

## Jeanie Bourke - Re: 30 Monument St. Bp#2014-02773

---

**From:** Jeanie Bourke  
**To:** Brewster Buttfield  
**Date:** 3/6/2015 1:29 PM  
**Subject:** Re: 30 Monument St. Bp#2014-02773  
**CC:** George Froehlich; Jamie Isaacson; Tammy Munson; Tom Landry

---

Good Afternoon Brewster,

Thank you for providing these changes and details. I have reviewed the information, see my comments below in red. This will need to be submitted formally as an amendment to the original permit. The application is the Residential Alterations/Additions, and you can reference the permit in the description along with the additional changes.

My suggestion is that you prepare the plans for the amendment and we meet next week to more comprehensively review the complete set. I am available on Mon. or Wed. afternoon between 1-3:30, let me know.

Additional details can be made prior to the submittal. To be consistent with the "Fast Track" approval, this set will also need to be stamped. Keep in mind that there is no guarantee that code issues won't arise in the field that will need to be addressed.

Thanks,  
Jeanie

>>> Brewster Buttfield <brewster@prospectdesign.me> 3/5/2015 5:32 PM >>>

Jeanie

Attached are revised sheets that address all the issues listed in your email.

1. The NW wall is detailed as a one hour wall and labeled as UL U340 This detail will need to be included on the plans for this wall type and include compliance with test UL 236 or ASTM E 119 with exposure from both sides. Also include continuance of the fire resistance for the eave projection per Table 302.1. Venting of the roof is allowed if applicable.
2. The window quantity is actually the same if you can the original basement windows (see photo below). The actual area of glass is reduced in the proposed plan by 17 sq.ft. This is shown on the existing and proposed elevation drawings. This is acceptable.
3. An updated plan for the deeper basement is a new sheet, A-103. It shows the required egress well, the stairs to basement instead of a hatch and the required thermal barrier for the insulation. This, as well as any other changes need to be updated on all associated plans, ie. sections, etc.
4. I have detailed larger landings on the two entries. Ok. Regarding the naming of the floors, the "lower level" floor is confusing as this is essentially an on-grade floor, thus the actual "1st floor". Accordingly, the stories would go basement, 1st, 2nd, 3rd and penthouse/roof deck. This is not being considered a story as the area is not habitable at less than 70 SF, per Sec. 304.2.

Let me know if you need any more information. I would like to settle these four issues and then sit down with you for a project review so no other issues arise later. I will make time available at your earliest convenience.

Thank you, Brewster



On Tue, Mar 3, 2015 at 2:48 PM, Jeanie Bourke <[JMB@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:JMB@portlandmaine.gov)> wrote:

Hi Brewster,

With all due respect, this is a new building and is required to be built per the requirements of the IRC 2009 for new construction. While this application meets the eligibility requirements for the expedited "Fast Track" review process, the associated building code complications would warrant a preliminary discussion with the Building Division. I am not aware of this request, did you have a meeting with any building officials during the design phase of this project?

I question the reference to the fire separation requirements. The minimum *Fire Separation Distances* are per Table R302.1 and the definition in Ch. 2. In this case it is the distance to the interior lot line or property line, not to structures on adjacent lots. Building codes take precedence regardless of zoning or planning standards.

I researched the 2012 code you referenced using the new Table for sprinkled buildings. As the footnote states this is specifically for all adjacent buildings in a subdivision. This is not the case and therefore it cannot be used in this situation.

After the field inspection and subsequent overview of the plans, the following items have come to our attention and need to be addressed as soon as possible to avoid a stoppage of work on this project.

1. Provide a 1 hour exterior wall detail, rated from both sides per Table 302.1 and UL 263 for the northeast wall.
2. Provide the percentage of glazing & openings of the existing and proposed northeast wall. With this

information we can understand the amount of increase.

3. Based on the field inspection by George for the footings, it was confirmed with the contractor that the house will have a full basement. If this is correct, an amendment is required for this change and should include the access and emergency escape and rescue opening.

4. It appears there is no compliant floor elevation/landing at both sides of the exterior doors per Sec. 311.3. This is also a requirement for other exterior doors, Sec. 311.3.2 when there are more than 2 risers as is shown on the plans.

Thank you for addressing these issues, let me know if you have any questions.

Jeanie

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*CEO/LPI/Plan Reviewer*

**City of Portland**  
**Planning & Urban Development Dept./ Inspections Division**  
**389 Congress St. Rm 315**  
**Portland, ME 04101**  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
**Direct: (207) 874-8715**  
**Office: (207) 874-8703**  
**Permit status can be viewed at: <http://www.portlandmaine.gov/792/Permit-Status>**

>>> Brewster Buttfield <[brewster@prospectdesign.me](mailto:brewster@prospectdesign.me)> 3/2/2015 10:12 AM >>>

Jeanie

I am writing to follow up on my call last week and to list out my rationale for why windows should be allowed on the northeast wall of the building at single family residence at 30 Monument Street.

This project began as a renovation of the existing building on this narrow lot and evolved, as it advanced through the permit approval process and also in meeting the goals of the new owner, into a complete reconstruction from ground up. It was permitted on the basis of an expansion of the existing structure. This allowed us to add more, taller volume while greatly reducing the lot coverage. The City's planning department's design guidelines were also met with the proposed facade fenestration. The code threshold for distances predicates sprinkler protection as this is a requirement of the code that was deleted by MUBEC.

The lot is 34 feet wide and the existing building was right on the northeast property line and the new construction is held back 1'-4" from the northeast property line. There were originally 3 windows on this face and we are proposing 6. The code calls for a one hour wall with no openings. The current separation between buildings is about 13'. If the abutting property was rebuilt to the new proposed zoning 5" setback, the buildings could be as close as 6'-4" apart but the new building would need to be sprinkled. Table 302.1 (2) of the IRC 2012 would allow unlimited openings in a 1 hour wall with 3' separation and unlimited openings in a 0 hour wall if both buildings are sprinkled and there is a 6' separation between buildings.

Taking these in to consideration, I argue we are meeting the intent of the rules with a one hour wall and the 6 unprotected openings we are proposing.

Thank you for your time. I look forward to hearing from you.

Brewster

--

Brewster Buttfield | Prospect Design | 207.749.7400  
[www.prospectdesign.me](http://www.prospectdesign.me)

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.

--

Brewster Buttfield | Prospect Design | 207.749.7400

[www.prospectdesign.me](http://www.prospectdesign.me)