



Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

---

## 23 Ocean Avenue plat

---

**William Clark** <wbc@portlandmaine.gov>  
To: Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

Thu, Oct 13, 2016 at 4:16 PM

Hi Nelle,

Looks like Don Dostie nailed it. Plan dated 10/11/16 is great.

Thanks,

Bill

[Quoted text hidden]



Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

---

## 23 Ocean Avenue - Final Traffic Comments

---

Tom Errico <thomas.errico@tylin.com>

Fri, Oct 21, 2016 at 9:36 AM

To: Helen Donaldson <HCD@portlandmaine.gov>

Cc: Jeremiah Bartlett <JBartlett@portlandmaine.gov>, Katherine Earley <kas@portlandmaine.gov>, Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>, Jeff Tarling <jst@portlandmaine.gov>

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

- The applicant is requesting a waiver for parking lot aisle width (21 feet versus the City standard of 24 feet). The applicant should provide documentation that supports the waiver request.

**Status: Following a review of vehicle turning template information and revisions to the parking lot layout, I support a waiver from the City's Technical Standards.**

- I find the driveway location and configuration to be acceptable given existing site conditions.

**Status: I have no further comment.**

- The applicant should provide a summary of the anticipated trip generation increase expected during the AM and PM peak hours following project completion. While I do not expect the project to significantly impact the public street system, I do believe documentation of traffic volumes changes is necessary.

**Status: The applicant has provided an estimate of trip generation. As noted the project is expected to generate 6 new peak hour trips in the morning peak hour and 7 new peak hour trips during the afternoon peak hour. This level of trip generation is not expected to impact traffic operations and safety and therefore I have no further comment.**

- The applicant should provide a review of safety data in the immediate vicinity of the project.

**Status: A review of crash data was conducted by the applicant and that analysis indicated that there are no High Crash Locations in the vicinity of the project site. I have no further comment.**

- I would prefer that backing maneuvers onto Hersey Street not be required and thus the applicant should either provide a layout that allows for on-site vehicle circulation – for head-out egress, or supporting documentation on the proposed circulation condition.

**Status: The applicant has provided information that demonstrates on-site circulation can be accommodated. I have no further comment.**

- A pedestrian easement will be required at the Ocean Avenue/Hersey Street intersection (a portion of the sidewalk is located on the applicants property).

**Status: The applicant concurs with this request. I have no further comment.**

- A detail for the driveway shall be provided that notes that the cross-slope shall not exceed 2%.

**Status: The plans have been revised and I have no further comment.**

- The plans do not include full replacement of the sidewalk on Ocean Avenue along the entire property frontage. The applicant should either include full sidewalk replacement or document justification for the current proposal.

**Status: The plans have been revised and I have no further comment.**

- Further review of the sidewalk ramp configuration is required. I would suggest that a fully ADA compliant ramp be provided on the opposite side of Hersey Street.

**Status: The applicant shall upgrade the sidewalk ramp on the opposite side of Hersey Street to meet ADA requirements. The applicant shall submit plans to the City for review and approval. I would note that the City recognizes the right-of-way limitations at the subject corner and will assist the applicant in design development.**

- The applicant is proposing to meet parking demand needs via leased parking spaces off Woodford Street west of Forest Avenue. Given on-street parking regulations, it is my professional opinion that occupants of the project site will park on Hersey Street given parking availability and convenience. Recognizing this factor, the applicant should provide a detailed parking demand and supply management plan that realistically proposes parking conditions. I would note that I'm open to the idea of shared parking given site uses, if it works from a management perspective. Further coordination and review on this subject is needed.

**Status: The applicant has provided updated information regarding parking supply/demand analysis, off-site parking, and how parking will be managed. My comments are noted below:**

- I generally find the parking generation analysis to be reasonable and would expect a parking demand of 18 to 21 vehicles, without the consideration of share parking.
- I support the concept of shared parking for this project and thereby a reduced parking supply given proposed land uses. Based upon the information provided by the applicant and information from the Urban Land Institute, I would estimate a peak parking demand of 16 to 18 parking spaces. The applicant is providing 9 parking spaces on-site and has an agreement in place for up to 6 parking spaces on Vannah Avenue, for a total of 15 parking spaces. I would suggest that the applicant conduct a monitoring study at the time of full occupancy and determine if 15 spaces is sufficient. If parking demand is greater than expected, the applicant shall provide additional off-site parking that meet actual demand. I would suggest that the Woodford Club site, as originally proposed, be formally agreed to as a back-up site.
- I support the location of the off-site parking lot on Vannah Avenue. For it to be fully accessible by pedestrians to and from the site, the applicant shall construct a missing sidewalk section on the north side of Vannah Avenue near the proposed parking lot. The applicant shall submit plans to the City for review and approval.
- The applicant has provided a parking management plan for the site. I am concerned that implementation will not be easily enforced, particularly as it related to early morning and late afternoon time periods when the residential and office uses are likely to conflict. I would note that the applicant has noted that TDM will likely impact trip and parking generation (for which I agree), but it is also likely that the residential uses may leave their cars all day, while walking or biking to work destinations. I would therefore suggest that the monitoring study also include a review of the parking management plan and necessary adjustments. I would suggest that the monitoring study be closely coordinated with the Planning Authority.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Thomas A. Errico, PE  
Senior Associate  
Traffic Engineering Director

**TYLIN**INTERNATIONAL

12 Northbrook Drive

Falmouth, ME 04105

207.781.4721 (main)

207.347.4354 (direct)

207.400.0719 (mobile)

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](#) | [YouTube](#)

"One Vision, One Company"

Please consider the environment before printing.

## MEMORANDUM



**TO:** Nell Donaldson, Planner  
**FROM:** Lauren Swett, PE  
**DATE:** October 21, 2016  
**RE:** 23 Ocean Ave, Level III Site Plan Application

---

Woodard & Curran has reviewed the Level III Site Plan Application for the proposed redevelopment located at 23 Ocean Avenue. The project includes the construction of a new mixed use building and associated site improvements.

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

- Level III Site Plan application response to comments and attachments, dated September 8, 2016, prepared by Kevin Moquin and Ransom Consulting, Inc., on behalf of owner Steven and Roberta Cope.
- Stormwater calculations, dated October 12, 2016, prepared by Ransom Consulting, Inc., on behalf of owner Steven and Roberta Cope.
- Project plans, dated September 2, 2016, prepared by Kevin Moquin, Ransom Consulting, Inc., and Carroll Associates Landscape Architects, on behalf of owner Steven and Roberta Cope..

### **Comments** (*Comments in italics are repeated from previous memos*)

- 1) *The Applicant has submitted a City of Portland Wastewater Capacity Application. The Applicant should note that they will be required to provide evidence of capacity to serve and approval of the proposed design from the City of Portland.* Applicant has acknowledged and the capacity to serve will be provided when available.
- 2) 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 Standard: 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 Standard: The project is required to include stormwater management features for stormwater quality control. A roof drain cartridge filter and an underdrained soil filter will be utilized to provide stormwater treatment on the site.
  - c) Flooding Standard: The project is required to include stormwater management features to control the rate or quantity of stormwater runoff from the site. The Applicant will be discharging a portion of the site's stormwater to the combined sewer in Ocean Avenue. The site does not discharge to this location in the existing condition; however, the Applicant has discussed this condition with Public Works, and the connection will be allowed. Stormwater from the site will be collected as part of a future City sewer separation project. As a result of this connection, the stormwater discharge to Hersey Street will be reduced, providing an improvement over the existing condition on Hersey Street.
- 3) All other comments have been addressed at this time.



Helen Donaldson <[hcd@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:hcd@portlandmaine.gov)>

---

## 23 Ocean Avenue (2016-150) and 1945 Congress (2016-075)

---

**Keith Gautreau** <[kng@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:kng@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Helen Donaldson <[hcd@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:hcd@portlandmaine.gov)>

Mon, Jul 11, 2016 at 2:48 PM

All set!

On Mon, Jul 11, 2016 at 9:23 AM, Helen Donaldson <[hcd@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:hcd@portlandmaine.gov)> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Keith Gautreau, Assistant Fire Chief  
Fire Prevention Bureau  
Community Outreach Branch  
Portland Fire Department  
380 Congress Street  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207)874-8409  
[kng@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:kng@portlandmaine.gov)

## Planning and Urban Development Department Planning Division

---



**Subject:** B-1 Design Review – 23 Ocean Avenue

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

**Date of Review:** Wednesday, September 28, 2016

---

23 Ocean Avenue was reviewed against *the B-1 Commercial Business Zones Standards* (Section (d) 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 Standards* (Section (i) of the Design Manual).

### **Design Review Comments:**

#### ***(d) B-1 Commercial Business Zones***

*Standard (1) a. Urban Street Wall* – Met - Project is located on or near the property line and creates strong street walls on all street-facing facades.

*Standard (1) b. Mixed Uses* – Met - Project is both mixed-use and multi-storied.

*Standard (1) c. Building Entrances* – Met - Principal office and residential entrances are side-facing but accessible from both sidewalks as required by the standard. The applicant was asked to add stronger visual cues to indicate the entrances, especially from the corner approach and indicating ADA route – the applicant added canopies and revised the materials of the ground floor to reflect its commercial use. Staff asked applicant to explore whether office entrance could be moved to face street or corner; applicant found this to be infeasible.

*Standard (1) d. Windows* – Met - The upper story windows were modified to align as requested to distinguish the residential from the commercial use and reflect residential patterns found in the context. The project uses office windows at the street corner with a picture window at the ornamental stair – these provide some indication of activity. The most active windows are placed interior to the block as an approach to the office entrance.

*Standard (1) e. Façade Character* – The commercial office use is placed adjacent to public sidewalk. Staff requested the ground floor façade character at the corner be made more active with a stronger orientation to the street. The applicant chose to modify the materials and roof line to emphasize the corner but fenestration was not revised. The more active office-front and entrance begin down the street and wrap the building corner interior to the block.

*Standard (1) f. Building Design* – Met - The proposed building is in a transitional parcel between residential and commercial zones and the context, even the residential streets, varies in massing, scale, and roof line. Overall, the building design is contemporary but compatible with

the surrounding context in its character, scale, and roof pitch. The portion of the building adjacent to the residential neighborhood continues to have clapboard materials and a three-story scale, a flat roof, and regular fenestration patterns using rectangular, vertically proportioned windows. As the building reaches the corner, the roof line and materials were revised to angle and provide emphasis at the more commercial corner approach.

*Standard (1) g. Building Materials – Met -* Materials at the ground floor include brick and fiber cement panel (a recent revision to differentiate the commercial ground floor use from the residential above). The upper floors remain metal cladding but metal is a fine-grain scale similar to clapboard with a matte finish. The materials in Woodfords is eclectic, though metal cladding is not common. The residential buildings in the context are predominantly clapboard with the occasional shingle. The metal proposed will be similar to clapboard in appearance. The applicant preferred metal for its durability and maintenance.

*Standard (1) h. Building Scale – Met -* The building scale, only three stories, is compatible with the two and three-story residential buildings in nearby. The commercial buildings immediately adjacent are one story.

*Standard (1) i. Landscaping and Buffers -* See notes from Planner.