



Shukria Wiar &lt;shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

---

## 161 York Street - Updated Preliminary Comments

---

Tom Errico &lt;thomas.errico@tylin.com&gt;

Wed, Jan 11, 2017 at 4:11 PM

To: Shukria Wiar &lt;shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Cc: Katherine Earley &lt;kas@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Jeremiah Bartlett &lt;JBartlett@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Lauren Swett &lt;lswett@woodardcurran.com&gt;, Jeff Tarling &lt;jst@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Hi Shukria -- The following is a update of my December 2, 2017 preliminary traffic comments.

- Curbing and sidewalk along York Street shall be extended to the limits of the westerly property boundary. Backing maneuvers onto York Street will not be permitted.

Status Update: This comment is related to the shared driveway west of the project site. The driveway shall be narrowed such that backing maneuvers cannot be easily performed. Information on how vehicles will enter and exit the two project parking spaces without backing out into York Street shall be provided.

- A driveway is provided along the easterly property boundary and I find conditions to be undesirable. This driveway should be eliminated (It is my understanding that this was a condition of approval for the abutting property).
- I support a waiver for parking aisle width given that it is less than a foot narrower than City standards, vehicle turnover is expected to be minimal, and vehicle circulation appears to be accommodated on-site.
- The driveway apron should be designed to provide a maximum cross slope of 2% along the walking route of pedestrians (pedestrian zone).
- The two end parking spaces within the garage will have difficulty in egress maneuvers. The applicant should provide information that acceptable vehicle circulation can be accommodated.
- The applicant shall document that City driveway spacing standards along York Street are met.
- The existing sidewalk or a temporary sidewalk shall be provided along the property frontage during construction. The applicant should provide details on construction activity that would impact traffic on York Street and how traffic will be managed.

### New Comment:

- Based upon the low trip generation expected from the project a Traffic Study is not required.

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

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:** Shukria Wiar, Planner  
**FROM:** Lauren Swett, PE, and Ashley Auger, PE  
**DATE:** December 7, 2016  
**RE:** 161 York Street, Preliminary Level III Site Plan Application

---

Woodard & Curran has reviewed the Preliminary Level III Site Plan Application for the proposed redevelopment project located at 161 York Street in Portland, Maine. The project involves the construction of a five-story condominium building.

### Documents Reviewed by Woodard & Curran

- Preliminary Level III Site Plan Application and attachments, dated November 8, 2016, prepared by Acorn Engineering, Inc., on behalf of York Street Redevelopment, LLC.
- Engineering Plans, dated November 8, 2016, prepared by Acorn Engineering, Inc., on behalf of York Street Redevelopment, LLC.

### Comments

- 1) The Portland City Council adopted a revised sidewalk material policy in October of this year. Per that policy, driveway aprons must match the sidewalk material. The Applicant must provide a brick apron at the York Street driveway.
- 2) The Applicant should provide evidence of Right, Title, or Interest to utilize the private way (Guilford Court) for access to the Site.
- 3) The Applicant has noted that there is an existing easement associated with the existing bituminous driveway on the northeastern side of the property. It is our understanding that this driveway was required to be discontinued as part of a prior project and the curb cut should be eliminated. The existing conditions survey notes that this driveway easement is "to be extinguished." The Applicant should clarify the intent for this space.
- 4) Per Section 13 of the City's Technical Manual, the Applicant is required to submit a Boundary Survey that has been Stamped by a Maine Licensed Professional Surveyor.
- 5) 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. However, a detail should be provided for proposed sediment barriers. The sediment barrier location appears to be on abutting property in some areas. Sediment barrier should be installed on the subject parcel or the Applicant should verify that they will have a construction easement for the work.
  - b) General Standard: The project will result in a net increase in impervious area of approximately 5,410 square feet. As such, the project is required to include stormwater management features for stormwater quality control. The Applicant has proposed an Underdrained Subsurface Sand Filter. The stormwater system is required to comply with the requirements of Chapter 7.3 of Volume III of the MaineDP Stormwater BMP Manual. In general, we are in agreement with the stormwater management approach, but we have a number of questions with regards to the stormwater modeling and design. See below for stormwater design questions.
  - c) Flooding Standard: The project will result in a net increase in impervious area of approximately 5,410 square feet. As such, the project is required to control the rate or quantity of stormwater runoff from the site. The Applicant should address the following comments as well as the comments provided below on the underdrained subsurface sand filter:



- The Applicant has utilized a direct entry of five minutes for the pre-development Time of Concentration; however, given the gradual slopes and pervious nature of the existing site, the Applicant should calculate a Time of Concentration and verify whether it exceeds five minutes.
- 6) We have the following comments on the layout and design on the stormwater filter system. Some of the design elements for this system may be specifically associated with the site's constraints, so we recommend that the Applicant consider consulting with the StormTech Manufacturer for review of the design.
- The Applicant should provide sizing calculations for the pre-treatment Isolator Row.
  - Access structures should be provided on both ends of the pre-treatment Isolator Row or indicate how maintenance will occur with the proposed layout.
  - The Applicant should clarify how stormwater runoff is intended to flow from CB-3 through the Isolator Row and Chamber system; it appears that CB-3 has an outlet to both the Isolator Row and the Chamber located over the filter area, and that larger storms will bypass the Isolator Row and flow into the Chamber. The Applicant should note that an overflow before the treatment row should be directed towards additional storage chambers, but not to the system with the sand filter and underdrain.
  - Subsurface explorations (test pits or borings) should be made within the filter area to identify depths to seasonal high groundwater and bedrock. A minimum of 1-foot of separation should be provided between the bottom of the filter and groundwater and bedrock. An impermeable liner system has been proposed.
  - The design details specify that the 4-inch underdrain be surrounded by a minimum of 6-inches of bedding, but that the underdrain system be only 12-inches thick; the Applicant should clarify dimensions.
  - We recommend that transition layers be provided between the sand filter media and the underdrain system in-lieu of the filter fabric currently specified (filter fabric is prone to clogging).
  - The Applicant should clarify how the 958 CF of provided treatment volume was derived.
  - The Outlet Control Structure appears to be much larger in diameter than necessary; the Applicant should clarify the intent for such a large structure.
- 7) The Stormwater Management Plan should include a stormwater inspection and maintenance plan developed in accordance with and in reference to MaineDEP Stormwater BMP Manual Maintenance Criteria and Chapter 32 of the City of Portland Code of Ordinances.
- 8) It appears that the Applicant is proposing to connect a field inlet to the foundation drain. This layout will likely introduce water into the foundation drain system. The Applicant should clarify the intent.
- 9) The Applicant should provide a detail for proposed field inlets.
- 10) The Applicant is proposing to connect a 12-inch storm drain to an existing 12-inch underdrain located within York Street. The Applicant should clarify the method of connection being proposed and whether a new drain manhole structure will be necessary within the City Right-of-Way. This connection will require review by the Department of Public Works.
- 11) The City of Portland Typical Pipe Trench Detail should comply with the City of Portland Technical Manual.
- 12) The Applicant is proposing a retaining wall over four feet in height. The Landscape Plan refers to the Structural Plan, which has not been received at this time, for the retaining wall design. A geotechnical evaluation of the proposed project was not submitted with the application. Has a geotechnical evaluation been performed, or are the subsurface soil types and soil bearing capacities assumed in the design of the slope stabilization / wall system? If assumed, we recommend noting those assumptions on the plans and we recommend requiring verification of those assumptions and associated calculations by the contractor and design engineer during construction.



- 13) The Applicant has noted that exterior lighting will be proposed, but cut sheets and a photometric plan have not been provided at this time. Appropriate cut sheets and a photometric plan should be provided as part of the final application in accordance with the City of Portland Technical Manual.
- 14) The Applicant has provided a letter from the Portland Water District demonstrating that there is sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. However, the Applicant should note that approval of the final plans is also required. Evidence of District approval should be provided upon receipt. The Applicant has also submitted a Wastewater Capacity Application to the City of Portland and noted that the response will be provided upon receipt.



Shukria Wiar &lt;shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

---

## 161 York Street Project - Tree & Landscape Review

---

Jeff Tarling &lt;jst@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Mon, Dec 19, 2016 at 1:43 PM

To: Shukria Wiar &lt;shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Barbara Barhydt &lt;bab@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Hi Shukria -

The Landscape Plan submitted for the 165 York Street project seem inadequate due to the lack of detail and landscape plant density typically seen in a project of this type. The landscape planting details could be better defined including plant bed structure, edges, mulch areas, non landscape areas shown in green. Additional plant density and details are suggested.

Current landscape topics -

a) Street-trees (4) located behind the sidewalk, consists of proposed 2 'Armstrong' Red Maples & 2 'Autumn Gold' Ginkgo.

Comment: both species, upright Red Maple & Ginkgo should work well and fit into the overall streetscape. Options might be best from a streetscape view if all 4 trees are similar unless this is a design intent. Tree sizes shall meet city standards of 2-2.5" for all trees & plant material. The 3.25 GAL minimum listed in the landscape plan is too small for the Ginkgo as shown. The Landscape Plan 'Street view', recommendation is for additional landscape treatment in the tree planter along the back edge of curb between the sidewalk and foundation. This could include woody or herbaceous plantings, or groundcover planted in companion to the proposed 4 street trees.

b) Landscape - the project edges appear void of landscape treatment, unknown what is planned. Building shadows might suggest woody or herbaceous plants, or groundcover hardy to shade conditions.

Fencing - additional fencing or wooden guardrail is suggested in the parking space area where landscape planting space is minimal, this would be an L shaped section from near the driveway entrance to the corner and down to near the building corner to better screen parked cars.

The proposed Juniper planting (6) should work adequately, the proposed size of 3.5 GAL is too small and should be plantd with 4-5' Height minimum is recommended. There appears to be room to plant at least 2 small ornamental trees, one on the left side near the entrance.

The extensive use of Creeping Lily Turf " shown as LS", in this section, while hardy to the conditions offers minimum landscape screening value at 12" height. It may suffice at the head of the parking spaces where winter snow load could be an issue.

Additional Green Space - the space shown for two car space parking off York Street if removed could add green space to the project.

Recommend revising / improving this section of landscape, the available green space while small for an 11 unit complex is important and should reflect landscape functions of screening to the extent possible and aesthetic interest for residents. Unknown if green infrastructure or rain gardens could be incorporated into the site plan.

c) Existing Plantings to remain - any tree / plant save areas should be

protected during construction with adequate measures. Any plant loss to be replaced with agreed upon plant types to match.

Jeff Tarling  
City Arborist - City of Portland Maine  
Parks, Recreation & Facilities Dept  
212 Canco Road  
Portland, ME. 04103  
(207) 808-5446  
[jst@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jst@portlandmaine.gov)

## Planning and Urban Development Department Planning Division

---



**Subject:** R-6 Small Infill Design Review – 161 York Street

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

**Date of Review:** Friday, December 9, 2016

---

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 161 York Street. The review was performed by Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer, Shukria Wiar, Planner, and Deb Andrews, Historic Preservation Program Manager, all within 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) and is within 100' of a historic district.

### Findings of the Design Review:

The Planning Authority under an Alternative Design Review may approve a design not meeting one or more of the individual standards provided that all of the conditions listed below are met:

- A. The 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.

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

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

*Principle A Overall Context* – Met – see below.

- **A-1 Scale and Form:** Buildings in the neighborhood with similar massing and proportion that are wider at the street use changes in massing, like the roof form and bays, to mitigate the scale and provide a pedestrian-friendly, visually interesting street presence. Of these formal and scaling elements, the project employs a pergola at the entrance, overhanging cornice at the third floor, and small balconies. **The scale is not adequately mitigated – see below for comments on articulation/massing recommendations.**
- **A-2 Composition of Principal Facades:** The composition of the street-facing facades is consistent with context in terms of using symmetrical bays (two or three bays) that are oriented to the street.

- *A-3 Relationship to the Street:* The building placement is consistent with the spacing of the residential fabric – slightly setback from sidewalk to allow for stoops and provide privacy.

*Principle B Massing – Met –* Buildings in the neighborhood with similar massing and proportion that are wider at the street use changes in massing, like the roof form and bays, to mitigate the scale and provide a pedestrian-friendly, visually interesting street presence.

- *B-1 Massing:* The basic massing is harmonious with the forms found in the context. However, the principal mass is relatively flat and is at least a story taller than is found in the context. Typically, a basic form like this will use articulation and scaling elements.
- *B-2 Roof Forms:* The roof form is flat and is found in multi-family building types nearby. **Screening of rooftop mechanics should be provided.**
- *B-4 Roof Pitch:* The roofs are monopitch/ flat roofs.
- *B-5 Façade Articulation:* **The project employs only one of the articulation elements required – covered entry. The balconies are too small to meet the required sf. Staff recommends that the design be modified to provide a more pronounced recess or projection where the balconies are currently located. Refer to 62 State Street as an example.**
- *B-6 Garages:* The garage door is very prominent – to reduce its visual impact, recess the door and reduce the amount of building lighting. The building lighting currently is accentuating the garage door only. More appropriate lighting will feature the building address and the entrance.

*Principle C Orientation to the Street – Not Met –* The mass of the building is oriented to the street but the main entrance is too far away from the street to be considered active or engaged.

- *C-1 Entrances:* **The entry is set too far back to be adequately emphasized from the street. The standard calls for a side entry to be accessed by a covered entry in the form of an arcade, porch, portico. Revision is needed to meet the standard. The entrance lobby could also be extended towards the street like an enclosed porch.**
- *C-2 Visual Privacy:* There are no living spaces on the ground floor.
- *C-3 Transition Spaces:* The entry is at the side with a pergola, the building is set back with planters.

*Principle D Proportion and Scale – Met –* The façade elements are proportionate and scaled to the overall building.

- *D-1 Windows:* The majority of windows are rectangular and have vertical proportion.
- *D-2 Fenestration:* The project appears to meet the 12% fenestration requirement and appropriately scaled to the massing of the building.
- *D-3 Porches:* **The balconies included in this project are less than 48 sf and do not meet this standard. The project uses a pergola rather than a porch.**

*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 – Not Met* – The front façade is without façade plane changes or adequate articulation methods.

- *F-1 Articulation:* Cornice and balcony details will create shadow lines on front façade. Remove the “dentals” shown at the 4<sup>th</sup> floor cornice. More information is needed about the window reveals.
- *F-2 Window Types:* Three window types at street façade. The ground floor windows imply living spaces – revise to reflect garage (smaller, higher windows, or use of grates).
- *F-3 Visual Cohesion:* The visual cohesion of the façade is good – one siding material proposed.
- *F-4 Delineation between Floors:* The floors are delineated by belt courses, entry pergola, and a cornice line.
- *F-5 Porches, etc.:* Balcony railings are used to provide articulation and shadow lines to the front façade. Multilevel balconies or bays are needed to meet standard B-5.
- *F-6 Main Entries:* The main entry is requires more emphasis.
- *F-7 Articulation Elements:* A cornice is provided at the fourth floor and appear to be at least 6”; no other façade offsets are provided. To meet standard B-5, either recesses or bay projections of at least 12” are required on the front façade.

*Principle G Materials – Met* – The material choices are placed according to their nature.

- *G-1 Materials:* The residential context is predominantly clapboards with occasional shingle or brick.
- *G-2 Material and Façade Design:* The materials are appropriately placed according to their nature – the topmost floor once recessed according to zoning may want to use a lighter, more recessive material.
- *G-3 Chimneys:* Not applicable.
- *G-4 Window Types:* Three window types on street façade.
- *G-5 Patios and Plazas:* Not applicable.