
MEMORANDUM

To: FILE
From: Nell Donaldson
Subject: Application ID: 2013-179
Date: 8/1/2013

Comments Submitted by: Tom Errico/Traffic on 7/31/2013

I have reviewed project details and offer the following preliminary comments.

- Eaton Traffic Engineering conducted a trip generation analysis associated with both the overall Bay House Developments (Phases I & II). The results of the analysis indicate the overall combined project is expected to generate 77 PM peak hour trips, with 15 trips associated with the Phase II development. Based upon this estimate the project will not require a Traffic Movement Permit.

- The project will be providing 42 parking spaces for 39 residential units. In excess of one parking space per unit will be provided and accordingly the project meets City standards.

- The proposed driveway location does not meet City separation standards. The applicant shall formally request a waiver from the technical standards with supporting documentation.

- The proposed driveway width does not meet City standards (it is slightly narrower than the minimum standard). I support a waiver from the technical standard given the response provided by the applicant and the low traffic volumes expected from the project.

- Several parking space dimensions do not meet City standards. The applicant shall formally request a waiver from the technical standards with supporting documentation.

- Changes to on-street parking regulations will be required on Newbury Street and possibly Hancock Street. The applicant will be required to provide application materials for the City Council packet that requests a traffic schedule change to the parking regulations.

- The applicant shall provide a construction management plan for review and approval. The plan shall provide details on how both vehicles and pedestrians will be routed through the construction area and where contractor employees will park.

- Based upon prior project approvals in the area, the applicant will be expected to make financial contributions to improvements at the India Street/Middle Street intersection and to an East End Traffic Monitoring Study. The Phase I project contributed \$5,000 to each effort and therefore this project would be expected to contribute significantly less. I will provide an estimate in the future.

MEMORANDUM

To: FILE
From: Nell Donaldson
Subject: Application ID: 2013-179
Date: 8/1/2013

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Best regards,
Thomas A. Errico, PE
Senior Associate
Traffic Engineering Director
T.Y. Lin International/T.Y. Lin 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

Comments Submitted by: Marge Schmuckal/Zoning on 7/25/2013

This project is located in the B-2b zone. 39 residential dwelling units are proposed and permitted in the B-2b zone. The land area of 435 sf per dwelling unit is being met. The given parking requirements are shown on the plans and exceed the 1 to 1 parking requirement on the peninsula. Setbacks are apparently being met. Graphic bar scales are not on the plans as required under the electronic submission requirements. I can not scale the elevations for height compliance. And I want to confirm my setback measurements that appear to be met.

The bB2b zone states that there is a maximum of 90% impervious surface as a requirement. Based upon the given information on the Project Data sheet, the project will have 90.2% impervious surface which is over the maximum allowed. The project must be revised to meet the maximum allowed impervious surface.

All HVAC equipment shall meet the maximum noise standard of the B-2b zone. Any submission for a permit shall contain all noise data giving readings in decibels.

I will await revised plans to advance my comments.

Marge Schmuckal
Zoning Administrator

MEMORANDUM

To: FILE
From: Nell Donaldson
Subject: Application ID: 2013-179
Date: 8/1/2013

Comments Submitted by: Marge Schmuckal/Zoning on 7/30/2013

I have reviewed additional plans down loaded into our system on 7/29/2013. On page 5 of 12 there is a note that shows how the project is meeting the impervious surface maximum of 90%. The given lot size on this sheet (30,282 sf) is different from the filled out site plan data sheet which states the lot size is 30,492 sf. The proposed given impervious surface is different again in the same two locations. I would want the applicant to confirm the actual lot size and the final proposed impervious area on the site so I can determine compliance with the Ordinance.

I did not see revised building elevation plans with a graphic scale for me to confirm the actual building height. I will need that information before signing off.

Marge Schmuckal
Zoning Administrator

Comments Submitted by: Jeff Tarling/City Arborist on 7/31/2013

Landscape comments for Bay House Phase II:

Street trees - would like to review the tree pit planting details, tree grates?

Parking area - review possible alternatives to using groundcover 'Vinca Minor' (VM) while a good groundcover, are their plant options that might provide more interest, screening? (I haven't seen the fence detail or perspective looking at the project from this viewpoint), the plant list could include shrub or herbaceous plants, ornamental grasses...

The proposed Amur Corktree, (PA) should be sized to meet landscape standard of 2" for ornamental trees vs the proposed 6-8' H. Tree options could include Katsura, Three-flower Maple, Tupelo, Korean Mt Ash... Phellodendron's in Portland have all tended to be really slow growing and much less in stature then Southern New England, a 30 year old specimen in Lincoln Park is only about 20' in height with a dbh of 17" !

Rain-planter - Are there opportunities to create a rain planter along the parking lot edge or other 'green' stormwater feature?

Other landscape options - Green wall or landscape treatment for any blank walls or slope areas such as Hancock Street view is recommended.

MEMORANDUM

To: FILE
From: Nell Donaldson
Subject: Application ID: 2013-179
Date: 8/1/2013

Comments Submitted by: David Margolis-Pineo/Civil Engineering on 8/1/2013

To: Nell Donaldson
Barbara Barhydt
From: David Margolis-Pineo
Re: Review Comments – Bayhouse II – 40 Hancock Street

The Department of Public Services has the following preliminary review comments for the above mentioned project.

1. Please add note to sheet 11 stating that all work within the street right of way will conform to City of Portland Technical Manual standards.
2. All catchbasins proposed for this project will have “The Snout” or approved equal install on the outlet pipe.
3. There are two catchbasins on the upper side of Hancock St at the intersection of Newbury St. The applicant is requested to connect those two basins to the proposed stormwater drainage system.
4. Due to the close proximity of the proposed stormwater drainage system to the existing water lines, it is requested that these plans be shared with the Portland Water District for review. Also it is requested that a profile of the proposed stormwater system be submitted for review and approval.
5. Several shown details differ from the City’s Technical Standards. The Engineer is requested to update the project details with the City’s current Technical Standards.
6. The survey plan requires a profession’s stamp and currently are not acceptable. Note 8 states, “Boundary information shown hereon is approximate until the research has been updated.” When the property survey is complete, please re-submit. Also please be aware that property corners are to be set, and Maine State Plane Coordinates are required.
7. Sheet 2 of 12 submitted with the Phase II project dated 7-26-13 does not match Sheet 1 of 1 submitted on 7-13-13. Please clarify and re-submit.
8. All submitted plans require a Professional Engineer’s stamp.
9. Proposed street lights shall meet City of Portland district lighting standards and shall have an electrical meter for City ownership.
10. Due to the expected disturbance of a substantial portion of the sidewalk along Newbury and Hancock Streets to construct buildings, foundations/footing along the property line, and to avoid a patch job of old and new brick to fill in existing driveway cuts to be eliminated, the City is requesting that all brick sidewalk along Phase II be the Pinehall Paver brick, the City’s current standard. The removed brick can be used to fill sidewalk voids on Newbury St which were created by the Phase I project. The transition from old to new brick would be at the proposed driveway cut to Phase II.
11. The proposed driveway access to Phase II does not City standard for separation from another driveway, 20’ as measured at the property line. If the applicant wishes to maintain this proposed location, a waiver is required. If a waiver is granted, there will need to be a discussion with city staff on how the drive aprons and use of brick in between the drive cuts will be placed.
12. It has been observed that the sidewalk and ramps on the corner of Hancock and Newbury adjacent to the applicant’s site has been removed. Before approval by this Department, the applicant shall show on the plans how the proposed ramps and street crossings will be constructed.
13. It appears that a portion of the proposed new sidewalk will be placed on the applicant’s property. Is the applicant agreeable to giving the City an access easement to use this sidewalk?
14. It is understood that all existing curb cuts to the applicant’s property will be closed with vertical curbing and brick sidewalks and only one drive cut is proposed off Newbury St.

Please be aware that these comments are preliminary only and additional comments may be forth coming.