

# 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
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"/>	
	<b>Complies</b>	<b>More Info</b>	<b>Does Not Comply</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Comments</b>
(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 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. Applicant will need to submit Building Permit drawings that show the 50% requirements are met.</b> 50% Lot Area = 46,887sf req 50% Roof Area = 35,631sf req; <b>33,009sf proposed</b>
(d) Parking Standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No surface parking, no garage doors facing street
<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 and principal entries added.
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 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 – zoning variance from ZBA</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 residential building; 3 buildings provided; 1 required for office building; <b>0 provided (waiver request)</b> Mountfort = 2 required; <b>1 provided (waiver request)</b> Fore = 1 required; 1 provided 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 Newbury Street (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 except the commercial entrance on Hancock/Newbury.
<b>Height Standards</b>					
<b>Principal Building</b>					
Height	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Newbury = UN 45' max 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 ( <b>more info needed for bonus story</b> ); 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 (9/17/18) 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Generally, staff are satisfied by the proposal. Staff and HP board had additional suggestions for the residential buildings – differentiate the commercial entrances from the residential design; better proportions of solid to void on the bays with design detail/panels.
<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. Residential buildings vary in roofline, form, plane changes.
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met on Hancock Street. Planning Board and staff commented on the lack of articulation on Fore St – addressed through floor delineation, shading and brackets; buildings add scale and activity with storefronts, entries.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Façade plane changes, overhanging cornices, massing variation. For the residential buildings with retail below – retail treatment revised; Residential articulation provided through bays, storefront
Standard 3.1: 3 required	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hotel: expression of structure, material changes; canopy at entry; lintels, trim, cornice Shipyards: windows added; expression of structure; emphasis on door 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 – more bays added. Residential 3: covered entry; trim and cornice line , bays 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Spandrel provided within curtain wall at floors – sun shading or other articulation measures added.

	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.</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> Extent of curtain wall was scaled back – articulation provided with cornice line/bracket details and delineation of floors with spandrel – <b>what is spandrel material and what level of reveal? What is the level of reveal and detail on the hotel facade?</b>
<b>6. Building Entries</b>					
Intent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Most facades include active entries.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some revisions requested regarding residential entries – prominent and legible from the street. This was accomplished in Building 3. <b>Commercial entries should differ in character from the residential entries.</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.</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Met on the hotel/retail façade; Brewery; office building; Residential buildings now all have a direct entrance facing the street. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Roof forms are now simple on the residential buildings – any future rooftop appurtenances will require an amendment and will need to meet the standards for integration of building systems.
Guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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.
Standard 7.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rooftop systems cannot be treated as an afterthought. Residential mechanical systems were moved to the side/rear of building. If future rooftop appurtenances are proposed, the parapet should be raised to integrate the screening/form.
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"/>	



---

## 86 Newbury Street

---

Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>

Wed, Sep 12, 2018 at 10:14 AM

To: Caitlin Cameron <ccameron@portlandmaine.gov>, Christian Roadman <croadman@portlandmaine.gov>

Hi Caitlin and Christian,

I have looked at their most recent submissions. They have addressed my prior comments. The outstanding items are:

- Final PWD ability to serve
- Final stormwater maintenance agreement (they've submitted a draft)

I discussed the project with one of our electrical engineers about underground electrical lines. Based on the limited info, he couldn't really say whether they could or could not go underground – he said it is dependent on what else is around the project. He noted that it looks like there are a lot of other overhead services across the street from the project that would need to be addressed. He also confirmed that when the electrical line is put underground at the street, there are three poles required in order to do that.

If you have any questions, 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](mailto:lswett@woodardcurran.com)

\*Licensed in Maine and Wisconsin

Commitment & Integrity Drive Results

[www.woodardcurran.com](http://www.woodardcurran.com)

---

## 86 Newbury Street - Final Site Plan Traffic Comments

---

Tom Errico <thomas.errico@tylin.com>

Wed, Sep 19, 2018 at 3:51 PM

To: Caitlin Cameron <ccameron@portlandmaine.gov>

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

Hi Caitlin – I have reviewed the application materials and offer the following final 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.

**Status: The applicant has noted that the residential driveway will also serve small truck deliveries. Given site operations and the desire for deliveries to take place off-street, I support a waiver from City Technical Standards for the number of driveways.**

- 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.

**Status: The subject driveway is an existing driveway and has not exhibited any safety or operational problems. While traffic activity is expected to increase, I support a waiver from the City's Technical Standards given area conditions and providing off-street truck loading.**

- 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.

**Status: The applicant has provided supporting information for the waiver request. In addition, I conducted a field review of two Portland garages (Gateway and Spring Street) that have reduced parking dimensions as compared to City Technical Standards. Based upon my review of the project, site limitations, and that many vehicles parking in the proposed garage will be long duration parkers, I support a waiver from City Technical Standards. Given my review of existing constrained parking garages, it is recommended that the parking spaces be marked for a 17-foot stall depth, resulting in a 23-foot aisle width.**

- 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.

**Status: The proposed parking garage (380 parking spaces) will adequately accommodate the proposed project assuming shared use and multi-modal reductions. I would note that the parking generation assumptions generally were suburban type sites sampled and thus may have included a higher percentage of automobile trips – thus supporting the reduced parking numbers. Additionally, the TDM Plan is intended to aggressively implement measures for reducing vehicle trips, which is consistent with the reductions assumed in the parking demand estimate.**

- 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.

**Status: The applicant has provided the requested information and I find conditions to be acceptable. I have no further comment.**

- Sight distance measurements from the proposed driveways should be provided.

**Status: The applicant provided the requested information and I have no further comment.**

- 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.

**Status: I suggest a condition of approval be included that the details of the construction management plan be provided for review and approval prior to the issuance of any City permits.**

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](mailto:thomas.errico@tylin.com)

Visit us online at [www.tylin.com](http://www.tylin.com)

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

"One Vision, One Company"

---

## Final Comments -Re: PL-45-2018: Shipyard Redevelopment: DRAFT Transportation Demand Management Plan

1 message

---

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

Thu, Sep 13, 2018 at 4:20 PM

To: Caitlin Cameron <ccameron@portlandmaine.gov>, Christian Roadman <croadman@portlandmaine.gov>

Good afternoon, Caitlin and Christian,

I find that the revised TDM Plan (dated July 31, 2018) is responsive to my comments submitted prior to the Planning Board workshop. I will look to the information that is provided relative to the request for parking allocations amongst tenant uses to see how the peak parking demand estimates in the TDM Plan align with the parking supply.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you require additional information or review comments.

Best regards,

Bruce

On Fri, Jul 20, 2018 at 10:50 AM, Bruce Hyman <bhyman@portlandmaine.gov> wrote:

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 ....*

--

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: August 2, 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