
100 Fore Street

Lauren Swett <lswett@woodardcurran.com>
To: Christine Grimando <cdg@portlandmaine.gov>

Fri, Oct 19, 2018 at 11:39 AM

Hi Christine,

I have not had a chance to upload my preliminary comments to Energov, but will this afternoon. My comments at this stage are relatively general:

- The application is preliminary and we will plan to do a complete review of the final submission. There are some big picture coordination questions that exist that may modify the project.
- A stormwater management plan has not been provided. The narrative notes that the project will meet the Basic and General Standards, but does not address the Flooding Standards. Please provide additional discussion on the Redevelopment Standard, and how all of the stormwater standards are being met. While the project may not meet the impervious thresholds to require compliance with the flooding standard, the Applicant should verify that downstream utilities have the capacity to manage the anticipated stormwater runoff and drainage from the site.
- Confirmation of utility ability to serve will be required.
- Significant coordination is required for the access driveway to the east of the site. It is unclear from these plans how stormwater from the project site and the future Thames Street extension to Fore Street will interact with infrastructure that is currently being proposed. The plans as currently submitted show improvements on properties owned by the Applicant and the City, and clarity is necessary on who will be completing the different components of work.
- The applicant has noted that grading north of the building along Fore Street is "TBD."
- Existing Catch basins in the small parking area at the western garage entrance are noted to be adjusted or replaced as necessary. Additional information on what these basins are for and what they connect to is necessary. Grading in this parking lot is also incomplete (see 15 contour in center of lot).

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Lauren

Lauren Swett, P.E.*

Technical Manager

Woodard & Curran

41 Hutchins Drive

Portland, Maine 04102

Phone: (207)558-3763 (direct)

(207)219-3591 (cell)

(800)426-4262 (office)

Email: lswett@woodardcurran.com

*Licensed in Maine and Wisconsin

Commitment & Integrity Drive Results

www.woodardcurran.com

M.ASCE

Chair, Leader Training Committee

American Society of Civil Engineers

<http://regions.asce.org/leader-training-committee/>

100 Fore Street - Initial Traffic Comments

Christine Grimando <cdg@portlandmaine.gov>
To: Christine Grimando <cdg@portlandmaine.gov>

Fri, Oct 19, 2018 at 1:33 PM

From: Tom Errico <thomas.errico@tylin.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 19, 2018 at 8:35 AM
Subject: 100 Fore Street - Initial Traffic Comments
To: Christine Grimando <CDG@portlandmaine.gov>, Bruce Hyman <bhyman@portlandmaine.gov>, Jeremiah Bartlett <JBartlett@portlandmaine.gov>

Hi Christine – I have conducted an initial review of application materials and offer the following traffic comments.

- The Applicant has conducted a trip generation analysis and concluded the project does not meet requirements for a Traffic Movement Permit given project details and trip credits for existing land uses. However, I continue to review the review methods used, which will ultimately determine whether the project will meet Traffic Movement Permit thresholds. Items needing further review include:
 - Specific reductions for existing traffic generation from the site is being reviewed. The reduction of Hamilton Marine is based on an earlier peak hour (3:30-4:30PM) and this may be inflated as compared to the typical commuter peak hour. Specific time-of-day peak hour generation from Hamilton Marine will be further reviewed. A similar review will be conducted for IBec Creative/Jade Integrated Health where 9.6 trips per 1,000SF was recorded (this is a very high trip rate per 1,000SF).
 - Use of a Shared Use Trip Reduction Factor (15%) needs further review given future area characteristics and anticipated tenant details.
 - Use of a Mode Share Reduction Factor of (12.8%) needs further review given project TDM details and gaining a better understanding of ITE trip generating assumptions and what level of alternative modes activity was in place at the site surveyed (ITE is not likely to provide this information).
 - An understanding of the number of employees may help to confirm expected trip generation. It is my understanding the office building will have 350 employees.
- The following summarizes some initial site plan comments.
 - The number of driveways to the site seems excessive. I am concerned about corner clearance to the level 2 garage entrance; the provision of a very wide driveway to the Gym Building (and spacing to the abutting driveway); and the angle of the driveway to the Ground level garage.
 - Information on how each parking level will be managed shall be provided. Given the lack of interior circulation, the parking garage lacks opportunities for optimal sharing of the parking supply.
 - If the Fore Street connector becomes a City Street, the Applicant should provide information on how the proposed roadway configuration would fit in the future public right-of-way and what would the ultimate full cross-section consist of.
 - The Fore Street connector roadway is proposed to be 28-feet wide. On-Street parking is to be prohibited. Determination on the appropriate right-of-way should be performed.
 - The Applicant should provide details on how will truck deliveries be accommodated.
 - Crosswalks should be provided across Fore Street at the Fore Street connector road intersection.
 - The Applicant shall provide width dimensions for all driveways.
 - The southerly Fore Street curb alignment has sharp angle points. Adjustments may make sense and review with DPW staff is suggested.
 - The Applicant shall provide a detailed parking demand/supply analysis.
 - Accommodation of Fire vehicles in the connector road drop off area further crowds this area. Depending on the outcome of Fire Department feedback, alternatives should be explored.

- Further traffic analysis is needed where the access drives intersect with Fore Street.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Best regards,

Thomas A. Errico, PE
Senior Associate
Traffic Engineering Director

TYLIN INTERNATIONAL

12 Northbrook Drive

Falmouth, ME 04105

+1.207.781.4721 main

+1.207.347.4354 direct

+1.207.400.0719 mobile

+1.207.781.4753 fax

thomas.errico@tylin.com

Visit us online at www.tylin.com

Twitter | Facebook | LinkedIn | Google+

"One Vision, One Company"

Planning and Urban Development Department

Planning Division



Subject: B6 Design Review – 100 Fore Street

Written by: Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer

Date of Review: Tuesday, October 16, 2018

The preliminary review of the proposed garage, office, and retail building at 100 Fore Street was conducted by Caitlin Cameron, Urban Designer, Christine Grimando, Senior Planner, and Shukria Wiar, Planner. The following memo reflects general comments and concerns about the project and frame the areas that would benefit from discussion and feedback during the first Planning Board workshop.

Design Review Criteria:

The Site Plan application is subject to the policies and standards listed below.

- Eastern Waterfront Master Plan - Design Guidelines for the Eastern Waterfront
- City of Portland Design Manual – (g) EWPZ Eastern Waterfront Port Zone and B6 Eastern Waterfront Mixed Use Zone

More information is needed to evaluate the proposal:

- **Diagram showing entrance locations, circulation**
- **Renderings and images showing the building in context**
- **Material samples or images**

Staff Comment and Topics for Discussion:

Eastern Waterfront design standards: All major and minor development reviewed under the provisions of the eastern waterfront zones shall be designed to support the development of this urban neighborhood as a dense, mixed-use, pedestrian friendly neighborhood.

Staff identified areas of focus for the design review discussion and request Planning Board feedback:

- **Contextual Design**

The site is below the Munjoy South development and the residential Munjoy Hill neighborhood defined by single family, two-family, and triple decker residential buildings, a small, pedestrian-scale street grid, and a “cinque terre” approach (meaning the development pattern follows the topography with Congress Street as the high point “spine” and Fore Street as the low point). The site is adjacent to the eastern waterfront and Portland Company site which currently includes a mix of transportation, industrial, and tourism uses and building typologies but is yet to be fully developed. And to the west is the India Street neighborhood with a mix of historic and contemporary mixed-use, hotel, and residential buildings of varying heights and scales. Most immediately across the street will be the recently approved office building at the Shipyard site with seven stories and a glass curtain wall and brick façade.

Recent projects have been strongly oriented towards the water and create a design character using high levels of fenestration and curtain wall. Successful design in this area will provide respectful transitions between and recognition of the patterns found within these varying contexts. However, there is latitude to define a new and contemporary pattern of development and possibly a waterfront facing approach. The 100 Fore design proposes to continue that emerging trend for contemporary development on the waterfront.

- Defining Context: What should be considered the context? The eastern waterfront area is being defined by new mid-rise buildings of 4-7 stories, often with large footprints, and contemporary styles. The site is downhill from the Munjoy South development which is not considered to be appropriate urban residential design and is likely to be redeveloped. The building is commercial mixed-use and should reflect that use in its character and scale (rather than drawing from residential character nearby). Staff view this as a transitional site but Fore Street context does include long, mid-rise buildings with active frontage. **Staff suggest that the relationship to Fore Street is the most critical and that context should be the most examined. The building should continue to build up the urban street wall and pattern of development established by previous developments and what is proposed at the Portland Company adjacent.**
 - Contextual Characteristics: Though the scale, use, and style of the surrounding buildings varies, the traditional context is defined by buildings with clear orientation, simple material palettes, strong street walls, and simple forms. The lack of a consistent, distinct context provides freedom for the new development but the current iteration of this proposal **lacks cohesiveness, or a clear orientation and design concept. Staff recommend revisions that simplify the design in these ways.**
 - Relationship to the Street: The relationship to the street is another way in which buildings relate to context. The site complexities and zoning dimensional standards are causing the massing/height of this building to be pushed away from the street. The result is a **one-story building on Fore Street**. As an urban, mixed-use building, the street façade calls for **more height, articulation, activity, and direct orientation**. Given the site and zoning constraints, staff agree with the design decision to **focus the entrances in a node at the west corner of the building**. The curve of Fore Street creates a strong sight line towards this corner of the building – **this should be more strongly acknowledge in the design massing, orientation, and concept.**
 - Orientation: Is it appropriate for a mid-block building to have such a strong waterfront orientation? The building feels schizophrenic in its orientation, trying to both face the water but meet the requirements of enhancing the streetscape. The street wall suffers with this approach (as described above). The design standards emphasize density, mixed-uses, and pedestrian friendliness. Though the character of streetscape on Fore is still being developed, **staff believe new designs should create a Fore Street context that does convey an urban, mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly street and likely provides more street orientation.**
- **Building Composition (placement, orientation, massing, articulation, and materials)**

The building includes a two-story parking plinth, office uses on the upper floors with circulation towers as anchoring elements, and retail spaces at the ground level at Fore Street. The building smartly uses the grade change to bury the parking. The design approach to Fore Street establishes a new street wall with a one-story garage and liner building. The building includes an entrance plaza at the western corner with concentration of retail, office entry, landscape and

plaza space. The material palette varies from garage and retail level – more solid treatment with storefronts at the retail spaces – compared with the highly transparent office trays that varying in massing. The circulation towers are expressed in solid materials attempting to anchor the floating glass box of the office spaces.

- Hierarchy and Massing: The project places the tallest masses away from the street, interior to the site. There is a significant amount of massing variation between the garage mass, the office plates which move in and out, and the circulation towers. **The one-story height at the street does not feel urban especially given the 4-6 story new developments nearby. Staff are concerned that the overall massing, building organization, and material placement do not convey a clear concept or hierarchy and confuse the legibility of the building. Simplification and a clear organizing and design concept should be pursued.**
 - Orientation: There is **not a clear orientation** and the massing is placed downhill away from the street. The street edge is an important component of the site and should not be ignored. The two end retail spaces appropriately hold the corners of the building and help define the urban space. The entry plaza at the western corner seems a logical node around which to orient the building forms and massing. Staff agree that creating a street wall is appropriate for this urban site, **but the form, uses, height as proposed are all in question at this street interface.** That being said, the building face should not strictly follow the curve of Fore Street.
 - Materials: Many of the new buildings in this immediate context propose high levels of fenestration and curtain walls. Staff are not opposed to the use of curtain wall here but there are **too many materials and the placement is not helping the building to have a clear hierarchy, orientation, or relationship to the context or street.** Consider, also, the material relationship of the garage with the street.
- **Pedestrian Environment**

Fore Street: The interface with Fore Street comes with a set of challenges. Fore Street is not a major pedestrian street and does not currently include high levels of retail or mixed-uses and activity. Fore Street is also a challenging building/pedestrian environment interface given its curves and grade changes; convex street walls are not conducive to friendly pedestrian environments. This long building façade is also north-facing. **Staff would like to discuss viable options for this interface that will result in comfortable, appropriately scaled and active space that provides a viable amenity or use given the context and zoning requirements.** The convex curve in the road and the design of the parking structure result in left over space that is not suitable for retail. Staff support the current plan which shows retail spaces at the two corners of the building – these appear to be viable spaces and are the most visible locations. It is appropriate to square off the wall to the street and create a space between the garage and the sidewalk. Some incidental uses could be housed here – bike storage, for example. Another strategy may be a structure that defines space without full interior enclosure (similar to the pergola suggested at the entrance plaza node). An outdoor plaza and landscaped area is another option – would this space get used as a north-facing space? **In any scenario, staff agree that the garage wall must be reconsidered to have more visual interest, articulation, and possibly height.**

Entrance Plaza: Staff support the design direction that places an entrance plaza on the western edge of the site. The curve of the road, the grades, and the building program (retail and office

entrance) make this location a logical node. This point is prominent and visible as one approaches on Fore Street. This design approach further helps mediate the grade changes and to bury and screen the lower level of surface parking. The plaza space should be comfortable and functional and the building design should clearly convey that this is the primary entrances. **Staff suggest that future iterations of the design continue in the direction of emphasizing this active node in the landscape design as well as the building architecture.**

General design comments for PB work shop!



More height at street

Simplify massing, orientation, materiality

activation strategies on Five St.

emphasize this corner!

enhance plaza
↳ massing, height
↳ materials
↳ plaza design

10/16/18 Design Review
cameron, cogninondo
swiff