**PB Hearing 3.22.16: 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 now meets all of the R6 zoning requirements; it is 5 feet from the side boundary and 15 feet from the rear boundary and 40 feet high with a stepback on the uphill rear side at 35 feet as required under the R6 zoning. At the Workshop there was a question over whether the stepback would be impacted by code requirements for a second set of stairs, but that issue is resolved and a second set of stairs will not be required. The Zoning Adminstrator’s comments about stairs being allowed above height limits is included for information as it was requested by the Board.
3. **Public comments**: A Neighborhood meeting is not required for this project. The comments received at the Workshop from two neighbors are included in the packet, but only Ms Casales has submitted further comments on the final proposals and remains concerned at the loss of a mature street tree in Waterville Street. Both the applicant and the City Arborist have given this question further consideration and the conclusion is that the tree should be removed as proposed because it is impacted by overhead wires and will be impacted by the construction and proximity of the new building.
4. **Proposed motion for the Board to consider:** The applicant has revised the materials, provided more detail regarding the landscaping, and added outside bike racks and generally meets the site plan and subdivision standards. The proposed waivers and conditions are either “standard” or relatively minor in nature:
* **Waiver for distance from corner:** The headings on the waivers have been reversed; in respect of the distance from the corner the applicant has moved the proposed driveway slightly further away from the corner so it better meets the technical standard and staff support this waiver.
* **R6 Design Review- entrances:** The applicant has provided additional information to address the R6 design standards. The first suggested condition reflects the final design review which noted that the design requirements apply to the main entrance and it is not clear which of the two entrances is the main entrance. The condition requests that the main entrance be identified and revised to meet the R6 Design Standards with any lighting also meeting the Citys’’s Site Lighting Standards.
* **Roof and other mechanical equipment:** The submissions do not clarify what or where the mechanicals will be located and staff are aware that external compressors for heat pumps or air conditioners can be large and loud. Therefore a condition requires that these be the subject of further staff review and approval.
* **Street trees**: The applicant has met the requirement for 4 street trees on the site; 2 new street trees are proposed in Waterville street; a 3rd street tree is the subject of the waiver; and the proposed condition ensures that the existing street tree in Fore Street remains and is protected.
* **ROW conditions to ensure the sidewalk is not adversely affected and that proposals in the ROW (which include 2 bike hitches) meet the Citys Technical standards;**
* **ADA accessibility**: The accessible route is via the garage and a large entrance door is shown in the elevations. The ADA requirement for an accessible aisle alongside a parking space for access to a vehicle was overlooked during the review. A separate Memo (circulated tonight) outlines a seventh condition that staff are recommending be added to the motion for consideration - it requires that the ADA aisle be incorporated into the garage layout. The additional motion has been discussed with Tom Errico, the consultant Traffic Reviewing Engineer, and staff consider there is enough space in the garage to accommodate this ADA requirement without any substantial impact to the overall design.