



PORTLAND MAINE

Strengthening a Remarkable City, Building a Community for Life • www.portlandmaine.gov

Planning & Urban Development Department
Jeff Levine, AICP, Director

Planning Division
Alexander Jaegerman, FAICP, Director

December 17, 2012

Mr. Greg Shinberg
Shinberg Consulting
477 Congress Street, Suite 102
Portland, Maine 04101

RE: Maritime Landing Project (Federated Companies) – Plan Comments

Greg,

This letter is intended to provide City staff comments on the Maritime Landing concept plan presented at our meeting with the Federated development consultant team on December 5th. We received one copy of the plan at that meeting while additional copies were distributed to the City on December 10th. The reviewed plans were prepared by DeLuca Hoffman Associates. Public Services notes that the plans are conceptual so comments are very preliminary until more detail can be provided. Also a soil analysis study is expected to be undertaken shortly which may further inform our initial comments. Public Services may have additional comments beyond those outlined in this letter, so we will forward review comments to you as soon as we receive them. Note that these comments are based on that version of the plan and do not reflect any changes you may have made to it since that time that may respond to some of these comments.

Based on our discussion at the December 5th meeting these comments will focus on “ground” issues associated with the project.

1. **Plan Clarity:** The plan indicates a number of ramps, landings, retaining walls and grading changes. As presented, these improvements are at times difficult to visualize given the conceptual nature of the plan. It would be helpful if representative profiles (cross sections), as well as a description of these improvements, were submitted so that staff can provide more thoughtful comments on these improvements. All of the various review staff members need to be able to visualize the changes and understand whether the proposed approach is appropriate for the context and challenges of the site, including the design’s level of simplicity or complexity.

The developer has obviously taken to heart the need for pedestrian access into the first floor of buildings. How this is all integrated into a cohesive pedestrian friendly streetscape is important.

2. **Bayside Trail Fill:** An extensive amount of fill is proposed over the existing Bayside Trail. This will require disrupting existing trail improvements (such as pavement, pavers, lighting) including remediation efforts that were constructed less than three years ago. Have you considered other alternatives that would reduce or eliminate the amount of fill over the existing trail? If so, please describe? Obviously we would like to minimize impacts on the trail.

Please indicate how much fill is proposed over the trail on your present plan. Have you developed a cost estimate for filling as well as the costs associated with reconstructing the trail to its current level of amenities?

3. **Bayside Trail Retaining Wall:** The retaining wall shown along the northerly property line of the trail adjacent to the DHS/Planet Fitness parking lot is very close to the property line. Any grading or temporary construction easements that may be required from the abutting property owner will likely be problematic. The property owner has had extensive conversations with the City in the past concerning trail construction activities undermining the stability of the fence and or the adjacent slope. Also how high is the proposed retaining wall and what type of material are you considering for the wall? The City recommends that the preferred design not include a retaining wall.
4. **Shifting of Buildings into Trail Space:** The revised plan shows shifting proposed buildings over the subdivision lot lines and into the trail space.

East of Chestnut Street... With the limited depth of lots east of Chestnut Street, we expected the parking garage would need some additional elbow room beyond the existing lot lines. As indicated in my email of 11/27/2012, we recommended that the depth of parking garage be minimized to a depth of less than 124 feet. We would like to explore with you modified parking layouts (please share the proposed layouts that you are considering), to see if one might result in a slightly reduced building depth.

The 10 foot building setback for the garage and residential buildings may be a key ingredient in helping provide handicap access into the buildings, but the dimensions of the buildings also need to be efficient in terms of minimizing their impact on trail space.

West of Chestnut Street... The lots in this section of the subdivision are deeper (140 feet) than the lots east of Chestnut Street. While we agree that a 10 foot building setback may make sense in terms of grade issues and pedestrian comfort, this was apparently accomplished by shifting the building 10 feet into the trail space. We prefer the development stay within the subdivision lot lines and not intrude into the trail space. Relocating the lot lines 10 feet results in the removal of the berm which contains contaminated material and is part of the Maine DEP remediation approval of the site. Obviously the removal of contaminated material from the site requires environmental regulatory review along with associated costs.

5. **Vehicle Access On The Trail:** Except for emergency vehicles and City maintenance vehicles, the Bayside Trail is intended for pedestrian and bicycle use only. The plan shows

vehicles entering the trail through an alley between the parking garage and a residential building and exiting through the future Pearl Street footprint. As discussed at our meeting, alternative ways of providing service circulation should be explored.

6. **Pearl Street:** The plan shows an extended sidewalk within the projected Pearl Street right-of-way. The extension of Pearl Street from Somerset Street to Marginal Way is a key part of the circulation plan for Bayside. Since we will likely need a paved road width of 28 or 32 feet, the sidewalk area needs to be reduced to accommodate this width and the plan should better accommodate the future layout of the street right of way. We would prefer that this portion of Pearl Street be constructed as much as possible as part of your development., in order to reduce the need to modify interim conditions. In addition, the plan shows a retaining wall along the easterly edge of Pearl Street. How tall is the retaining wall?
7. **Pedestrian Access Alleys:** Your plan has two alleys between the building that connects the Bayside Trail to Somerset. These alleys are a good part of your overall site plan. It was explained at our meeting that the pedestrian access alleys on both sides of the parking garage will have mountable curbs and allow some type of vehicle traffic. These alleys are intended to replace a central pedestrian access lane to the trail that runs between lots 6 and 7 and can help improve the livability of the area.

Generally, however, access lanes to the trail are intended for pedestrian or bicycle use, not vehicles. The use of these lanes on a daily basis for truck deliveries or other vehicle use is potentially troublesome. Options for deliveries from the street or possibly within the garage should be explored. If service access must be provided from these alleys we will have to have additional discussion to determine how such access would not detract from the pedestrian nature of these connections.

8. **Chestnut Street Alterations:** The submitted Chestnut Street plan for this area needs further exploration to determine the best design in terms of pedestrian access, vehicle flow, pedestrian amenities and streetscape elements that reinforce Chestnut Street as a gateway to the Federated project and the Bayside neighborhood. I would anticipate further discussion on this.

The concept plan shows some significant changes to Chestnut Street. The island has been reconfigured resulting in a decreased width. The travel lanes have been decreased from 18 feet to 16 feet. The curb line is being relocated on both sides. Retaining walls are shown on both sides of Chestnut Street (110 feet and 130 feet respectively). The sidewalk closest to the easterly curb is only 6 feet and it is 10 feet alongside the building.

Please indicate the height of the retaining walls, the anticipated material and who would be responsible for maintaining the retaining walls (they appear to be in the city street r-o-w)? This is a highly visible location so quality of materials is critical. Are there opportunities for plantings within the retaining wall?

9. **Lot Development Near Trader Joes:** The site plan indicates two proposed driveways on Elm Street to serve the building nearest Trader Joes. The second driveway is only partially shown on the plan. The proposed curb cut(s) do not meet City standards. In addition, the

driveways are located on a challenging curve. The building should be sited to avoid impacting the Elm Street view corridor as much as possible.

10. **Parking Garage:** Assuming the top floor of the parking structure does not have a roof, how is snow to be removed?
11. **Crosswalks:** All crosswalks locations and designs will need further review.
12. **Utilities:** The sanitary sewers and water lines in this area are very old. An assessment of these and other possibly other utilities will need to be undertaken.
13. **Green Roofs:** Has any consideration been given to green roofs?
14. **Somerset Street Right-of Way:** I'm not sure we have concluded our internal discussions on whether the Somerset Street should be expanded to a 60 foot right of way for this two block area or whether it should remain a 50 foot right of way with a 10 foot easement. In any event I'm sure we will have an answer for you in a reasonable time frame.

Should you have any questions or concerns with this letter please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Richard Knowland
Senior Planner

CC: by email
Jeff Levine
Barbara Barhydyt
Greg Mitchell
Michael Bobinsky
Katherine Earley
David Margolis Pineo
Matt Jeffries
Bob Metcalf
Ben Walters
Matt Barnes
Bill Hoffman