**415 Cumberland**

**This is a project that may look familiar to several board members, as the property has come in several times before, in various iterations, over the last few years. None of these recent proposals came to fruition, and the current applicant is proposing a new set of changes: 8 residential units and 2 commercial spaces. All will be located within the existing building footprint.**

**There is some exterior work proposed, including window infill, installation, and replacement; a small roof deck and railing; a metal canopy; cement board siding over the rear portion of the building, and a new fence between 415 Cumberland and the YMCA next door. One point worth noting is that the YMCA shares easements with the property. As staff understands, the new gate / fence will have an access code provided to the YMCA for entry from the outside.**

**The property is not in a historic district, but is within 100 feet of the Congress Street historic district, so it was eligible for advisory design review which I will refer to shortly.**

**The proposed project retains existing parking, via 6 tandem spaces within the garage. This is acceptable under both the BC3 and R6 zones affecting the project. 4 bike parking spaces are proposed to be added, via two bicycle racks.**

**Regarding: PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Staff did not receive public comment regarding the project, but the applicant did hold a neighborhood meeting which four people attended. As reported by the applicant, the feedback generally reflected a desire to see the property used (in contrast to previous stalled efforts).**

**Other Issues : STAFF**

**Environmental: Because the site as existing is essentially built out, the project is not subject to additional stormwater controls. Staff does request the following condition of approval: confirmation of adequate wastewater capacity shall be provided to and reviewed by City staff. (The applicant provided evidence that they submitted a request for confirmation of wastewater capacity, but no letter confirming it.)**

**Historic Preservation Design Review: The proposed project was reviewed by Deb Andrews, Historic Preservation Program Manager, because it is within 100 feet of a historic district. The applicant was generally responsive to her comments, but staff suggests a condition of approval: proposed window specifications and the proposed metal canopy detail shall be submitted for review and approval by historic preservation staff.**

**Construction Management Plan: Tom Errico, consulting traffic engineer, acknowledged that the 6 tandem parking spaces should be designated for residential (or low-turnover) use. He also recommended the following condition of approval: The applicant shall submit additional information pertaining to construction management, including:**

**Pedestrian detour plan minimizing sidewalk impact; construction material delivery and truck plan minimizing sidewalk and vehicle lane impact; and, information on contractor parking such that public on-street parking is not impacted.**

**Grading on Forest Avenue sidewalk and driveway:**

**The condition of these items is less than ideal, and have been a point of some recent communication with the applicant. Bruce Hyman, Transportation Program Manager, expressed concern about their condition and a desire for improvements. Mr. Greer, the project representative, responded that making the driveway section ADA compliant would make the driveway not function for car passage. Staff updated a suggested condition of approval to reflect this response:**

**The applicant shall submit for review by the Planning Authority and the Department of Public Works data documenting the condition of the existing sidewalk and driveway, including: physical condition; elevation changes (back of sidewalk and driveway to street); and, calculated cross-slopes (including any grade-breaks for specific widths). The applicant shall document that better or full ADA-compliance is or is not feasible. The Planning Authority and Department of Public Works may grant a partial waiver of the technical manual standards, if there are detailed data documenting that better or full compliance is not feasible.**

**Other ADA compliance: because the project involves renovation of an existing building, and significant changes regarding interior use, staff referred the applicant to the permitting and inspections department to ensure that they were meeting accessibility requirements. A reviewer flagged one particular interpretation of the International Existing Building Code as it relates to this project as worthy of further consideration, so staff recommend the following condition of approval:**

**The applicant shall ensure ADA accessibility compliance, to be reviewed and accepted by staff in the building and permitting department. Any required modifications to the site plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Authority.**

**Street Trees: The applicant is proposing eight residential units, while retaining two street trees and providing two new street trees. This leaves a total of four street trees not provided per the City’s technical standards, for which the applicant can pay a fee-in-lieu into the street tree fund. This yielded the final suggested condition of approval:**

**The applicant shall pay into the City’s street tree fund, at a cost of $400 per tree, to account for each of the four trees not provided per the City’s Technical Standards.**

**If there are any clarifying board questions, I’ll be happy to answer them, otherwise I’d like to let the applicant describe their project in more detail.**