



June 13, 2014

Ms. Caitlin Cameron, Planner  
Planning and Development Department  
City of Portland, Maine  
389 Congress Street  
Portland, Maine 04101-3509

**Subject: 185 Fore Street  
Preliminary Site Plan and Subdivision Application  
Response to Review Comments**

Dear Ms. Cameron:

On behalf of Bateman Partners, LLC, we are pleased to provide the following responses to the Preliminary Review Comments related to the Subdivision and Site Plan Application for the proposed proposed mixed-use building at 185 Fore Street. For ease of reference we have repeated the comments in *italics*, followed by our response.

**COMMENTS FROM DAVID SENUS & ASHLEY AUGER, WOODARD & CURRAN  
DATED 05-29-14**

---

Comment 1:

*The Applicant has noted that the project site is subject to the conditions of a previous environmental cleanup effort associated with the American Hoist and Derrick Company, and that the restrictions are in the form of a restrictive deed covenant. The Applicant should clarify what these restrictions entail. Are there special soil characterization, handling, and disposal requirements or special building slab construction requirements (i.e. – vapor barrier below building)? Dewatering procedures may be subject to testing and treatment in accordance with the City's Industrial Pretreatment program prior to discharge to the City's sewer system.*

Response:

The above comment is correct. The two parcels were in fact part of American Hoist and Derrick Company, but were the less chemically/petroleum impacted part of the site than the balance of the site.

Hoffman Engineering, Inc. (environmental engineering subconsultant) has recommended a Phase II on each of the lots to allow for the design, if necessary, of a vapor barrier and/or a sub-slab depressurization system. It is our understanding subgrade basements will not be constructed as part of the new construction and as such for example a sump pump would not be necessary as part of the construction.

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 2

Dewatering within utility areas during construction may encounter impacted groundwater. Again, that is the purpose of the recommended Phase II, to evaluate these specific proposed construction areas that, if necessary, a pretreatment system can be designed in the event that dewatering is necessary.

Based on existing data it does not appear that any soil excavated from the proposed construction areas and transported off site will be characterized as hazardous waste. However, this soil will not be considered “clean fill” and will need to be disposed of at a facility such as Commercial Paving/Recycling in Scarborough.

Comment 2:

*The application is preliminary. As such, we anticipate that additional documents will be submitted with the final application, including confirmation of capacity to serve the development from utilities and a Construction Management Plan. Woodard & Curran will perform a review of the Final Application upon receipt of these documents.*

Response:

Requests for ability to serve were submitted to the City of Portland and Portland Water District on March 11, 2014. A copy of the response letter dated March 19, 2014 from the Portland Water District confirming their ability to provide water supply to this project is appended to this comment response letter as Attachment A.

Comment 3:

*In accordance with Section 5 of the City of Portland Technical Manual, a Level III Site Plan project is required to submit a stormwater management plan pursuant to the regulations of MaineDEP Chapter 500 Stormwater Management Rules, including conformance with the Basic, General, and Flooding Standards. We offer the following comments:*

*a) Basic Standards: At this time, it does not appear that the Applicant has provided a plan, notes, and details to address erosion and sediment control requirements, inspection and maintenance requirements, and good housekeeping practices in general accordance with Appendix A, B, & C of MaineDEP Chapter 500. The erosion control notes on Sheet C-1.1 refer to a sheet that does not appear to have been submitted. Additional information to address the Basic Standards will need to be provided with future submittals.*

Response:

FST is developing a site specific Erosion & Sediment Control Plan for the project, which will include inspection and maintenance requirements in accordance with MeDEP Chapter 500. This information will be provided under separate cover when it is available.

*b) General Standard: The project is required to include specific stormwater management features for stormwater quality control. The Applicant has proposed to install a cartridge*

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 3

*filter treatment unit (Model 10080 as manufactured by Fabco Industries or approved equal) within the building internal storm drain system. The Applicant should provide pollutant removal performance data for the treatment unit for review.*

Response:

Information on the pollutant removal performance of the Fabco cartridge filter system is provided in Attachment B.

*c) Flooding Standard: The project will result in a net increase in impervious area. As such, the project is required to include specific stormwater management features to control the rate of stormwater runoff from the site. The Applicant has requested a waiver from this standard and proposes to discharge the building roof water directly into the combined sewer system in India Street. This waiver request cannot be supported for this project, as the direct connection of stormwater into the combined sewer system will result in an increase in the rate of inflow entering the system. As such, the Applicant will be required to detain stormwater onsite or propose a means of discharging stormwater from the site through a design that is acceptable to the City Engineer.*

Response:

David Senus of Woodard & Curran provided FST with information on the previously approved Eastern Waterfront Development project, which included the Ocean Gateway Parking Garage, as well as a proposed office building on the Fore Street and India Street parcel. According to the stormwater analysis prepared by Woodard & Curran, this approved project removed approximately 1.27 acres of tributary area from the combined sewer system in India Street by conveying runoff from the parking garage parcel to Casco Bay via the Hancock Street storm drain network. The roof runoff from the proposed office building on the corner of Middle and India Streets was designed to connect to the combined sewer because there is no separate storm drain in the immediate vicinity. The significant reduction in area tributary to the combined sewer resulted in a reduction in stormwater peak flow rates. The currently proposed project will maintain this previously approved runoff pattern.

The plans have been revised to show a dedicated roof drain connected to the existing catch basin at the corner of Fore and India Streets, as requested by the city engineer. This will allow for further reduction in stormwater runoff to the combined system if the India Street storm drain network is separated from the sanitary sewer in the future.

Comment 4:

*The Applicant should provide a Stormwater Management Plan, which shall include a stormwater inspection and maintenance plan developed in accordance with and in reference to MaineDEP Chapter 500 guidelines and Chapter 32 of the City of Portland Code of Ordinances.*

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 4

Response:

FST is in the process of preparing a Stormwater Management Plan for the project, and will submit this under separate cover when it is available.

Comment 5:

*The proposed grading on the northern corner of the site appears to be very steep. The Applicant should indicate what stabilization methods will be utilized in this area.*

Response:

The adjacent offsite steep slope area is currently stabilized with riprap stone material. The existing stub retaining wall extending from the Ocean Gateway Garage will be extended to the proposed building allowing for a softening of this slope. The intent will be to grade this area and stabilize with loam and seed, but a portion of the existing riprap stone will remain as this is on the adjacent site.

Comment 6:

*The Brick Sidewalk, Vertical Granite Curb, and Typical Trench Details should be prepared in accordance with Figures I-10, I-16, and II-12, respectively, of the City of Portland Technical Manual for work within the City Right-of-Way.*

Response:

As requested, the City's standard details for brick sidewalk, vertical granite curb and typical trench details have been added to the plan set. A copy of the updated plan set is appended to this comment response letter.

Comment 7:

*The Barrier Free Ramp Detail contains a note referencing the Town of Scarborough Right-of-Way; the Applicant should modify this note.*

Response:

The barrier free ramp detail has been revised to reflect the City's standard detail sidewalk ramps and detectable warning surface. A copy of the updated plan set is appended to this comment response letter.

Comment 8:

*Multiple notes on the Utility Plan (C-5) refer to a Site Electrical Plan (E1.01), a copy of which has not been received with this Preliminary Application.*

Response:

A copy of the Site Electrical Plan is appended to this comment response letter.

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 5

Comment 9:

*Sheet C-3.0 indicates to “Restore Ex. Bituminous Pavement Area” in the alley between the proposed building and the Ocean Gateway Garage; however, the Boundary & Topographic Survey indicates that this area is gravel. The Applicant will be required to pave this alleyway as part of this project.*

Response:

As requested, the site plans have been revised to include the installation of bituminous pavement within the alleyway between the proposed building and the parking garage.

Comment 10:

*Underground conduits and an easement exist for telecommunications services across the project property with service to the Ocean Gateway Garage. These conduits and easement should be depicted on the Boundary & Topographic Survey Plan. It appears that the Applicant is re-establishing this service connection across their site as part of the proposed Utility Plan; however, the Applicant should describe how they are coordinating this work with the adjacent Garage property owner.*

Response:

Owen Haskell, Inc. (project surveyor) is researching the presence of the easement in question. At this point, we are uncertain of its existence; however, the site development plans for this project include relocating these underground lines as part of the project. Refer to the Site Electrical Plan that is appended to this comment response letter.

Comment 11:

*Multiple utilities (natural gas, drains, primary electrical) exist in the alleyway between the Ocean Gateway Garage and the proposed building (with easements to these utility companies); however, the location of many of these utilities are not depicted on the survey or site plans. The location of these utilities and any recorded easement information should be included on the boundary survey and the project design plans.*

Response:

The 11’ wide easement is shown on the plans. The extent of underground utilities in this alleyway is based upon the archive plans available from the City of Portland for the construction of the Ocean Gateway Garage.

Comment 12:

*A large Central Maine Power (CMP) manhole / vault exists at the project corner of the Fore and India Street intersection. The project proposes a brick sidewalk finish over this vault. The Applicant should work with CMP to verify whether the concrete top of this vault can be modified to allow for the brick sidewalk treatment, or whether the top will need to be replaced to accommodate brick sidewalk in this area.*

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 6

Response:

The proposed site development plans have been revised to maintain the concrete slab at the intersection of India and Fore Street. Based upon site inspection, this concrete slab appears to be an integral part of the CMP vault and as such the extent of brick sidewalk will match to the existing concrete slab as currently exists today.

**COMMENTS FROM REBECCA SCHAFFNER DATED 05-28-14**

---

**Site Plan Standards**

(a) Transportation Standards; 2. Access and Circulation, c. Sidewalks:

*An easement agreement will be needed to allow public access onto the private portion of the sidewalk.*

Response:

The applicant is prepared to execute the standard City pedestrian access easement as a condition of site plan approval. Please forward a copy of easement language for review and eventual execution by the applicant.

(a) Transportation Standards; 4. Parking; a. Location & Required # of Vehicle Parking Spaces:

*Unsure why number of spaces secured is above required minimum.*

Response:

The leased parking agreement was executed on May 3, 2013 to secure adequate parking supply for the site for future development. The lease agreement for this site secured the right to use up to 96 parking spaces. As shown on the Zoning Summary table on Sheet C-1.1, the proposed development is required to provide 19 parking spaces; therefore, the applicant has demonstrated adequate supply is available via the lease agreement to provide parking within the Ocean Gateway Garage.

*Agreement appears to treat all proposed building occupants as tenants of Bateman Partners; if the upper floors are to be independently owned condos unsure this agreement is adequate.*

Response:

The lease agreement was structured to anticipate multiple tenants, owners, etc. Specific language is included within the lease agreement that states “WHEREAS, Tenant may develop and construct office, retail, residential or other lawful facilities on the parcel located at 25 India Street, Portland, Maine and shall use the Parking Spaces, as defined below, for owners, tenants, renters, licensees, invitees, employees transient users or, and/or owners of condominium units in, the 25 India Street Parcel (collectively, and as so defined, “Qualified Parkers”).

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 7

(a) Transportation Standards; 4. Parking; b. Location & Required # of Bicycle Parking Spaces:

*Access to bicycle parking for condo residents is awkward and inconvenient.*

*Would like to see 1 on-street bike hitch moved to Fore Street near residential entrance.*

Response:

As requested, a bike hitch has been added to the Fore Street side of the building. It should also be noted that bicycle storage is provided internal to the building for each residential unit.

(b) Environmental Quality Standards; 2. Landscaping & Landscape Preservation; b. Site Landscaping; i.i.i. Street Trees

*Proposal does not meet street tree provisions along Middle Street, trees needs to be added here. City Arborist would like to see 2 street trees on India Street and 1 street tree on Fore Street – a waiver shall be required for remainder and a financial contribution for those that cannot be planted on-site.*

Response:

Anthony Muench, RLA, met with Jeff Tarling to review the street tree planting requirements along Fore Street and India Street. Due to the conflict with underground power conduits beneath the Fore Street sidewalk, we are not able to install additional street trees; however, two raised planting beds have been added to the plans adjacent to the building exterior walls to enable landscape planting materials to be provided. In addition, the existing tree along India Street will be removed and replaced with two new street trees with tree grates and tree guards. It is our understanding that Jeff Tarling is in agreement with this alternate approach.

(c) Public Infrastructure and Community Safety Standards; 2. Public Safety & Fire Protection; a. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

*Have lighting and surveillance safety concerns regarding the alleyway between the proposed building and Ocean Gateway Parking Garage.*

Response:

Several building mounted exterior wall pack lighting fixtures will be provided for security lighting around the perimeter of the building. Refer to the Site Electrical Plan that is appended to this comment response letter.

(d) Site Design Standards; 6. Exterior Lighting

*No lighting plan submitted; will want to see a lighting plan consistent with Eastern Waterfront Lighting District standards.*

Response:

The street lighting has been prepared by Bennett Engineering and is depicted on the Site Electrical Plan that is appended to this comment response letter.

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 8

**Subdivision Review**

**Sec 14-496 Plat requirements, (b)Recording Plat**

*A recording plat will be required as part of the final submission*

**Response:**

A recording plat will be prepared and submitted prior to final approval.

**COMMENTS FROM CHRIS PIRONE/FIRE DATED 06-02-14**

---

**Construction Management Plan**

**Comment 1:**

*Streets must maintain a 20' width for Fire Department access at all times.*

**Response:**

All streets surrounding the site exceed the minimum width requirement of 20'.

**Comment 2:**

*Fire Hydrants shall not be blocked or enclosed by fencing. A 3' foot clearance must be kept at all times around the fire hydrant.*

**Response:**

The proposed site development is not proposing any fencing or enclosure within 3' of a hydrant.

**Comment 3:**

*If gates are locked, a Portland Fire Department Knox padlock must be purchased by the applicant to allow access for the Fire Department.*

**Response:**

The proposed site development is not proposing any gates with locks.

**Comment 4:**

*The Construction Company' emergency contact information shall be posted on the property in case of an after-hours emergency.*



Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 9

Response:

Construction Management Plan Notes have been added to Sheet C-1.1 of the plan set that include requirements for posting of emergency contact information on the site and with the Portland Fire Department. A copy of the updated plan set is appended to this comment response letter.

Comment 5:

*All construction shall comply with 2009 NFPA 1 Chapter 16 Safeguards During Building Construction, Alteration, and Demolition Operations.*

Response:

Construction Management Plan Notes have been added to Sheet C-1.1 of the plan set that include reference to commented requirements. A copy of the updated plan set is appended to this comment response letter.

Comment 6:

*Any cutting and welding done will require a Hot Work Permit from Fire Department.*

Response:

Construction Management Plan Notes have been added to Sheet C-1.1 of the plan set that include references to commented requirements. A copy of the updated plan set is appended to this comment response letter.

**Exit Discharge**

Comment 1:

*A Life Safety Evacuation Plan shall be submitted with the Building Permit detailing the exiting and waiting area for occupants.*

Response:

Archetype will be developing a full Life Safety Evacuation Plan, working with a fire suppression engineer and providing this work at the time of submission of the Building Permit.

**Fire Vehicle Access**

Comment 1:

*Fire Department access shall have an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 ft. 6 in.*

Response:

The proposed building development will not result in any overhanging structures that will impact or obstruct vertical clearance for Fire Department vehicular access.

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 10

Comment 2:

*Vertical clearance shall be permitted to be reduced, provided such reduction does not impair access by fire apparatus, and approved signs are installed and maintained indicating the established vertical clearance when approved.*

Response:

The minimum 13'-6" vertical clearance will not be impacted; therefore, reduction in vertical clearance is not being requested.

**2009 NFPA 1 18.3 Water Supplies and Fire Hydrants**

Comment 1:

*If the building has a sprinkler system; fire hydrants must be within 100' but no closer than 40'.*

Response:

The building will have a sprinkler system. The closest fire hydrant is located on the opposite side of India Street, which is approximately 55' from the building and 57' from the external sprinkler riser connection. The existing hydrant is shown on the site plans.

Comment 2:

*Fire Department Connections shall not be located where large diameter hose may block egress.*

Response:

The external sprinkler riser connection is located adjacent to one of the Middle Street building entrances, which should not interfere with building access.

**Building**

Comment 1:

*The new building shall not affect the egress or required Fire Department access for the neighboring building.*

Response:

The proposed building is located within the project site boundaries and does not encroach into the alleyway between the new building and parking garage. As a result, egress into this area will not be impacted as a result of this development.

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 11

**Premises Identification**

Comment 1:

*The main entrance of the building must be the address for the property. This should be consistent with 911, tax assessor, Inspections Division and future mailing address.*

Response:

The proposed address for the building will be 185 Fore Street, which we believe is consistent with the City's addressing systems.

Comment 2:

*Street addresses shall be marked on the structure and shall be as approved by the City E-911 Addressing Officer.*

Response:

Address is now located on revised building elevations.

Comment 3:

*If the building entry faces a different street, both the street name and number should be large enough to read from the street.*

Response:

The main entry is off Fore and India Streets and will be labeled 185 Fore Street.

Comment 4:

*Address numbers must be a minimum of 4 inches high.*

*The number should be in Arabic numerals rather than spelled out (for example, "130" instead of "One Hundred and Thirty").*

*Color: Addresses should be in a color that contrasts with the background.*

*Whenever possible, should be illuminated.*

Response:

Refer to building renderings in Attachment C. A large 185 is located in contrasting colors and is very visible.

Comment 5:

*Provide additional address signs at entrances to the property when the building address is not legible from the public street.*

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 12

Response:

The number will be very visible from the street. Please refer to elevations and perspective drawings.

Comment 6:

*Buildings set back in groups that share common entrances can make quickly locating a specific building and the shortest route difficult. On such sites, additional signs with directional arrows and/or diagrams of the buildings and access layout should be posted.*

Response:

The residential entry and the first floor commercial entry are located directly off Fore Street. Please identify a specific problem that you may have in locating these entries as proposed. At this point, we are uncertain as to the specifics of your concern.

**COMMENTS FROM JEFF TARLING/CITY ARBORIST DATED 05-30-14**

---

Comment 1:

*Both of these projects 185 Fore Street and 16 Middle Street need to have three trees planted at each site. At 185 Fore Street request one tree along the Fore Street frontage and two along India Street. Due to the recent tree problems at a nearby project that was unable to plant 8 trees due to underground utilities, we have six NEENA tree grates and guards in the City's possession that can be used for this project. It will offer uniformity. We can work with the project team to decide on the recommended tree type. Need to review the sunlight and space availability.*

Response:

Anthony Muench, RLA, met with Jeff Tarling to review the street tree planting requirements along Fore Street and India Street. Due to the conflict with underground power conduits beneath the Fore Street sidewalk, we are not able to install additional street trees; however, two raised planting beds have been added to the plans adjacent to the building exterior walls to enable landscape planting materials to be provided. In addition, the existing tree along India Street will be removed and replaced with two new street trees with tree grates and tree guards. It is our understanding that Jeff Tarling is in agreement with this alternate approach.

**COMMENTS FROM DAVID MARGOLIS-PINEO DATED 05-30-14**

---

Comment 1:

*Applicant will need to execute a pedestrian access easement with the City to allow public access onto the applicant's property.*

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 13

Response:

The applicant is prepared to execute the standard City pedestrian access easement as a condition of site plan approval. Please forward a copy of easement language for review and eventual execution by the applicant.

Comment 2:

*Please show where snow will be stored or indicate how snow will be handled.*

Response:

Due to the proposed site development proposal, very little snow removal will be required (i.e. majority of site will be covered with building with flat rooftop). The alleyway is owned by others and snow removal activities likely require snow to be hauled away from the site.

Comment 3:

*If a general note does not currently exist, please add a note stating that all work within the road right of way will follow City of Portland Technical Manual standards.*

Response:

This requirement is contained as General Note 7 on Sheet C-1.1 of the plan set.

Comment 4:

*If the first floor retail area will be serving prepared food products, a grease removal unit may be necessary. If so, the applicant should contact Frank Brancely for guidance. 854-8832.*

Response:

The café is more similar to a break room in many office settings. This facility will have a microwave, refrigerator and sink. There will not be any food preparation activities; therefore, a grease trap is not being provided.

Comment 5:

*The applicant is requested to place additional bike parking on Fore St. in the proximity to office/retail door and to locate towards the back of the sidewalk and away from the curb line.*

*Bike Rack spacing guidelines:*

- \* If bike racks are located next to and parallel to the building, they shall be a minimum of 30" from the building (36" preferred). The minimum spacing between racks (on center) shall be 6'.*
- \* If bike racks are located next to and perpendicular to the building, they shall be a minimum of 48" (on center) from the building (60" preferred). The minimum spacing between racks (on center) shall be 36" (48" preferred).*

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 14

- \* *If bike racks are placed at the curb and parallel to the curb, they shall be located a minimum of 24" from the back of curb (36" preferred). The minimum spacing between racks (on center) shall be 6'. They should be placed/spaced to avoid car doors opening based upon expected parking spaces.*
- \* *Bike racks may not be placed when bicycles are parked to reduce the clear sidewalk width below 5'.*
- \* *Bikes are to be located in closer proximity to primary entrances to the building. The primary entrances appear to be on Middle Street.*

Response:

As requested, the configurations of the bike racks have been modified as shown on the Site Layout Plan (Sheet C-2.0). A copy of the updated plan set is appended to this comment response letter.

Comment 6:

*Curb Ramps:*

- \* *Curb ramps must be designed in detail showing the dimensions of tipdown curbs, flush curb and dimensions of detectable warning panels. Also show the location of any drainage structures and utilities that may impact curb ramp location and design.*

Response:

As requested, the configuration of the curb ramps has been modified as shown on the Site Layout Plan (Sheet C-2.0). In addition, the curb ramp details have been revised to reflect City standard installation details. A copy of the updated plan set is appended to this comment response letter.

Comment 7:

*If the proposed building's footings encroach the street right of way, an easement from the City will be required.*

Response:

Presently, it is not anticipated that footings will extend on to City property.

Comment 8:

*The four property corners shall have property pins set by a registered land surveyor prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.*

Response:

As requested, property monumentation is proposed to be installed at the four corners of the property as shown on the Site Layout Plan (Sheet C-2.0). A copy of the updated plan set is appended to this comment response letter.

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 15

Comment 9:

*Both of the cross walk ramps at the corner of Hancock and Middle Street do not meet current City of Portland standards. The applicant is requested to rebuild these two ramps to meet current City standards.*

Response:

As requested, the sidewalk ramps at the intersection of India and Fore Streets have been identified to be removed and replaced as part of the project as shown on the Site Layout Plan (Sheet C-2.0). In addition, the curb ramp details have been revised to reflect City standard installation details. A copy of the updated plan set is appended to this comment response letter.

Comment 10:

*The applicant is requested to direct all site stormwater drainage into the catch basin at the corner of India and Fore St. The penetration to the catch basin shall be core drilled with a snap in boot connection.*

Response:

As requested, the roof drain discharge from this building has been redirected to connect into the existing catch basin at the corner of India and Fore Streets. A detail for the City's standard booted pipe connection has been incorporated into the plan set.

Comment 11:

*The City is reviewing wiring options for the proposed three new street lights. It is the City's intent to acquire ownership of these lights. Therefore a meter may be necessary for power billing purposes. The applicant should verify that the light specified for this location meets City of Portland lighting standards.*

Response:

There will be only one new light pole and one relocated light pole. The new pole will match the existing pole that will be relocated.

**COMMENTS FROM CAITLIN CAMERON/DESIGN REVIEW DATED 05-29-14**

**(Design Review (5/27 Caitlin Cameron, Alex Jaegerman, Barbara Barhydt)**

B5b Standards (Design Manual):

Comment 1a:

*Shared Infrastructure: Meets the requirement. Is there any physical connection between this building and the parking garage (it does not appear to be the case)? Please clarify access points to garage.*

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 16

Response:

A bridge from the garage to the new building will be provided as shown on the revised building plans. Guests and occupants of the building will have designated parking spaces in the garage and access to the bridge will be via the third floor of the building.

Comment 1b:

*Why is the building set back so far on India Street?*

Response:

The building is designed to step back allowing water views down India Street for the rear or northerly units. The building design has been modified to pull the front face for the first floor of the building closer to India Street to provide the street interplay you are seeking while at the same time allowing for the units above to see the water views.

Comment 1c:

*Overall, the project does not, yet, create an adequately active and engaging façade on India Street. Because it appears the use on the ground floor is office rather than retail/restaurant, design elements that have a dialogue with the street are important (entries, transparency, lighting, proximity to street, etc.) An additional reference about ground floor façade design is Michele Reeves' lecture "Good Design is Good for Business" which can be found here:*

*<http://www.portlandmaine.gov/1114/India-Street>*

*<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=18cK5gzLOpc&feature=youtu.be&t=40s>*

- *What is the visible transmittance of the glass?*
- *Please clarify the materials on the India Street façade, ground level (rendering shows brick/solid while plan shows windows).*
- *Please clarify the café space – is that the kitchen for the office? How is it planned to be used?*
- *Please provide more details on the awnings proposed (material, color, size).*
- *What is the façade lighting plan?*

Response:

All of the first floor glass is clear with no tinting.

Refer to the revised building plans for clarification on building materials, etc.

The café is a meeting and break area for office workers on the first floor. The room is multipurpose. It will also be used for presentations to clients.

Refer to revised building elevations for additional information on the proposed awnings.

There is no proposed façade lighting. The only lighting will be at the egress doors at decks and perimeter security lighting.



Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 17

Multi-family Standards (Design Manual):

Comment 1a1:

*The project is located several blocks away from the typical residential buildings. The form and height, porches and façade variation do a good job of mediating the different scales and building characters around it. However, there are a couple of points that we feel do not, yet, meet the intent of the standard:*

- *We are concerned about authenticity of materials and durability of the thin brick and EIFS for the façade and cornice.*
- *Additional visual interest and dialogue with the streetscape is needed on India Street.*

Response:

The project architect has kept the precast at the lower level and then transitioned to the EIFS and thin brick above. It is Archetype's experience that with careful detailing (i.e. providing a drainage plane behind the EIFS and thin brick; specifying brick corners with returns; specifying colored mortar) and proper building maintenance that these products are long lasting and durable. Archetype will be detailing the construction of the thin brick per the standards of brick industry association technical notes on brick veneer with a tooled mortar joint. With proper detailing and installation it will yield a high quality aesthetic. Archetype can also provide as an example 100 Middle Street twin towers which they designed in the mid-eighties, all the cornices on that building above the first floor were an EIFS product. This product has been in place for about 30 years. It should also be mentioned that brick veneers of thin brick or full brick can be problematic and not yielding full life cycles if the products are not detailed correctly, installed correctly and maintained. The days of creating full thickness brick walls ended in the early 1950's. Today, architects need to address these products and install to the latest industry standards.

Comment 1a2:

*We appreciate the infill nature of this project and its location is very important in how it contributes to and improves the streetscape on India St.*

- *Building placement could be closer to the street.*
- *Street trees and/or landscaping should be provided to enhance the streetscape on India Street.*
- *Is there potential for a more prominent entrance on India Street?*

Response:

Refer to revised building plans and site plans. Anthony Muench has also been retained to provide landscape architectural services for this project as summarized above.

Ms. Caitlin Cameron  
June 13, 2014  
Page 18

Additional Comments/Questions:

Comment 1:

*Please clarify the ADA access within the ground floor retail space.*

Response:

There are ADA accessible entries to the residential and first floor commercial use from Fore Street and another entry from India Street to the first floor commercial use. There are interior steps between the two levels of first floor commercial uses; however, no internal ADA ramp is proposed at this time.

Comment 2:

*If footings of the building cross the property line, a license is needed.*

Response:

Presently it is not anticipated that footings will extend on to city property

We trust these responses adequately address the review comments. If you have any questions regarding these materials please contact this office.

Sincerely,

FAY, SPOFFORD & THORNDIKE



Joseph A. Laverriere, P.E.  
Senior Principal Engineer

JAL/smk

Attachments: A – Portland Water District Ability to Serve Letter  
B – Fabco Pollutant Removal Performance Information  
C – Building Rendering  
Revised Civil Site Plans  
Revised Building Floor Plans and Elevations  
Site Electrical Plan

c: Nathan Bateman – Bateman Partners, LLC  
David Lloyd – Archetype PA