

Order 221-16/17

Amended to delete, in Section 14-281(g), "Amendments brought forth by the city will require a supermajority of the City Council to take effect.": 9-0 on 5/1/2017

Passage as amended: 9-0 on 5/1/2017

Effective 5/31/2017

ETHAN K. STRIMLING (MAYOR)  
BELINDA S. RAY (1)  
SPENCER R. THIBODEAU (2)  
BRIAN E. BATSON (3)  
JUSTIN COSTA (4)

**CITY OF PORTLAND  
IN THE CITY COUNCIL**

DAVID H. BRENERMAN (5)  
JILL C. DUSON (A/L)  
PIOUS ALI (A/L)  
NICHOLAS M. MAVODONES, JR (A/L)

**AMENDMENT TO PORTLAND CITY CODE  
CHAPTER 14  
Re: INSTITUTIONAL OVERLAY ZONE**

**BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE IN CITY COUNCIL ASSEMBLED AS FOLLOWS:**

*That Chapter 14, Sections 14-277 to 14-282 of the Portland City Code are hereby amended as follows:*

- Art. I. In General, § 14-1--14-15**
- Art. II. Planning Board, § 14-16--14-45**
- Art. III. Zoning, § 14-46--14-490**

...

Div. 16. Waynflete School Overlay Zone, § 14-276--14-276.10

Div. 16.1. Institutional Overlay Zone (IOZ), § 14-277--14-293

Div. 17. B-7 Mixed Development District Zone, § 14-294-14-304

...

**DIVISION 16.1. INSTITUTIONAL OVERLAY ZONE (IOZ)**

**14-277.—Reserved. Purpose of the Institutional Overlay Zone**

The Institutional Overlay Zone (IOZ) designation provides a regulatory mechanism available to the city's four major medical and higher education campuses where an improved regulatory structure is needed to facilitate a consistent, predictable, and clear growth management process. The purposes of the Institutional Overlay Zone are to:

(a) Acknowledge that the city's major academic and medical institutions play a prominent role in the health and well-being of

the local and regional community, and in order to sustain that role, these institutions need flexibility to change and grow;

(b) Encourage proactive planning for institutional change and growth which identifies and addresses likely long-term institutional needs and cumulative impacts while leveraging potential benefits at the neighborhood, city, and regional level;

(c) Ensure that institutional change and growth both complements and, as appropriate, integrates adjacent or surrounding neighborhoods through carefully planned transitions;

(d) Support the formation and continuation of mutually beneficial public-private cooperation;

(e) Support an ongoing public engagement process that benefits both the institutions and nearby neighborhoods;

(f) Reflect Comprehensive Plan and other policy objectives;  
and

(g) Provide a consistent regulatory approach to all major institutions which allows unique regulatory requirements that balance the particular needs of institutions with the needs of the surrounding neighborhood and wider community.

#### **14-278.—Reserved. Location and Applicability**

The city's four primary medical and higher education institutions are eligible to apply for designation as Institutional Overlay Zones. The Eligible Institutions are the two major hospital institutions of Maine Medical Center and Mercy Hospital and the two major academic institutions of University of Southern Maine and University of New England, their successors and assigns. Designation as an IOZ is the preferred mechanism where the Eligible Institution's proposed development is inconsistent with the existing zoning.

#### **14-279.—Reserved. Establishment of an Institutional Overlay Zone**

(a) Application for an Institutional Overlay Zone. Where the Eligible Institution seeks designation as an IOZ, they shall submit a zone change application consisting of two components:

1. An Institutional Development Plan (IDP) (see Section 14-280).
2. A Regulatory Framework (see Section 14-281) that would, when and if adopted, be the text and map amendment to the City's Land Use Code and Zoning Map.

(b) Required Public Involvement. At least two neighborhood meetings shall be required. The first shall be held prior to the formal submission of a zone change application for an Institutional

Overlay Zone and the second shall be held during the City's review. Meetings shall identify the concerns, if any, of affected residents and property owners, and inform the development of the Institutional Development Plan (IDP) and Regulatory Framework. Meetings shall be held in a convenient location proximate to the institution. The applicant shall provide written notification to property owners of record within 500 feet of the proposed IOZ boundary at least ten days prior to the meeting dates and maintain written records of the meetings.

(c) Required Scoping Meeting. The Eligible Institution shall meet with the Planning Authority after the first required neighborhood meeting and prior to submission of the zone change application to confirm the focus of the Institutional Development Plan (IDP) and Regulatory Framework, including associated study areas that may be outside of the proposed IOZ boundary. The IDP and Regulatory Framework will vary in detail and focus depending on the Eligible Institution and its particular context. The content requirements in Sections 14-280 and 14-281 and the comments from neighborhood meeting(s) shall provide direction for the content of the IDP. The Planning Authority or Planning Board may require additional information or modify content requirements as is relevant to the Eligible Institution (see Section 14-280(c)).

(d) Reviewing Authority.

1. The Planning Board shall review the zone change application, including the IDP and Regulatory Framework. At least one public workshop and a public hearing before the Planning Board are required.
2. Upon recommendation of the Planning Board, the City Council shall review and consider adoption of the Institutional Overlay Zone and the accompanying Regulatory Framework as an amendment to the city's code of ordinances.

(e) Future Institutional Development.

1. All new development by the Eligible Institution within the boundary of the IOZ shall be compliant with the IOZ and accompanying Regulatory Framework, consistent with the IDP, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and meet applicable site plan standards, unless such standards are superseded by the Regulatory Framework.
2. Any use/development proposed by the Eligible Institution outside the IOZ boundary that complies with the zoning for permitted uses in that location shall be reviewed under the standards of that zone. Any use/development proposed by an Eligible Institution outside of the IOZ boundary that is

proposed in a residential zone and is functionally related to the operations within the IOZ shall be addressed by the IDP and require an amendment to the IDP.

**14-280.—Reserved. Institutional Development Plan (IDP)**

(a) Purpose. Any use conducted by an Eligible Institution and any construction by an Eligible Institution in an Institutional Overlay Zone shall be consistent with an Institutional Development Plan (IDP) approved by the Planning Board in accordance with this ordinance. The purpose of the IDP is to establish baseline data about institutional land uses, facilities, and services and measure, analyze, and address the anticipated or potential impacts of planned institutional growth and change. The IDP shall serve as a background document that supports the proposed Regulatory Framework and frames subsequent site plan review(s).

(b) Planning Horizon. An IDP shall provide the city and abutting neighborhoods with a clear outline of the anticipated or potential growth and change of the Eligible Institution for the short- to medium-term (e.g. 1-5 and 5-10 years respectively), as well as a conceptual growth plan for the long-term (e.g. 10 years or more); however, the specific planning horizons for each institution will be determined as part of the IDP approval process.

(c) Content. The IDP submission shall address the following elements unless specifically modified by the Planning Authority or Planning Board, with the scope and level of detail to be clarified at the required Scoping Meeting:

1. Context Information

- a. The institution's adopted mission, vision, or purpose statement
- b. A summary of relevant baseline data on the institution, including:
  - i. A neighborhood context plan;
  - ii. An inventory of current programs and services;
  - iii. A current census of the number of people using the institution (e.g., employees, enrollment, patients), with an indication of maximums and minimums over time;
  - iv. An inventory and/or plan of all existing property holdings within the main campus

and within the City of Portland, including an indication of functional land use links between off-campus properties and the main campus (e.g. remote parking);

v. An inventory and/or plan of existing facilities, including data on use, floor area, and any existing functional connections between facilities.

c. A summary of the baseline characteristics of the existing campus and context of the institution, based on identified study areas, including:

i. A summary of existing resources, such as historic, open space, and natural resources;

ii. A summary of the existing transportation system, including vehicular, pedestrian, transit, bicycle, and parking supply, demand, and utilization;

iii. A summary of existing public infrastructure supporting the institution, including demand, utilization and any capacity issues;

iv. Relevant municipal plans, projects, and studies that may influence the IDP study area and opportunities for integrating institutional growth.

d. A summary of public involvement in the development of the IDP, including major areas of public concern.

2. Assessment of Future Institutional Growth and Change

a. A description of institutional needs and areas of future institutional growth and change, including:

i. Projected census of users (e.g., enrollment /employment/patient/visitor figures and anticipated variations over time);

ii. Institutional objectives for property both within and outside the IOZ boundary (e.g. acquisition and/or disposition), including an indication of any functional land use connection for sites outside the IOZ boundary to the main campus; and

iii. A Development Plan addressing anticipated or potential institutional needs and

physical improvements, including the proposed boundary of the IOZ and any phasing of the development.

b. Analysis and associated plans that address the following elements in terms of anticipated growth or potential impacts within the identified study area, and support the development parameters as set out in the Regulatory Framework:

i. Transportation and access

a. An analysis of the projected changes in parking demand, supply, and impacts to the off-street and on-street parking capacity, including an explanation of the proposed parking plan;

b. An analysis of the projected changes in vehicular, pedestrian, transit, and bicycle access routes and facilities, their capacity, and safety;

c. A transportation, access, and circulation plan, representing the synthesis of the analysis, and including a program of potential improvements or set of guidelines to address access deficiencies to and within the IOZ. The plan should outline proposed mechanisms and potential strategies to meet transportation objectives, including transportation demand management, phasing, and when a Traffic Movement Permit (TMP) may be required.

ii. Environment

a. An analysis of potential cumulative impacts on natural resources and open spaces;

b. An analysis of projected energy consumption, hazardous materials generation, noise generation, and similar issues as relevant;

c. An environmental plan, representing the synthesis of the analysis and including a proposed program or set of guidelines for future preservation,

enhancement, conservation, and/or mitigation.

iii. Infrastructure

- a. An analysis of projected public utility demand and the capacity of associated infrastructure;
- b. An analysis of projected public safety needs and projected impacts to the capacity of these services;
- c. An infrastructure plan, representing the synthesis of the analysis and including a proposed program or set of guidelines to support sustainable growth.

iv. Design

- a. An analysis of projected impacts to neighboring properties and public spaces, including potential shadow, wind, and lighting impacts, impacts of height and massing, and impacts to historic resources;
- b. An analysis of transition areas between the institution and adjoining neighborhoods, including identification of key character defining components of the surrounding context;
- c. An analysis of existing Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design issues and identification of how these principles would be addressed as part of the proposed campus development;
- d. A conceptual built environment/public realm plan, representing the synthesis of the analysis and including a set of guidelines for urban design, landscape, open space, and streetscape treatments, with particular attention to the treatment of edges (both within and abutting the IOZ boundary) to achieve compatible transitions.

v. Neighborhood Engagement

- a. A plan for ongoing community engagement that represents best

practices, promotes collaborative problem solving around community concerns, fosters transparency, and identifies mechanisms for neighborhood feedback and institutional accountability;

b. A property management framework that identifies the institution's process for handling operational property issues with neighbors;

c. Strategies for assuring communication pertaining to property acquisition and disposition in surrounding neighborhoods;

d. A set of construction management principles, to apply to all institutional construction, that represent best practice, aim to minimize short- and long-term construction impacts on surrounding residents and businesses, and ensure a clear communication strategy is in place in advance of construction.

(d) Standards of Review. The IDP shall:

1. Address all content requirements, unless explicitly modified by the Planning Authority or Planning Board;

2. Reflect the issues/topics identified in the required public process;

3. Demonstrate consistency with the city's Comprehensive Plan and the purpose of this ordinance;

4. Demonstrate how the property ownership, proposed growth, and requested Regulatory Framework relate to the institution's mission;

5. Demonstrate that traffic and parking impacts have been anticipated and that the proposed parking provision is justified as based on an assessment of options for reducing traffic and parking demands;

6. Outline an approach to open space, natural, and historic resources that supports preservation and enhancement.

7. Demonstrate that potential cumulative environmental impacts have been anticipated and can be minimized or satisfactorily mitigated;

8. Demonstrate that utility impacts have been anticipated and can be minimized or satisfactorily mitigated;
9. Reflect a comprehensive design approach that ensures appropriate transitions with the existing or future scale and character of the neighboring urban fabric;
10. Promote compatibility with existing or future uses in adjacent neighborhoods, maintain housing, and support local amenities;
11. Anticipate future off-site improvements that would support the integration of the institution into the community and city-wide infrastructure;
12. Conform with Portland's Historic Preservation Ordinance standards for designated landmarks or for properties within designated historic districts or designated historic landscapes, if applicable. When proposed adjacent to or within one hundred (100) feet of designated landmarks, historic districts, or historic landscapes, the IDP shall be generally compatible with the major character-defining elements of the landmark or portion of the district in the immediate vicinity; and
13. Incorporate strategies to support clear communication and ongoing public engagement between institutions and nearby neighbors.

(e) Approval. Upon finding that an Eligible Institution's IDP meets the standards of review, the Planning Board shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny an IDP.

(f) Monitoring. The IDP shall establish a schedule for reporting on IDP implementation at regular intervals of not more than ten years from the date of approval of the initial or amended IDP, and identify thresholds for IDP amendments;

(g) Amendments. An approved IDP shall guide campus development unless and until amended. If at any time the Eligible Institutions request minor amendments to an approved IDP, the Planning Authority may approve such minor amendments, provided that they do not constitute a substantial alteration of the IDP and do not affect any condition or requirement of the Planning Board. The applicant shall apply with a written statement of the proposed amendment and proposed amended IDP to the Planning Authority, whose decision as to whether the amendment is minor shall be final. Major amendments shall be reviewed by the Planning Board. When the IDP is amended, the baseline data in the IDP shall be updated as appropriate.

#### 14-281. Regulatory Framework

(a) Purpose. The Regulatory Framework translates the IDP into a set of clear and specific zoning requirements for the IOZ that constitute the text and map amendments to the City's Land Use Code and Zoning Map. The zoning requirements are anticipated to include parameters that guide the growth and change of the institution as well as broad strategies to address potential impacts, with plans and details to be developed under site plan review.

(b) Applicability. The Regulatory Framework shall apply only to properties that are within the IOZ boundary and to which the Eligible Institution holds right, title, or interest. For these properties, the Institutional Overlay Zone shall supersede the underlying zoning, and all new institutional development shall be conducted in compliance with the Regulatory Framework and the approved Institutional Development Plan. Properties located within the Institutional Overlay Zone not subject to right, title, or interest of the Eligible Institution shall continue to be governed by the regulations of the underlying zoning designation.

(c) Uses. Institutional uses, including hospitals and higher education facilities, shall be permitted, as shall uses that are functionally integrated with, ancillary to, and/or substantively related to supporting the primary institutional use, consistent with the applicable approved IDP.

(d) Content. The Regulatory Framework shall reflect the information and analysis of the IDP. The content shall be tailored to address the particular issues associated with the institution and its neighborhoods. The Regulatory Framework should be succinct and use tables and graphics as possible to address the following, if applicable:

1. Zoning boundary of the IOZ: The area to which the regulations apply, as shown on the zoning map, subject to other provisions of this ordinance (i.e. the map amendment to the City's Zoning Map);
2. Phasing and schedules: Requirements that relate to particular proposed phases; a chart showing the schedule or thresholds for submitting an amended IDP (or elements of an IDP, such as a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan);
3. Uses: Clarification, as necessary, on permitted uses.
4. Dimensional Requirements: Graphics, sketches, or standards, including details for transition zones within the IOZ boundary;
5. Transportation: Elements such as TDM trip reduction targets or contribution to area-wide TDM measures; broad parameters for ensuring pedestrian, vehicular, bicycle and transit access and safety; parking ratios

and management strategies; thresholds for access improvements;

6. Environment: The approach to the inclusion of open space and preservation of environmentally-sensitive areas;

7. Mitigation measures: The broad approach to identified mitigation measures, which would be addressed in greater detail in the site plan review process; thresholds for addressing deficiencies; goals for preservation/protection;

8. Design: Graphics and standards to clarify building placement and envelope (height and massing); guidelines for integration of site features; required treatments for transition zones and treatment for all edges (both within and abutting the IOZ boundary); guidelines for establishing campus identity; and

9. Neighborhood Integration: Thresholds and strategies for neighborhood engagement; mitigation of impacts on neighboring properties, including construction impacts; buffering requirements; objectives for pedestrian linkages and safety; other requirements that address community concerns.

10. Monitoring: A schedule for regular monitoring reports on IDP implementation in accordance with the IDP.

(e) Standards of Review: The Regulatory Framework shall:

1. Be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Institutional Development Plan;

2. Provide a clear zoning framework, using graphics and tables as appropriate, to apply to future site plan reviews;

3. Provide specific regulatory statements as appropriate that respond to concerns raised during the required public involvement; and

4. Outline measurable goals and thresholds for improvements or other actions identified in the IDP to be advanced in subsequent site plan applications.

(f) Approval/Adoption. The Planning Board shall review the proposed Regulatory Framework against the standards of review and make a recommendation on the institution's IOZ designation and Regulatory Framework to the City Council for adoption as part of this zoning ordinance.

(g) Amendments. A Regulatory Framework and IOZ boundary as adopted by the City Council shall remain in force unless and until amended. Amendments to a Regulatory Framework and/or IOZ boundary may be brought forth by the city or Eligible Institution. Proposed

amendments to the IOZ boundary or Regulatory Framework shall be reviewed by the Planning Board and adopted by the City Council subject to the provisions of this ordinance.

14-282. Reserved.

\* Editor's note. Order No. -16/17, adopted May , 2017, provided that the Regulatory Frameworks, as they are adopted by the City Council for each Eligible Institution, shall be codified within this section.



Helen Donaldson &lt;hcd@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

---

## MMC IDP - Traffic Assessment Review Comments

---

Tom Errico &lt;thomas.errico@tylin.com&gt;

Wed, Sep 20, 2017 at 3:03 PM

To: Helen Donaldson &lt;HCD@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Cc: Jeremiah Bartlett &lt;JBartlett@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Keith Gray &lt;kgray@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, Katherine Earley &lt;kas@portlandmaine.gov&gt;, "Jeff Tarling (JST@portlandmaine.gov)" &lt;JST@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

Hi Nell – the following outlines my comments as it relates to the Preliminary Traffic Assessment dated September 2017 prepared by Gorrill Palmer. These comments are directed at specific items that will need to be addressed as part of a future Traffic Movement Permit (TMP).

- Intersection turning movement counts will be required at ALL study area intersections during a time-period that is appropriate considering yearly seasonal variation. Winter traffic counts will not be permitted.
- The Preliminary Traffic Assessment investigated traffic conditions at the intersections of Congress Street/St. John Street and Congress Street/Valley Street only. It should be expected that the study area will include additional intersections that meet trip threshold criteria from MaineDOT and those that are considered to be High Crash Locations (as well as others that may have specific concerns). We would expect the study area to include – at a minimum -- intersections bounded by St. John Street, Park Avenue, Bramhall Street and Veteran's Bridge.
- The Preliminary Traffic Assessment identified High Crash Locations in the vicinity of MMC. I would note that other locations may be added if data suggests high numbers of crashes. Mitigation of safety deficiencies may be required.
- The Preliminary Traffic Assessment presents traffic volume data during two volume scenarios. The first during the typical commuter time-period and a second during the peak MMC time-period. I would note that the TMP traffic study will require that commuter and MMC peak hour time-periods be evaluated as part of assessing traffic mobility impacts.
- To better understand vehicle arrival and departure activity of existing MMC employees, traffic counts will be required at existing parking supply facilities
- The Preliminary Traffic Assessment estimates at full buildout of the project, MMC will generate 703 peak hour trips during AM peak hour and 785 trips during the PM peak hour. Less is expected during the typical commuter time-periods (581 trips during the AM peak hour and 570 trips during the PM peak hour). The Trip Generation estimate should be considered preliminary and at this time the methods are not approved.
- The Preliminary Traffic Assessment analyzed movements at the St. John Street parking garage assuming a single point of access. The analysis concluded that the driveway would operate at failing levels of service and the Assessment notes that further study of traffic signalization and turn lanes would be required. Given the size of the parking garage and the associated traffic loadings onto St. John Street, additional garage entry and exit points (including other street connections like Fore River Parkway) will need to be considered. Employee exit delay directly impacts usage of the garage and the management of egress capacity (and the nearby public street intersections) will be critical.
- The capacity analysis investigated traffic conditions at the Congress Street intersection with St. John Street and Valley Street. I would note that given visual observations of the intersection during peak hours, the analysis conclusions

do not reflect field conditions. During the TMP process, enhancements and calibration of the traffic models would be required.

- In conjunction with the TMP process, there may be a requirement for off-site traffic mitigation at it relates to level of service standards and safety deficiencies. Examples include roadway and intersection improvements, traffic signal modification, traffic calming, pedestrian, transit and bicycle accommodations, etc.

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](http://www.tylin.com)

[Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Google+](#)

"One Vision, One Company"



Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

---

## final draft of MMC's IDP and Regulatory Framework

---

**Keith Gray** <kgray@portlandmaine.gov>

Thu, Sep 21, 2017 at 2:49 PM

To: Helen Donaldson <hcd@portlandmaine.gov>

Cc: Katherine Earley <kas@portlandmaine.gov>, Jeremiah Bartlett <jbartlett@portlandmaine.gov>, Christopher Branch <cbranch@portlandmaine.gov>

Hello,

The Institutional Development Plan identifies that any new development will be required to meet the City's stormwater management ordinance and further identifies that the majority of all proposed development does not increase the amount of impervious area or peak rate of runoff. This suggests that flooding standards do not apply. Any new development, regardless of landcover, will change the drainage characteristics and timing of peak rates of runoff to downstream infrastructure and is particularly concerning when discharging to the combined sanitary/storm systems. Stormwater detention and/or routing to a separated system is anticipated and will be reviewed under Site Plan approval.

Thank you,

Keith

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Keith D. Gray, PE  
Senior Engineer  
Dept. of Public Works  
City of Portland Maine

207.874.8834  
[kgray@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:kgray@portlandmaine.gov)

## Board Considerations/Questions

- **Design Guidelines** – Staff suggests strengthening the design guidelines with more specificity. Consider additional language regarding:
  - Blank facades
  - Design characteristics to review for context and compatibility
- **Garage Design General** – Design guidelines for garages currently only apply to Congress Street. Staff suggests that the guidelines be broadened to apply to any structured parking. In addition, staff felt the guidelines around garages should be strengthened and suggested language around screening of cars, activation on Congress Street, and upper floor design (see below).
- **Garage Design – St. John Street** – Further discussion is warranted regarding the impact of the proposed garage on St. John Street. Design impacts to consider would be the long views, especially from the Western Promenade. The project has the potential to be the largest building in the city and its mitigation of these impacts could be partially addressed through design including consideration of the appropriate height, length of building, and design as seen from long views.
- **5.16 Frontage Activation Diagram** – A diagram locating levels of activation according to street frontage was added per Planning Board suggestion. The diagram currently only covers Congress Street. Staff requests this diagram include more streets - St. John, Valley, Gilman, and Vaughan - with a “Limited Blank Facades” designation. Does the Board agree with the designations presented in the diagram? Other comments?

## Institutional Development Plan

### Transportation Plan:

- Applicant has expressed the design intent for the public ROW should integrate with the adjoining neighborhood contexts
- Applicant has agreed to prepare a campus-wide ROW Plan at the time of the first site plan review – the streetscape design will be more thoroughly vetted at that time in terms of sidewalk material, lighting, street trees, building interface, etc.
- Sidewalk design – Applicant may request waivers from the City sidewalk material policy but staff does not approve any specific sidewalk treatment as part of the IDP without a comprehensive ROW Plan

### Environmental and Infrastructure Plan:

- **Natural Resource Protection**
  - P.84, first bullet, *The Western Promenade, . . .* : Add reference to the intent and defining characteristics to be protected as a historic landscape such as references to the Historic Landmark Designation Report:
    - *Significance: Scenic value; recognize/preserve scenic landscape; prominent outlooks*

- . . . *the site maintains its original design objective. That is, to provide uninterrupted views of the surrounding countryside.*
- *The Western Promenade is a “site from which to take in the magnificent views of the countryside and the White Mountains.*

### Design Guidelines:

#### • **General Guidelines:**

- Reference was added giving priority to Congress Street for building orientation
- *Garage Design Guidelines* should be moved into the General Guidelines and should apply to all structured parking, not only those on Congress Street.
- **Revise the Garage Design Guidelines as follows:**  
*In addition to the general guidelines, any parking structure will:*
  - *Screen views of cars from public rights-of-way;*
  - *Provide elements of architectural interest on upper floors to contribute positively to long views and gateway approaches;*
  - *Will meet street activation intent according to street type; and*
  - *For buildings facing Congress Street (other than the core campus), not be the only or primary use and the building design will place liner buildings or active portions of the building to face Congress Street*
- **Blank Facades** are not addressed throughout the IDP area. Add a guideline that reiterates blank facades should be limited and that street-facing facades should be designed to have visual interest.
- **Figure 5.16 Frontage Types:** Move the Figure 5.16 to the General Guidelines section and revise:
  - Title: *Frontage: Types of Activation*
  - Add *Limited blank facades* to St. John, Valley, Gilman, and Vaughan streets
- **Specificity for design** compatibility should be added to the guidelines on the following topics:
  1. Visual transparency
  2. Areas of design characteristics to be considered in review: Massing, proportion, scale, composition, articulation, patterns, placement and orientation to the street, etc.

One suggested strategy for this would be *General Guidelines 4. Building designs will relate to and be compatible with the existing, or – in areas of change – planned character of residential and commercial neighbors. Design elements and characteristics to consider include:*

- *Building placement and relationship to the street*
- *Overall massing and scale*
- *Roof forms*
- *Proportion, directional expression, and composition of facades*
- *Rhythm of solids to voids*

- *Rhythm and proportion of openings*
- *Rhythm of entries and projections*
- *Relationship of materials, texture, and color*
  
- **Urban Main Street (Congress Street):**
  - Reference was added giving priority to Congress Street for building orientation

## Regulatory Framework

- **Table 4.1 Dimensional Requirements**
  - Maximum Floor Area Ratio: Remove reference, unnecessary
  - Maximum Building Length: Staff request that the appropriate garage building length be discussed further regards to mitigating impacts ; building length should be measure “roughly parallel to St. John Street”
  - Transition Zones: Height: Height language has been clarified; Remove references to alleys
  - Transition Zones: Setbacks: Adjustments to the setbacks were made according to staff recommendation – larger setbacks (15’) when directly abutting residential properties
  
- **Map 4.1 Max Building Heights**
  - # of Stories on Congress Street should be added to height maximum requirements in the legend as follows:
    - *70’ and 85’ max height = 6 stories on Congress St.\**
    - *125’ max height = 10 stories on Congress St.*
    - *200’ max height = 15 stories on Congress St.*
  - Add note\*: *For buildings with residential use above the ground floor the following height maximums apply, 70’ maximum height and 7 stories, 85’ maximum height and 8 stories.*
  - Add definition of how stories are measured