

**From:** Jean Fraser  
**To:** Tom Greer  
**CC:** Jaegerman, Alex  
**Date:** 10/9/2013 6:15 PM  
**Subject:** 133 York Street- issues that need to be addressed urgently

Tom

Today we conducted the first substantive review of the recently submitted Hearing submissions on this project. It appears that there are several fundamental issues that need to be resolved prior to this being considered at a Public Hearing. We are not sure that these can be resolved (with reviewer signoffs) in time for the October 22, 2013 PB Hearing (for which the PB Report is finalized on 10.17.2013) and we strongly advise delaying the Hearing.

#### **FIRE ACCESS**

Chris Pirone has in writing (see Workshop Memo- staff review attachments) and in discussions with your team confirmed that a 20 foot access is needed to the front of the building. Today he has confirmed:

*"The applicant will need to show that our largest fire apparatus can get access to the front of the building and operate with 20' access in front of the building for emergency operations; to clarify the needed 20' in front of the building it must be measured from the furthest point of the building not just at ground level."*

Based on the submitted site plan and recently received section, the available distance between the canopy and the new curb is about 10 feet; between the bays and the new curb is 12 feet and both appear to be lower than a fire truck. The entrance doorway to the building appears to be 15 feet from the curb. Also we are not sure whether fire apparatus can get around the corner (need to see template showing fire apparatus can get around the corner). Based on this it appears that the footprint of the building needs to be reconsidered.

#### **VEHICLE ACCESS TO PARKING LEVEL/SPACES**

We received the turning templates for the parking spaces as part of this final submission and note:

Vehicles are shown parked partially "under" the storage units and starting from that point; yet the storage units are shown on the elevations with full height doors. Even if the storage units are partial as shown in the section, they appear to be 3-4 feet above the ground which is not high enough to allow a car to pull that far into the building;

For at least three of the parking spaces the ability to enter/exit appears to rely on there not being a vehicle parked in the adjoining space;

We note that these templates take no account of snow storage along the edge/end of the drive;

The templates suggest that the footprint of the building may need to be reconsidered;

We would like to see (in order to finalize staff comments) corrected templates for all spaces that accurately depict the location of the car in respect of the storage unit and show cars in the adjacent parking spaces.

#### **STORMWATER- TREE FILTER SIZING**

The City's Engineering Reviewer has sent me the following comments today:

1) *The tree filter sizing calculation indicates that the subsurface soils have an infiltration capacity of 0.525 cubic feet per second over the effective infiltration area. It appears the unit conversion did not account for an hours-to-minutes conversion factor (divide by 60); as such the modeled infiltration rate is significantly higher than could be expected. Please revisit the calculation and model to verify that the tree filter system can provide sufficient infiltration capacity;*

2) *The Stormwater Management Plan should include annual reporting requirements in accordance with and in reference to Chapter 32 of the City of Portland Code of Ordinances.*

#### **ELECTRICAL AND COMMUNICATION SERVICE**

We need to see a recorded easement for the location of this service if it is to remain at the existing location on private property (which is not part of the applicant's property), since it only serves this property and will need to be upgraded;

Both the Site Plan Ordinance (section 14-526 (c).3.b) and the Subdivision ordinance (14-499 (h) require that electrical lines be underground, so the staff view is that the electrical lines serving this new building should be underground from a pole or underground source in the ROW. So the retention of the existing O/H electrical lines is in question.

#### **CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN**

The recently submitted documents for the hearing indicate that a construction easement from McCormick Place has not been obtained and may not be agreed. Please provide an explanation of how the construction will be organized and managed in the absence of a construction easement with Mc Cormick Place so as to:

Ensure that none of the materials (including dust) from the building to be demolished will impact the abutting properties, including cars parked a few feet from the building on the McCormick Place property;

Safely dig foundations downhill a few feet from the property boundary (with no stable retaining wall in place at the moment) without any impacts to the neighbor's property or to the use of that property;

Ensure suppliers, contractors and subcontractors will not go onto any abutting private property unless a construction easement is in place;

Confirm what financial or legal mechanisms will be in place to deal with any damage or inconvenience to surrounding neighbors and their property, given the fact that you are cutting tree limbs from trees located on other property and constructing new structures on or very near the property lines and private structures (eg recently installed fencing) .

**OTHER**

There are some other detailed staff review comments that are resolvable and potentially could be addressed through conditions, and I anticipate a few more. I have not yet received formal comments from neighbors so it is possible they may raise additional issues.

Barbara Barhydt is on vacation this week so I have discussed these issues with Alex Jaegerman and he has been copied on this e-mail. Please do not hesitate to call either me or Alex if you would like to discuss further.

Thank you  
Jean

*Jean Fraser, Planner  
City of Portland  
874 8728*