KAPLAN THOMPSON
ARCHITECTS

Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions

Date: 12/08/14

Shukria Wiar,
Planner
Planning & Urban Development Department
Portland Maine

November 03, 2014
RE: Review Comments for Single Family Site Plan,
71 Quebec Street
Project ID: 2014-02350

Dear Ms. Wiar

We have received the staff comments for above project regarding the Site Plan Requirements (dated October 24, 2014), & the R-6 Infill Design Review (dated October 23, 2014). The following comprise the project team responses to the various items & issues raised.

Site Plan Requirements:

1. The project site is located in the R-6 Zone. Drawing Notes on Sheets L-1.0, L-2.0, and L-3.0 have been updated accordingly to reflect this omission.

2. Existing soil information has been added to the Drawing Notes on Sheets L-1.0, L-2.0, and L-3.0. Soils are characterized by the USDA Soil Survey for Cumberland County as (HB) Gravelly Sandy Loam 3-8% Slopes, which are generally considered to be a well-drained soil suitable for building applications.

3. Spot grade elevations shown on Sheet L-3.0 are actual elevations based on topographical information provided on the Survey. Architectural plans use an assumed FFE of 100.0

4. Any/all easements are shown on the Existing Conditions Survey provided by Nadeau Land Surveyors.

5. Neighboring properties shall not be negatively impacted by site drainage or storm water runoff. Existing grades are shown along the property line in parentheses; for example (150.6). Proposed grades and swales provide positive drainage away from the proposed house and abutting properties. Surface drainage either sheet flows to the street, or is directed to site infiltration basins. Crushed stone pads (drip edge) shall be located at the base of each downspout.

6. The site has very little topography, with the exception of proposed infiltration basins, which are represented by contours and spot grades as shown on the plan.

7. The rear and front infiltration beds have been connected by a 4" PVC sub-surface drainage pipe to prevent overflow of the infiltration beds, and potential backflow onto abutting properties.

8. Silt fence is shown around three sides of the property perimeter; See Site Prep. Plan, Sheet L-1.0

424 FORE ST., PORTLAND, ME 04101
P 207-842-2888 F 207-842-2828
WWW.KAPLANTHOMPSON.COM

RESURGAM CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 12/08/14

9. Foundation drains shall be combined with the sewer line immediately after the p: connected to the City sewer system in Quebec Street. These lines can be modified City CSO is separated. Roof drains will drain to the ground, rather than to a sub requested. Drawing A1.1 has been modified to suit.

10. Existing vegetation to be preserved is shown on the Site Preparation Plan, Sheet L

11. The proposed house location, utilities, and associated construction/lay-down area existing 14" Norway Maple tree (in the City sidewalk) to be preserved. The Norway Maple is located directly in front of the planned front entry & in the close vicinity of proposed underground utilities. Given the likelihood of construction impact, we concur with the City Arborist that the 12" Callery Pear tree is unlikely to survive construction (see Jeff Tarling's email comments dated 10-29-2014). If the City wishes however, we will attempt to preserve the Callery Pear & will take reasonable steps during the course of construction to attempt to preserve that tree. We defer to the recommendation of the City Arborist as to whether the Callery Pear tree should be removed at the start of construction or if preservation should be attempted.

12. As requested, the plans have been updated to show limits of site disturbance.

13. A waiver is requested from the City Technical Standard 1.7.1 requiring a 10' minimum driveway width. The proposed driveway width is 9'-3" at the street boundary. This width is a reflection of the desire to provide a 20' minimum separation distance between adjacent driveways (as measured between edge of driveways at the property line, as described in Technical Standard 1.7.1), & the minimum 10' side yard. The ground floor of the proposed house has been held at a relatively narrow 11' width, & the remaining property width has been made available for the driveway. The project team feel that a 9'-3" wide driveway is unlikely to cause significant difficulty for vehicles entering or exiting the property. The proposed driveway width & driveway separation are shown on drawing A1.1.

    It should be noted that the project team reviewed the proposed driveway width & separation with the city staff & city traffic consultant on site on August 5, 2014. Other driveway options were included in the review, but the proposed arrangement was the preference of the city staff & city consultant, & was subsequently also adopted by the project ream.

14. We look forward to seeing the Consultant Traffic Engineer's comments when available.

<u>R-6 Infill Design Review:</u>

We understand that the project has been reviewed with the Alternative Design Review program. We note that the Planning Authority under an Alternative Design Review "... may approve a design not meeting one or more of the individual standards provided that all of the conditions listed below are met."(Design Certification Program for the R-6 Infill Development Standard). We see that review notes by Caitlin Cameron confirm that the project as originally submitted does meet all of the required conditions, while not meeting one or more of the individual standards.

There are however some outstanding questions & comments from the review staff which are addressed as follows:

1. No, the entry door has not been moved closer to the property line since the preliminary comments. The plans & renderings are shown with the same position. Plans & renderings are generated from the same 3-d computer drawing file, ensuring they each reflect exactly the same configuration in all respects. The front door is located 12' from the street property line.

   The project team feels that the proposed12' separation between sidewalk & door, coupled with the slight change in elevation provide an appropriate balance between proximity to the sidewalk versus security &

RESURGAM CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 12/08/14

privacy for the house occupants. In addition a new street tree is proposed in a location side of the entry, rather than directly in front as the existing tree location would be, to prominent as possible.

The project team is sensitive to the appearance of the main entry, & its relationship to way. Typical main entrances in the neighborhood do tend to be closer to the street, so the street line, but they are also raised some distance above the elevation of the sidewal elevation provide a transition space between public & private realms, & a degree of pı

We note that a number of houses, both recent & old, within a 2 block radius have similarly set back main entrances, including some that are approximately 25' or more from the street boundary, & often do not face the street.

These include the following properties:
80 Quebec st.
39 Lafyette St.
42 Lafyette St.
34 Lafyette St.
59 Lafyette St. (immediately opposite 71 Quebec St., at the corner of Quebec Street & Lafyette St.)
32 Melbourne St.

2. Noted.

3. The clerestory windows on the NE, & SW facades are stepped to reflect the interior spatial arrangement. Each pair provides light & ventilation to a child's bedroom. One window is located at an elevated platform, while the other (lower window) is above a desk. The project team feels that the proposed stepped arrangement is an intentional signal on a minor facade, as to the interior room arrangement. The stepped motif is also thought of as a reflection of the stepped forms of the house. The project team has considered a number of alternative arrangements for these windows, including alignment, & even deletion of one of the windows, but is not strongly settled on any particular arrangement.

4. The project team recognizes that the a greater differentiation between window sill heights of the 3 1/2 floor windows (4.3, 4.4 & 4.5) would help emphasize the difference between the "corner" windows (4.3 & 4.4), & the "picture" window (4.5). These windows have been modified to suit & the exterior elevations & window schedule have been revised.

In addition a number of individual standards are deemed to have been not met. These were identified in the staff comments with red text. Our understanding is that despite not meeting these individual standards the majority of the standards within each principle were met, as required by the Design Review Criteria. As such we understand that the planning staff are not seeking further comments or responses from the project team for these items, although we would be happy to do so if requested.

Revised landscape and architectural drawings have today's revision date in the title block (but the pdf file name is unchanged from the original submission - per city submission requirements).

Please let us know if there are any further questions or items the staff would like addressed by the project team.

Sincerely,

Richard Lo

424 FORE ST., PORTLAND, ME 04101
P 207-842-2888 F 207-842-2828
WWW.KAPLANTHOMPSON.COM