PLANNING | IOZ & LEVEL III SITE PLAN REVIEW

MMC 2400-space employee garage (ground level + 8 tiers) w/ 52 adjoining surface parking spaces (replacing 283 spaces in ‘First Atlantic Lot’) 190 St. John Street

ZONING ANALYSIS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Preliminary Review (7/5/18) | *Review of Revised Plan (8/3/18)* | *Final review (8.30.18)* |
| *Use* |  |  |  |
| *Dimensional Requirements* |  |  |  |
| *Design* |  |  |  |
| *Signs* | Proposed sign does not match others on campus per the sign plan submitted in 2008. In the final submittal, provide an explanation as to why the design diverges from the sign plan. | Waiting on new draft sign plan to be uploaded to ePlan. Sign design is generally acceptable; just want to be sure that it is consistent with MMC’s plan for signs campus-wide. | See separate comments on sign plan.  |
| *Transportation* | ~~Continued concern re likely success of some TDM measures and data collection. Wait on hiring of TDM coordinator to finalize TDM plan.~~~~Campus-wide parking analysis in IDP, GP’s memo, and TDM plan don’t entirely match. GP’s memo cites a projected deficit of 500-600 spaces. This figure does not appear in the IDP, and doesn’t mesh with employee growth figures from the IDP (approximately 300 new employees by 2026?). A table with ratios and existing and projected demand would be helpful.~~ | ~~Will review TDM plan and provide final comments as soon as possible.~~A ~~table would still be helpful if it is possible to pull one together. What we are interested in is clear documentation of existing supply and demand & future supply and demand and the ratios behind each.~~ | Please upload revised TDM plan into ePlan.  |
| *Environment* |  |  |  |
| *Mitigation Measures* |  | Please note discussion regarding improvements to nearby Valley Street park space. |  |
| *Neighborhood Integration & Neighborhood Engagement* |  |  |  |
| *Construction Management* | ~~CMP should include some discussion of methods to mitigate impacts to 210 St. John, particularly given location of construction access. Also speak directly to concerns about loss of landscaping there.~~~~Need construction easements on Union Station Plaza lot. These will be required prior to building permit.~~~~Speak to timing of deliveries (i.e. in June meeting, we discussed loading during off-peak hours)~~Finalize plan for temporary parking for displaced employees~~Clarify which three spaces are being taken on St. John Street during construction (figures conflict)~~~~Ped detour plan should include temporary crosswalk at 210?~~P~~rovide more detail on how the public will be apprised of construction updates.~~ | ~~Will there be revisions based on the conversation with the owners of 210 St. John?~~Construction easements will also be necessary on all sites where work is proposed. This will be a condition of approval. ~~Waiting on feedback from city’s traffic engineer.~~~~Consult with Randy on this. If having pedestrians cross at C makes more sense, then using this existing crosswalk is acceptable as well.~~  | Construction easements and evidence to complete work on 184 St. John & 210 St. John (as necessary – may no longer be) will be a condition of approval  |
| *Other* | ~~Provide more information on how snow ban parking will be managed.~~ | ~~Based on your response to neighborhood comments, there is a better understanding of where you are in the process of determining where neighborhood residents will be permitted to park during snow bans.~~  |  |

SITE PLAN REVIEW

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Preliminary Review | 2nd Review |  |
| Transportation | a. Impact on Surrounding Street Systems | * Waiting on confirmation that MaineDOT agrees to installation of traffic signal (GP was making initial contact)
 | Further comments on this from city’s traffic engineer should be forthcoming.  | See markup from 8/27. Additional comments will be forthcoming. |
| b. Access and Circulation | * Intersection design
	+ Further discussion on design of bike lane pending – need to confirm best practice for avoiding southbound right turn/bike conflicts.
	+ See bike lane paint specs here: [https://www.transpo.com/roads- highways/materials/pavement-marking-material/color-safe-bike-lanes](https://www.transpo.com/roads-highways/materials/pavement-marking-material/color-safe-bike-lanes)
* Include evaluation of pedestrian connections through Western Promenade. There is evidence of desire lines off the formal path network. Could these be formalized? If so, lighting or additional safety measures (e.g. call boxes?) may be necessary. Any new lighting or paths would need to be approved by HP.
 | **St. John/D Street intersection**See most recent concept from Bruce Hyman and note follow up comment sent on 8/1:* *Design should include radius curb (10'R) for the outside and inside edge of the right turn pocket*
* *The dashed line should start at the entrance point of the turn pocket (not extending past it)*
* *The exact sign placement needs some MUTCD guidance and placed in the sidewalk*
* *As I mentioned previously at the meeting on Monday, ALL bike lane lines next to motor vehicle lanes are to be 6" lines (both solid and dashed).*

**D. Street**Design should include 6' sidewalk and 4' esplanade (with street trees - 'Karpick' Red Maple or 'Bowhall' Red Maple).  Jeff Tarling has raised some questions about sidewalk plowing.  He wrote: "Knowing this route will likely be on the sidewalk plowing route in the future, the crosswalk, center island if there is one, and the Valley Street sidewalk should be constructed with the turning radii of the our 'Trackless' sidewalk plow in mind." He is particularly concerned about the crosswalk landing on the east side of Valley, where there is a stone retaining wall up against the back of sidewalk.  Please forward Western Prom assessment when complete.Please note Planning Board concern regarding headlight glare and traffic relative to nearby residential properties opposite St. John Street.Please note that there may be additional comments forthcoming on the Fore River connection analysis. At the least, the analysis should note that a surface crossing is not precluded by the garage design.Also note that there will be a condition of approval regarding the Eagles entrance. |  |
| c. Public Transit Access | * ~~Technically, not required to provide a facility under site plan review, as the nearest pullout is less than a quarter of a mile north. However, there is an existing METRO~~
 | Please show METRO stop south of the garage entrance along the Eagles frontage. | Confirming this placement with METRO. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | ~~stop in front of the Eagles lot. How will this stop be handled?~~* ~~Note that METRO is working to install a shelter facility on Congress at the north end of Union Station Plaza.~~
 |  |  |
| d. Parking | * See notes on parking analysis above
* ~~Support partial waiver on bike parking. However, bike parking location (in off-corners of ground level of garage) should be reevaluated. Is there a more accessible location closer to the entrances?~~
 | ~~~~  |  |
| e. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) | * See above
 |  |  |
| Environmental Quality | a. Preservation of Significant Natural Features |  |  |  |
| b. Landscaping and Landscape Preservation | * ~~Add notes to planting plan regarding treatment of 210 St. John buffer. It is our understanding that existing arborvitae in this area will be replaced if damaged during construction. This (or any alternative plan for this area) should be noted.~~
* ~~Clarify which fence detail goes in which location.~~
* ~~May be more comments re viability of checkerboard pavers in utility access area~~
* ~~Provide screening for transformer and generator on front of building~~
* ~~Need street trees on D Street, as possible~~
 | ~~Waiting on comments from fire/arborist on pavers~~~~See above comments on D Street~~ |  |
| c. Water Quality, Storm Water Management and Erosion Control |  |  |  |
| PublicInfrastructure and Community Safety | a. Consistency with Master Plans |  |  |  |
| b. Public Safety and Fire Prevention | * ~~Continued concerns re CPTED around site. Evaluate for additional opportunities for natural surveillance/territorial reinforcement. Expand entrance? Bring security room with windows to grade level?~~
 | ~~Addition of bike racks, windows, expanded canopy help with concerns about the area around the entrance.~~ |  |
| c. Availability and Adequate Capacity of Public Utilities | * Need capacity to serve letters
* ~~Revise dumpster enclosure to wood~~
* ~~Provide capacity to serve letters upon receipt~~
 | Need water capacity letter. | Need water capacity letter. |
| Site Design | a. Massing, Ventilation and Wind Impact |  |  |  |
| b. Shadows |  |  |  |
| c. Snow and Ice Loading |  |  |  |
| d. View Corridors |  |  |  |
| e. Historic Resources |  |  |  |
| f. Exterior Lighting | * Need waiver request for average illumination levels
* ~~Is there an opportunity to dim or turn off lights at night when use will be down?~~
* Concern re visibility of rooftop lights from Western Prom. Can the top deck be closed down at night and these lights be shutoff?
* As noted above, may need lighting within Western Prom. Further info on this pending evaluation noted above.
 | Response is understood. A waiver will be recommended.~~Please upload night renderings to ePlan.~~~~Assessment still outstanding.~~ | Waivers required. Please revise lighting submittal to note that top floor garage lights will be off with motion sensors and specify hours. |
| g. Noise and Vibration |  | Verification that HVAC meets standards will be included as a condition, as requested. |  |
| h. Signage and Wayfinding | * ~~See above.~~
 |  |  |
| i. Zoning Related Design Standards | * ~~Can material samples be provided for Planning Board~~
 | ~~Please provide final proposed materials to the Planning Division when they come in. We will want to look at these, including the lighter concrete, before they go to Planning Board.~~~~~~ |  |

RTI/Easements

* ~~Need Exhibit A of Eagles P&S~~
* Need evidence of rights to make improvements to 222 St. John ~~and to Union Station Plaza lot~~, to Eagles lot, and to 210 St. John
* ~~Need evidence of easement across Union Station Plaza lot for stormwater & access~~
* Confirm that we have evidence of stormwater infrastructure easements with 222 St. John pursuant to lot split. Is there a figure showing this & the access easement? Technically, Cowcatcher and Caste Cow are separate entities, so the drainage easement should exist (as the access easement does).
* Clarify terms around obligation to provide ‘parking for up to 400 vehicles, either in the parking structure….or on the surface of said parcel until such time as said parking structure…is constructed’ in the Caste Cow/Cowcatcher deed.

Other

* ~~As discussed at our June meeting, the city is repaving Valley Street this summer. Need to scheduling a meeting prior to the paving to either amend the contractor’s scope of work or have MMC do the work.~~ MDOT’s Valley Street paving to move forward as per 8/2 email between Dave Senus & the City of Portland/MDOT. Please note that the final overlay should be completed this summer, and that, during the period between mill and overlay, all area sidewalks should be ADA accessible.

Waivers

Bicycle parking – providing 40 spaces (138 required). Is 40 spaces still an accurate number

Maximum driveway width – 30 feet (24 max)

Driveway separation

Parking dimensions

Illumination

Other Permits Required

ME Construction General Permit

FAA Aeronautical Study for Determination of Hazard. Please confirm that lighting conforms with FAA Advisory as per the submitted permit.

MEDEP Stormwater Permit (city delegated review)