



Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

23 Ocean Avenue - Final Traffic Comments

Tom Errico <thomas.errico@tylin.com>

Fri, Oct 21, 2016 at 9:36 AM

To: Helen Donaldson <HCD@portlandmaine.gov>

Cc: Jeremiah Bartlett <JBartlett@portlandmaine.gov>, Katherine Earley <kas@portlandmaine.gov>, Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>, Jeff Tarling <jst@portlandmaine.gov>

Hi Nell – I have reviewed the application materials and offer the following preliminary traffic comments.

- The applicant is requesting a waiver for parking lot aisle width (21 feet versus the City standard of 24 feet). The applicant should provide documentation that supports the waiver request.

Status: Following a review of vehicle turning template information and revisions to the parking lot layout, I support a waiver from the City's Technical Standards.

- I find the driveway location and configuration to be acceptable given existing site conditions.

Status: I have no further comment.

- The applicant should provide a summary of the anticipated trip generation increase expected during the AM and PM peak hours following project completion. While I do not expect the project to significantly impact the public street system, I do believe documentation of traffic volumes changes is necessary.

Status: The applicant has provided an estimate of trip generation. As noted the project is expected to generate 6 new peak hour trips in the morning peak hour and 7 new peak hour trips during the afternoon peak hour. This level of trip generation is not expected to impact traffic operations and safety and therefore I have no further comment.

- The applicant should provide a review of safety data in the immediate vicinity of the project.

Status: A review of crash data was conducted by the applicant and that analysis indicated that there are no High Crash Locations in the vicinity of the project site. I have no further comment.

- I would prefer that backing maneuvers onto Hersey Street not be required and thus the applicant should either provide a layout that allows for on-site vehicle circulation – for head-out egress, or supporting documentation on the proposed circulation condition.

Status: The applicant has provided information that demonstrates on-site circulation can be accommodated. I have no further comment.

- A pedestrian easement will be required at the Ocean Avenue/Hersey Street intersection (a portion of the sidewalk is located on the applicants property).

Status: The applicant concurs with this request. I have no further comment.

- A detail for the driveway shall be provided that notes that the cross-slope shall not exceed 2%.

Status: The plans have been revised and I have no further comment.

- The plans do not include full replacement of the sidewalk on Ocean Avenue along the entire property frontage. The applicant should either include full sidewalk replacement or document justification for the current proposal.

Status: The plans have been revised and I have no further comment.

- Further review of the sidewalk ramp configuration is required. I would suggest that a fully ADA compliant ramp be provided on the opposite side of Hersey Street.

Status: The applicant shall upgrade the sidewalk ramp on the opposite side of Hersey Street to meet ADA requirements. The applicant shall submit plans to the City for review and approval. I would note that the City recognizes the right-of-way limitations at the subject corner and will assist the applicant in design development.

- The applicant is proposing to meet parking demand needs via leased parking spaces off Woodford Street west of Forest Avenue. Given on-street parking regulations, it is my professional opinion that occupants of the project site will park on Hersey Street given parking availability and convenience. Recognizing this factor, the applicant should provide a detailed parking demand and supply management plan that realistically proposes parking conditions. I would note that I'm open to the idea of shared parking given site uses, if it works from a management perspective. Further coordination and review on this subject is needed.

Status: The applicant has provided updated information regarding parking supply/demand analysis, off-site parking, and how parking will be managed. My comments are noted below:

- I generally find the parking generation analysis to be reasonable and would expect a parking demand of 18 to 21 vehicles, without the consideration of share parking.
- I support the concept of shared parking for this project and thereby a reduced parking supply given proposed land uses. Based upon the information provided by the applicant and information from the Urban Land Institute, I would estimate a peak parking demand of 16 to 18 parking spaces. The applicant is providing 9 parking spaces on-site and has an agreement in place for up to 6 parking spaces on Vannah Avenue, for a total of 15 parking spaces. I would suggest that the applicant conduct a monitoring study at the time of full occupancy and determine if 15 spaces is sufficient. If parking demand is greater than expected, the applicant shall provide additional off-site parking that meet actual demand. I would suggest that the Woodford Club site, as originally proposed, be formally agreed to as a back-up site.
- I support the location of the off-site parking lot on Vannah Avenue. For it to be fully accessible by pedestrians to and from the site, the applicant shall construct a missing sidewalk section on the north side of Vannah Avenue near the proposed parking lot. The applicant shall submit plans to the City for review and approval.
- The applicant has provided a parking management plan for the site. I am concerned that implementation will not be easily enforced, particularly as it related to early morning and late afternoon time periods when the residential and office uses are likely to conflict. I would note that the applicant has noted that TDM will likely impact trip and parking generation (for which I agree), but it is also likely that the residential uses may leave their cars all day, while walking or biking to work destinations. I would therefore suggest that the monitoring study also include a review of the parking management plan and necessary adjustments. I would suggest that the monitoring study be closely coordinated with the Planning Authority.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Thomas A. Errico, PE
Senior Associate
Traffic Engineering Director

TYLININTERNATIONAL

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

Visit us online at www.tylin.com

[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [YouTube](#)

"One Vision, One Company"

Please consider the environment before printing.