**WORKSHOP 2.9.16: 31 Fore Street - Redevelopment to create new 4 unit condo building**

*Staff presentation*

1. **Proposal:** The applicants propose to demolish the existing 3 story building and build a larger building for 4 condo units over an enclosed garage for 6 vehicles. The footprint of the building is 867 sq ft larger than that of the existing building, but the new building would be about 3 feet farther away from the neighboring building at 25 Fore Street.
2. **Zoning:** The proposed building meets most of the R6 zoning requirements; it is 5 feet from the side boundary and 15 feet from the rear boundary and 40 feet high. Early in the review staff clarified that the proposals did not meet the R6 stepback requirements because the building is within 10 feet of the side property boundary. The requirement here would be for the building to be stepped back 5 feet as from the 35 feet height, but this requirement does not apply to stairwells and elevator shafts that need to go above the 35 ft height.
3. **Public comments**: A Neighborhood meeting is not required for this project. Two public comments have been received and circulated. One is from a condo owner in the uphill abutting property at 25 Fore Street who raises some detailed concerns regarding impacts on that property. The other is from a neighbor further up Waterville Street questioning the removal of the large street tree on Waterville Street and noting the lack of landscaped areas.

1. **Review issues:** 
   * **Stepbacks:** Discussions with the applicant and the City’s building code reviewers suggests that that only a small stepback at the rear corner is required in order to meet the zoning requirements because of the need for a second set of stairs for egress. The second set of stairs would mean that most of the side elevation is exempt from the stepback requirements. Staff have not received any definitive detailed information supporting the inclusion of the second set of stairs and consider that the stepback should be extended to the elevator unless that information is received.

* **If larger stepback**: If the second set of stairs is not required by the Building Code, the stepback would take the upper part of the wall back to where there is a hall and a bathroom. These could have obscured windows that let in light but protect privacy.
* **R6 Design Review- entrances:** The applicant was advised in January of the Design Review comments regarding the small scale and lack of architectural prominence of the “main” entrance reached by steps from Fore Street. Staff understand that this entrance and the entrance at the garage level are being reconsidered; the final design should address ADA accessibility requirements and the concerns of the neighbors at 25 Fore Street. Staff also note that it will be a challenge to provide adequate lighting for the side entrance that does not impact neighbors.
* **R6 Design Review – materials**: The Design Review also notes that the base level material would typically be masonry or concrete rather than the clapboard as proposed.

The neighbor on Fore Street has also expressed concerns about the entrance and impact of the exposed basement level walls.

* **Waiver for distance from corner:** A revised waiver request was received but inadvertently omitted from the packet and has been circulated today. The last item indicates that to meet the standard of 35 feet from the corner would require the building height to be increased. Staff consider that the applicant should move the driveway as far as possible even if not quite meeting the standard.
* **Landscape and open space**: The proposals are preliminary and the landscape plan needs further development to address review standards, including:
  + Details of the raingarden
  + Yard landscaping and vegetated buffers to adjacent properties
  + Screening of the basement level exposed walls
  + Open space provision for the multi family use
* **ADA accessibility**: In view of the stepped access to the main entrance, staff requested the applicant to confirm that the project met the federal and state ADA requirements. The accessible route appears to be via the garage and staff are concerned that this does not fully address the ADA requirement that the accessible door “must be one which is typically used by residents and/or guests for the purpose of entering the building”.
* **Impacts on neighbor’s property:** The applicant has indicated in **Att K** that they do not foresee entering into a temporary construction easement with any neighbors. Staff agree with the abutting neighbor that the structural integrity on the slope needs further confirmation. The Construction Management Plan needs to be more comprehensive to address this structural issue, along with impacts on traffic and street parking; protection of existing landscaping and street trees; and containment of dust.
* **Street Trees**: The City Arborist Jeff Tarlingsupports the replacement of the street tree on Waterville St with 2 new street trees, although a recent public comment has questioned its removal as its “established” . In respect of the neighbor’s concern about the existing street tree in Fore Street, Mr Tarling would not support its removal and considers that the sidewalk problems can be repaired.
* **Firebox on corner:** the public comment referred to the existing fire call box on the corner. This is called a EVCS box with telephone inside and was only recently taken out of service because it was not reliable and the Fire department intend to remove it in due course. The Fire Department is open to leaving this one in place if the applicant or neighbors want to refurbish it or pay for the Fire Department to refurbish it.