

**From:** John Charette <john@charette-design.com>  
**To:** Liv Chase <livchase@yahoo.com>, Tracie Reed <traciereed@dextrouscreative...>  
**CC:** Ann Machado <AMACHADO@portlandmaine.gov>  
**Date:** 8/18/2014 10:13 AM  
**Subject:** Re: 180 Washington Ave - Permit #2014-01749  
**Attachments:** S 1 Structural framing plan.pdf; S 2 Structural framing plan.pdf; S 3 Structural Framing Plan.pdf; A 1.2 Floor Plans.pdf; C 2 Site Plan.pdf

Ann,  
Attached are revised files including A1.2 floor plans which resolve a great deal of your questions. also attached are revised structural plans and the revised site plan.

Please note that the top of decking is (and has been) set at 45' above average grade. The very top of the roof slope is 45' above average grade, and the top of the roof deck sits at this level due to the location on the roof and slope. Sections are correct and elevations are correct with respect to grade and zoning heights, I don't expect revisions but if you need more information we can provide you with whatever you may need.

John Charette  
Charette Design  
Architecture + Sustainability  
207-831-7757

On Mon, Aug 18, 2014 at 8:35 AM, Liv Chase <livchase@yahoo.com> wrote:

> Hi Ann,  
> John Charette should have sent the corrected drawings to you yesterday.  
> Can you confirm that your received those drawings and the process is moving  
> forward. I have cc John on this e-mail.  
> Thanks,  
> Liv Chase  
>  
>  
> On Friday, August 15, 2014 3:05 PM, Ann Machado <  
> AMACHADO@portlandmaine.gov> wrote:  
>  
>  
> Liv -  
>  
> Thanks for the deed.  
>  
> Will John Charette be sending the correct site plan as well?  
>  
> Please have him send the pdfs directly to me.  
>  
> Thanks.  
>  
> Ann  
>  
>  
> Ann Machado  
> Zoning Specialist  
> Planning & Urban Development

> Portland City Hall  
> (207) 874-8709  
> >>> Liv Chase <livchase@yahoo.com> 8/14/2014 9:52 AM >>>  
> Hi Ann,  
> I apologize for the incompetence of my architect. I notified him yesterday  
> when I saw all of these errors. This is very unprofessional and a great  
> deal of work for you. The plans that the architect submitted originally  
> (without the stamp) are the correct drawings. In regards to the site plan,  
> the building is not draw correctly on the lot. The width of the building is  
> 24' and it is located on the right side line (so no set back on the right)  
> and this leaves a set back of 5'+ on the left. Therefore the overhang shown  
> is within the property line. Please see attached deed (item #2). In  
> response to item #3, yes we are doing 2 condominiums, so applying for 2  
> occupancies now is what we intended.  
> My architect is John Charette. He can be reached at  
> john@charette-design.com or by phone at 831-7757. All the other comments  
> in regards to the building design, plans, elevations, and sections should  
> be corrected by John. I have forward him your e-mail. Again, I am sorry for  
> the confusion this has caused. Please let me know if you have any questions  
> for me.  
> Regards,  
> Liv Chase

>  
>  
> On Thursday, August 14, 2014 9:10 AM, Ann Machado <  
> AMACHADO@portlandmaine.gov> wrote:

> Liv -

> I have completed my initial zoning review and at this time I can't sign  
> off. I need the following:

- >
- > 1. The second page of the fast track application was not filled in. It  
> needs to be resubmitted with a category checked and with a signature and  
> date.
  - > 2. A copy of the deed needs to be submitted.
  - > 3. Is the use going to be two residential units or two residential  
> condominiums? If the certificate of occupancy is issued for two residential  
> units, you will need to apply for a condo conversion permit to convert the  
> units to residential condominiums in the future. If you pay for two  
> certificates of occupancy now, then two certificates of occupancy will be  
> issued, one for each residential condominium.
  - > 4. There appear to be discrepancies between the floor plans and elevation  
> plans.
    - > -the footprint of the building is 69' x 24'
    - > - the foundation plan and the Ground level plan match these dimensions and  
> what the West elevation shows - the south elevation does not include the  
> deck off the rear of the ground floor
    - > - the first floor footprint (A1.2) is 19'8" x 63' with the 6' deck off the  
> back - the West elevation shows the rear as being the full 24' wide - the  
> East elevation shows the front where the garage are as 24' wide - also what  
> are the 5' x 14' extensions off both sides of the building? The building is  
> 24' wide and with 5' extensions coming off both sides the footprint would  
> be 34' wide and the lot is only 29.92' wide - the floor plan also shows a  
> door on the left side which is not on the north elevation.

- > - the second floor footprint is also around 19.7' wide by 63' long - the
- > north and west elevations show a small deck on the right rear corner which
- > is not shown on the floor plan - the north and west elevation also show the
- > building as being 24' wide for the front three quarters of the building,
- > but this is not shown on the floor plan.
- > - the third floor plan matches the elevations.
- > - the framing plans match the elevations and not the floor plan dimensions.
- > -It is unclear on the East and South elevations if the building is
- > indented on the 2nd & third floors or if it is just different facade
- > material
- > 5. The application states that there are three bedrooms in the second unit
- > but the second floor plan only shows two.
- > 6. The North elevation gives the average grade (based on the average of
- > the four corners) as 45 to the top of the roof. You need to give the
- > elevations at the four corners to show how you came up with the average
- > grade. Also if there is a roof top deck, the height of the building needs
- > to be measured from average grade to the top of the decking on the deck.
- > 7. The site plan does not reflect all parts of the footprint.
- > -The elevations show a 4' overhang over the left side entrance - the
- > building on that side scales at about .66' off the property line - the
- > overhang would encroach over the property line.
- > - Also the concrete barrier block retainer shown on the South and west
- > elevations appear to be 6' wide - which would also encroach on the
- > neighbor's property.
- > - the footprint of the rear deck on the ground floor level is not shown
- > \* I would wait to hear from Phil DiPierro in Planning before any changes
- > are made to the site plan because he may ask for modifications also.
- >
- > Please send any corrected pdfs directly to me.
- >
- > Let me know if you have any questions.
- >
- > Thank you.
- >
- > Ann Machado
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > Ann Machado
- > Zoning Specialist
- > Planning & Urban Development
- > Portland City Hall
- > (207) 874-8709
- >
- > Notice: Under Maine law, documents - including e-mails - in the possession
- > of public officials or city employees about government business may be
- > classified as public records. There are very few exceptions. As a result,
- > please be advised that what is written in an e-mail could be released to
- > the public and/or the media if requested. --
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >