Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 04/26/17

Portland Maine Yes. Google's good here.

Laurie Leader <lrl@portlandmaine

RE: BP#2016-02845 164 Middle Street - Plan review comments

1 message

Lita Semrau <lita@portcityarch.com> Wed, Mar 8, 2017 at 10:18 AM
To: Laurie Leader <lrl@portlandmaine.gov>
Cc: Patrick Ducas <patrickd@ducasconstruction.com>, Curtis <curtis@portcityarch.com>, Jonathan Rauch <jrauch29@gmail.com>, Jason Grant <jgrant@portlandmaine.gov>, Lita Semrau <lita@portcityarch.com>

Laurie

Here you go – any responses will be in **bold green** . . . I have rearranged our previous conversation in order of the drawings for clarity . . . I have tried to answer everything but please let me know if you have any questions . . . las

We have included SKA-18 to show the egress through the existing back alley . . . please let me know if you have any questions.

Lita Semrau, AIA, LEED

Principal

Port City Architecture

65 Newbury Street

Portland, ME

(207) 761-9000

lita@portcityarch.com

www.portcityarch.com

From: Laurie Leader [mailto:lrl@portlandmaine.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2017 9:08 AM
To: Lita Semrau
Cc: Patrick Ducas; Curtis; Jonathan Rauch; Jason Grant; Mark Chaloupecky; Matt Legere; Aaron C. Jones
Subject: Re: BP#2016-02845 164 Middle Street - Plan review comments

Lita,

See my response in red to your comments below.

Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 04/26/17

T1.2

- We need not provide a wall type for the CMU because we have it on the section which als includes the ceiling with a rating on A3.5 Elevator Section – we can add UL#'s to the section for the CMU wall also Yes please provide UL#s

The UL# was added to A3.5 which has been included.

LS1.1

- Working on this . . .OK will await revisions.

Please see attached LS1.1 & LS1.2 with the requested NFPA information. Mark could not help himself and added additional information including the new front stairs that will be helpful with your review so we have not clouded any items but just reissued the entire drawings.

S1.2

- At the entry, we did not want to affect the existing slap including its structure once we understood that the existing slab was sloped and thus, all the changes per SKA-02 (please note that after this detail was provide, it was found that the existing slab is 11 ½" to 12" thick) – we did infill the between the sloped floor & the new level with light concrete would you like more info on that . . . Yes please provide further details.

Please refer to SKA-02 and let me know if you have any questions . . .

- We will add the information about the key and the material OK

Please see attached S1.2.

A1.2

- We will provide detail bubble for the elevator blow up OK

We never created enlarged plan blow up of the stairs and elevator because we were actually able to provide the dimensions required on this plan so we have eliminated the detail bubble – see attached A1.2

- The detail through the existing stairs is per SKA-02 and the detail that it referenced originally is no longer relevant – how would you like me to handle this . . . I thought SKA-02 was the proposed new entry rather than existing stair? Please clarify detail and if no longer relevant, I can remove from review. Provide submit a proposed new entry?

Instead of "stair," I should have said "ramp" in the first statement. The existing ramp was not structurally modified but was built directly upon as indicated. We have added the "SKA-02" to the detail bubble and have included SKA-02 . . .

- Pertaining to the roof hatch, I know this seems to be a strange location but when you look at the tenant fitout, you will see that the hatch lines up with their layout and thus, they are providing the handrails – how would you like us to handle this . . . I referenced the tenant fitout plan. The tenant fitout will have to provide details of the ladder. Per section 1009 of the IBC, options for the ladder are either an alternating stair device or a ships ladder.

I would like to follow up with the ladder conversation from earlier today because I believe we are okay with just a ladder . . . please let me know if you have further comments:

Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 04/26/17

- **According to IMC 306.5, we are required a means of accessing the equipment on the roof if the roof is higher than 16'-0" so we have provide a roof hatch and the tenant will providing a ladder**

- **According to 1009.13, "in a building is four or more stories above grade plane, one stairway shall extend to the roof surface . . . in buildings without an occupied roof, access to the roof from the top story shall be permitted to be by an alternating tread device."**

- **This building is only two stories above grade in the rear (only one story in the front) thus a stair (or alternating tread) is not required.**

A3.5

- We will add a UL# for the elevator ceiling and for the CMU wall per not above . . . OK

See attached A3.5.

A3.6

- The owner is only providing an OSHA rail at the stairs (the tenant wanted a very specific railing that they wanted to furnish) – the finished railing will be by the tenant and is in the next set for you to review . . . how would you like us to handle this . . . Please clarify the final approved railings are within the tenant buildout.

The railing is on the tenant building out drawings on A5/A-806 and we have added a note on attached A3.6. Please let me know if you would like us to forward you this sheet (even if it is pixelated).

Thanks,

Laurie

On Mon, Mar 6, 2017 at 2:39 PM, Lita Semrau <lita@portcityarch.com> wrote:

Laurie –

Thank you for your quick return . . . Please see the notes / questions below – when we have all the info, we will send you marked up drawings with the answers where appropriate . . . las

LS1.1

- Working on this . . .

A1.1

- We will provide detail bubble for the elevator blow up

Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 04/26/17

- The detail through the existing stairs is per SKA-02 and the detail that it referenced origina is no longer relevant – how would you like me to handle this . . .

- Pertaining to the roof hatch, I know this seems to be a strange location but when you look at the tenant fitout, you will see that the hatch lines up with their layout and thus, they are providing the handrails – how would you like us to handle this . . .

S1.2

- At the entry, we did not want to affect the existing slap including its structure once we understood that the existing slab was sloped and thus, all the changes per SKA-02 (please note that after this detail was provide, it was found that the existing slab is 11 ½" to 12" thick) – we did infill the between the sloped floor & the new level with light concrete would you like more info on that . . .

- We will add the information about the key and the material

T1.2

- We need not provide a wall type for the CMU because we have it on the section which also includes the ceiling with a rating on A3.5 Elevator Section – we can add UL#'s to the section for the CMU wall also

A3.5

- We will add a UL# for the elevator ceiling and for the CMU wall per not above . . .

A3.6

- The owner is only providing an OSHA rail at the stairs (the tenant wanted a very specific railing that they wanted to furnish) – the finished railing will be by the tenant and is in the next set for you to review . . . how would you like us to handle this . . .

Lita Semrau, AIA, LEED

Principal

Port City Architecture

65 Newbury Street

Portland, ME

(207) 761-9000

lita@portcityarch.com

www.portcityarch.com

From: Laurie Leader [mailto:lrl@portlandmaine.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 06, 2017 1:37 PM
To: Lita Semrau; Patrick Ducas; Curtis; Jonathan Rauch
Cc: Jason Grant
Subject: BP#2016-02845 164 Middle Street - Plan review comments

Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 04/26/17

Lita,

I have completed the review of the above project for building code and have the following comments as noted on the attached files.

Please send all revisions to this (my) email and please note that the pdf file name shall be exactly as the original, refer to the name of the attached files. Our Eplan program will automatically assign a version to the revised plans.

Let me know if you have any questions,

Thanks,

Laurie

--

Laurie Leader
Plan Review/Code Enforcement
City of Portland, Maine
Inspections Division
389 Congress Street
Portland, ME 04101

P: 207-874-8714
F: 207-874-8716
E: lrl@portlandmaine.gov

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.

No virus found in this message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 2016.0.7998 / Virus Database: 4756/14042 - Release Date: 03/01/17

--

Laurie Leader
Plan Review/Code Enforcement
City of Portland, Maine
Inspections Division
389 Congress Street
Portland, ME 04101

P: 207-874-8714

F: 207-874-8716
E: lrl@portlandmaine.gov

Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 04/26/17

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.

No virus found in this message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 2016.0.7998 / Virus Database: 4756/14042 - Release Date: 03/01/17

---

8 attachments

T1.2 Wall Types.pdf
409K

A1.2 First Floor Plan.pdf
431K

A3.5 Elevator Section.pdf
561K

A3.6 Elevator Section.pdf
586K

LS1.1 - Lower Level Egress Plan.pdf
3348K

SKA-02 Entry Stair Section.pdf
99K

SKA-18 Alley Plan.pdf
65K

LS1.2 - First Floor Egress Plan.pdf
614K