions that are contextual with the vertical facades in the streetscape. The roofline has also been varied to give hierarchy to the façade and provide additional variation and emphasis on the vertical rather than horizontal.

- *B-1 Massing:* The building massing was revised to create three bays and emphasize the entry and vertical circulation tower. These design gestures create massing that is broken down into scale and proportions similar to the multi-family buildings found in context.
- *B-2 Roof Forms:* The proposed flat roof form is in keeping with the traditional multi-family building types found in the context. **The jog in the roofline at the central portion is not a roofline found in context** – in this case it is necessary to house the circulation and is also used as a massing variation to give hierarchy to the entry.
- *B-3 Main Roofs and Subsidiary Roofs:* The roof forms are flat, **however, there are multiple levels to the roof whereas the context typically has simple roof forms. In this case, the changes in roof lines provide positive elements such as massing variation, hierarchy, and to respond to zoning setbacks, but does not create a true main roof with subsidiary roofs.**
- *B-4 Roof Pitch:* Flat roofs are allowed provided there is a 12” cornice.
- *B-5 Façade Articulation:* The project employs a covered entry, recessed entry, and a bay window.
- *B-6 Garages:* The garage is on the ground floor but has been buried and the door is on the side of the building thus making it less obvious on the street and bringing the living spaces down closer to street level.

Principle C Orientation to the Street – Met – The project appropriately provides a sense of transition and privacy for the residential uses. The ground floor parking is partially buried into the site with the side drive and garage entry now on the side and rear of the property. This positions the living space of the building closer to the street and creates a similar relationship to the traditional residential buildings with a basement and raised first floor. The building was lowered on story thus removing the need for two circulation towers – this has allowed for more active living space on the front façade and improves the relationship to the street.

- *C-1 Entrances:* The main entry is emphasized by directly facing the street, placement of the bay as a canopy, and prominent door design with sidelites and lighting.
- *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, recessed entry, and a vestibule for transition space.

Principle D Proportion and Scale – Met – The building is wider than the traditional buildings but successfully creates proportions on the front façade typically found in the context (usually a discernable vertical proportion). Individual building elements are human-scaled.

- *D-1 Windows:* The majority of windows are rectangular, vertically proportioned.
- *D-2 Fenestration:* The project appears to meet the 12% fenestration requirement and appropriately scaled to the massing of the building.
- *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. The façade was revised to be symmetrical.

- *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 Symmetry:* 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, bay window, and recessed entry with canopy.

- *F-1 Articulation:* The design uses dimensional trim, bay window, and the texture of the material to provide surface articulation and visual interest.
- *F-2 Window Types:* **Three 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. Otherwise, the windows and board provide some delineation of the upper floors.
- *F-5 Porches, etc.:* n/a
- *F-6 Main Entries:* The main entry is emphasized with prominent placement facing the street and a “canopy” provided by the bay, recessed entry.
- *F-7 Articulation Elements:* It appears the rake of the roof meets the 6” requirement; trim is provided at the windows, ground floor, and cornice; offsets in the principal façade are at least 12”.

Principle G Materials – Met – The material choices are contextual and fine-grained.

- *G-1 Materials:* The residential context is predominantly clapboards with occasional shingle or brick. The clapboard is an appropriate, fine-grain material in keeping with the context. Brick at the ground floor is logical and grounds the building. Wood panel is used in feature locations such as the bay window and bay is also consistent with the traditional treatment.
- *G-2 Material and Façade Design:* The materials are appropriately placed according to their nature – brick base and clapboard above.
- *G-3 Chimneys:* Not applicable.
- *G-4 Window Types:* **Three 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 – Met – See R-6 comments above.

Standard 2 – Met – The building sits close to the street with a slight front yard setback buffer consistent with residential architecture in this neighborhood. The building was revised to follow the established pattern on the street with the building uphill and a side driveway downhill. The residential units are slightly above the ground floor to preserve privacy and in keeping with the typical pattern of a masonry water table and raised ground floor.

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 is now on the side of the building away from the street.

Standard 6 – Not Applicable



Shukria Wiar <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>

24 St. Lawrence Street

Robert Thompson <rmt@portlandmaine.gov>
To: Shukria Wiar <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>

Thu, Jun 28, 2018 at 3:18 PM

Hi Shukria,

As you requested, I've reviewed the latest site plan (V.3) for the proposed project at 24 St. Lawrence Street. Based on the submitted site plan, the Fire Department's concern regarding the access to the means of escape for neighboring buildings has been eliminated.

Our guide for Development Review specifically states 'The new building shall not affect the egress or required Fire Department access for the neighboring building'. In this case, Fire Department access would be by portable ground ladder, carried between the buildings, and extended to the windows of 20 St. Lawrence Street. This is the tactic we would utilize if there were a fire in the neighboring building as it currently exists. It's my understanding that a deck will protrude from the second floor of the proposed building. Based on the height of the balcony, and required angle of the ground ladder, there is no concern about our ability to perform firefighting operations with the new site plan.

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

Thank you,
Chief Thompson

--

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