

From: "Jason Pica" <jason@portcityarch.com>
To: <JF@portlandmaine.gov>
CC: "William Savage" <wsavage@acorn-engineering.com>, "Andrew Hyland" <a...>
Date: 1/22/2016 10:58 AM
Subject: RE: Prelim review comments 31 Fore St
Attachments: 31 FORE ST - R-6 DESIGN STANDARDS 1-22-16.pdf

Good Morning Jean,

Please see attached R-6 Infill design Analysis which I believe will address many of the concerns including Setback and Height Restrictions you noted in your email below. Also note that we have had a prior meeting with Anne Machado from Portland Zoning as well as a Pre-app meeting where many of these issues were discussed. I think the Aesthetic issue that you are seeing is the Garage level which we agree is lacking articulation and design appeal. The reason it looks the way it does is that we are working with the client on 4 or 5 different options for this level, playing with materials and fenestrations. The current rendering is showing a Ship lapped or tongue and grooved cladding with the intent of having some window openings as well as trim to match the materials and fenestrations above. Unfortunately we weren't able to have this reflected on the renderings before we needed to submit the information you requested on Wednesday. I will forward you New renderings as soon as we have worked through all of the issues but please know that the Garage level final design will not look the way it currently does and will comply with the City of Portland's R-6 infill design standards. Please let me know if you need anything else to move forward towards the Planning Board Review and I will send new drawings as they are completed. Thank You and feel free to call me if you have any other issues that you'd like to discuss. Thanks

Jason Pica

Senior Architectural Designer

Port City Architecture

(E) <mailto:jason@portcityarch.com> jason@portcityarch.com

(P) (207)761-9000

(C) (207)632-3523

<<http://www.portcityarch.com/>> www.portcityarch.com

65 Newbury St

Portland Maine 04101

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Jean Fraser <JF@portlandmaine.gov <mailto:JF@portlandmaine.gov> >
Date: Jan 21, 2016 4:19 PM
Subject: Prelim review comments 31 Fore St
To: William Savage <wsavage@acorn-engineering.com <mailto:wsavage@acorn-engineering.com> >
Cc:

Hello Will

Please find below the preliminary comments, pending the receipt of additional information from your team as requested below. I do not yet have written review comments and have not been able to speak to the City Arborist regarding the street trees and landscaping, so the following comments are not comprehensive - but I am sending them now as they relate to fundamental aspects that may require some redesign.

At this stage I am not sure that the proposal meets the R6 ordinance requirements, so the timing of the PB workshop will depend on whether we can confirm compliance with the basic zoning standards as set out in 14- 139, especially regarding the height and setbacks above 35 feet. The application asserts that requirements have been met but does not include information for us to document that is the case.

Preliminary Zoning comments:

- * A zoning analysis needs to be prepared to show (referring to dimensions and showing calculations) how the proposals meet the following requirements (and the plans need to show precise dimensions, grading and contours with spot heights and setback lines; accurate elevations):
- * Minimum Front Yard Setback for Principal and Accessory Structures: 5 ft, or the average depths of adjacent front yards. (need to state how this has been met (based on the advice given to you by the Zoning Administrator)
- * Structure Stepbacks: Portions of a structure above 35 ft shall be no closer than 10 ft from the side property line and no closer than 15 feet from the rear property line when such property line abuts a residential zone. Does not apply to side yards on side streets. (show setback lines and show that building above 35 ft in height meets these setbacks- appears not to on the uphill side and maybe also at the rear. The standard relates to the scale and bulk of the building, so it would not matter what's inside that part of the building. All parts of the building need to meet these applicable setback line(s), which should be shown on the plan. Since there is another abutting building very near we would expect the setbacks to be met.)
- * Maximum Height: Principal and attached accessory structure: 45 ft (see note below)
- * Landscaped Open Space: 20%. This area shall not include parking areas or other impervious surfaces as defined in section 14-47. (so the brick patio needs to be subtracted if impervious; please show calculations) (Plan needs to show all landscape including grass)
- * Height: this would be calculated by first establishing the average proposed grade at the base of the foundation/structural wall using information from the grading plan. At the moment that plan seems to indicate (using the 4 corner numbers) an average grade of around 60', while the roof is shown at 137' 4" on the elevation, giving an average height of 77'. It would be helpful if the plans and the elevation put dimensions in the same way (either as feet and inches, or as decimal feet). Also the proposed grades shown around the base of the building on the elevations are not realistic and do not match the plans - also the south west corner is shown as 2 different proposed grades on the elevations.

* Elevations: As mentioned above these need to match the civil plans and show dimensions including for the garage door and for the height of the base level- this info is needed for the Design Review (see below)

* (info only at this stage) Draft Subdivision Plat: the submitted draft needs revisions to meet the ordinance requirements and I will send review comments when available; revisions to the plat can be done at the final review stage, so this is a lower priority issue but I wanted to mention it.

Preliminary Engineering comments:

* Grading information and contours are needed on the grading plan and need to be consistent as between plans/elevations;

* Garage stormwater discharge (from cars) needs to be treated in some way- sumps? or could be directed outside of garage? This can be subject of further discussion.

* Is patio impervious?

* Show distance from access drive to corner (Fore/Waterville) and request waiver for this as it does not appear to meet Technical standards (section 1.7.1.7). (Reviewer is likely to grant the waiver)

Preliminary pedestrian access/ADA comments:

* New housing construction must comply with the HUD Fair Housing and Maine Human Rights Act regarding ADA standards for accessible design. The architect should submit a narrative outlining how the proposals (including the access stairs from the sidewalk) meet these legal ADA requirements. We appreciate that the site is sloped and that a handicapped person living there who has a car would be able to access the elevator from the garage, but what about non car owners and visitors? By way of context, the City has been receiving complaints that new developments in Portland have been placing ADA pedestrian access at the rear or "back" doors rather than at the front and most convenient locations.

* Also note that some bike parking needs to be outside for visitors.

Preliminary Design Comments:

* There are actually two design review sections that apply- the R6 Design Standards and the multi family design standards. I have excerpted the multifamily below (note particularly re open space), and attach the R6 Standards that I believe Barbara already sent you last week as a link.

* The following comments are from a preliminary review of the proposal at 31 Fore Street under the R-6 Infill Development Design Principles & Standards:

Submittal requirements:

- material choices should be called out on the elevation

- a narrative should be provided that explains how the project fits into its context, major design decisions or considerations, and why you believe it meets the R6 design standards

Preliminary Design Comments:

Garage Level:

- Generally, there is concern about the level of articulation at the garage level of the building facing the streets. The points below are in regards to the articulation of these two facades:

- What is the material at the base of the building?

- There is a lack of articulation and visual interest - this would be improved by adding elements such as clerestory windows or increasing the landscaping.

- Consider carrying the shingle material further down the facade 6" to 12" rather than ending at the window line. This will slightly improve the composition and proportion.

- Is there a garage door? What is the material choice? Are there windows in the door?

Entrance:

- As per Standard C-1 Entrances, a side entrance is allowed but must be emphasized at the street. Improve the visibility of this main entrance with elements such as an extended canopy or porch toward the sidewalk, indication at the street with the pavers or posts/markers, lighting.

Materials:

- Why are there dark panels on the facade facing Fore Street? This requires more explanation.

* The formal design review will be undertaken once we have received the additional information requested re design narrative, dimensions, materials and zoning/setbacks

* It would help staff and the Board to understand how the proposals would fit into the context to have a 3-D rendering (photo-montage) from the corner of Fore/Waterville (so that the abutting buildings on both Fore and Waterville can be seen)- you don't need to send photos of nearby buildings.

Clearly the biggest issues- which need to be resolved first- are the setbacks at 35 feet and the overall height, as if these R6 zoning standards are not met then the proposals would need to be revised and re-submitted. In view of this, please do not count on any particular date for the PB workshop as my previous "aim for" date was based on the assumption that the proposals already clearly met zoning requirements. Having said that, I will do my best to move this review forward quickly once we have the information.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Jean

Extract re Multifamily Design Standards: (City of Portland Design Manual Adopted May 11, 2010)

(1) STANDARDS. Two-family, special needs independent living units, multiple-family, lodging houses, bed and breakfasts, and emergency shelters shall meet the following standards:

a. Proposed structures and related site improvements shall meet the following standards:

1. The exterior design of the proposed structures, including architectural style, facade materials, roof pitch, building form and height, window pattern and spacing, porches and entryways, cornerboard and

trim details, and facade variation in projecting or recessed building elements, shall be designed to complement and enhance the nearest residential neighborhood. The design of exterior facades shall provide positive visual interest by incorporating appropriate architectural elements;

2. The proposed development shall respect the existing relationship of buildings to public streets. New development shall be integrated with the existing city fabric and streetscape including building placement, landscaping, lawn areas, porch and entrance areas, fencing, and other streetscape elements;

3. Open space on the site for all two-family, special needs independent living unit, bed and breakfast and multiple-family development shall be integrated into the development site. Such open space in a special needs independent living unit or a multiple-family development shall be designed to complement and enhance the building form and development proposed on the site. Open space functions may include but are not limited to buffers and screening from streets and neighboring properties, yard space for residents, play areas, and planting strips along the perimeter of proposed buildings;

4. The design of proposed dwellings shall provide ample windows to enhance opportunities for sunlight and air in each dwelling in principal living areas and shall also provide sufficient storage areas;

5. The scale and surface area of parking, driveways and paved areas are arranged and landscaped to properly screen vehicles from adjacent properties and streets;

6. Two-family or multiple-family dwellings shall not be converted to lodging houses unless all units in the building have been vacant for at least one (1) year prior to the date conversion is sought or unless the individual multiple-family units are less than one thousand (1,000) square feet in size. In no event shall any single-family dwelling in the R-5 or R-6 zone be converted in whole or in part to a lodging house.

Jean Fraser, Planner

City of Portland

874 8728

--