



Jeanie Bourke &lt;jmb@portlandmaine.gov&gt;

---

**56 Pine St. Amendment BP# 2017-00426 plan review comments**

15 messages

---

**Jeanie Bourke** <jmb@portlandmaine.gov>

Fri, Apr 7, 2017 at 12:03 PM

To: Ilma Lopez &lt;ilma.jeil.lopez@gmail.com&gt;, seth9er@hotmail.com

Hi Ilma and Seth,

I have completed the review of this project for building code and have the following comments as noted on the attached file(s).

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

Please let me know if you would like to discuss anything or have any questions.

Best,

Jeanie

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315  
Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

---

 **58 Pine Amendment Deck.pdf**  
120K

---

**Jeanie Bourke** <jmb@portlandmaine.gov>

Fri, Apr 7, 2017 at 1:29 PM

To: Ilma Lopez &lt;ilma.jeil.lopez@gmail.com&gt;, seth9er@hotmail.com

My apologies on the blank attachment, this one has my comments.

Jeanie

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315

Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

[Quoted text hidden]

---

 **58 Pine Amendment Deck.pdf**  
128K

---

**Seth Kearns** <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)>  
To: Jeanie Bourke <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>

Tue, Apr 11, 2017 at 11:54 PM

Hello Jeanie, hope all's well.

To answer your questions in sequence:

1.) Stair tread: 11" (5/4" decking)

Riser: 7 1/2"

3/4" over hang

2.) Intermediate posts every 4-5'

Baluster spacing: 3 1/2"

Handrail profile: Colonial/Traditional/Ladieswaist (depending where you get the handrail the names differ from one company to another.), Handrail to die into each intermediate post.

3.) The architects did not represent the full dimension on the drawing for some reason. However, to maintain budget and streamline the functionality of the deck as to not be a lounging deck we want to decrease the length which does look equivalent to the architects drawing. The final dimension would be 22'x7'4".

4.) All fastening to be used: Galvanized or coated. Standard framing distances, 16"oc, joist hangers to be used for the top landing. The only new addition to our design from what is presently there is that we will have added 4x4 PT posts that support the end of the top landing which will be lagged into a ledger on the side of the building which it presently has. The 4x4 will also give us a frame work to apply our skirting to enclose underneath. The post will drop onto Galvi standoffs.

5.) Ilma should have put \$10k for cost. Is this not what she put?

Thank you Jeanie, I hope this can suffice. I will be able to take a call if you have any further questions.

Best,

-seth

---

**From:** Jeanie Bourke <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 7, 2017 5:29 PM  
**To:** Ilma Lopez; [seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)  
**Subject:** Re: 56 Pine St. Amendment BP# 2017-00426 plan review comments

[Quoted text hidden]

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.

---

**Jeanie Bourke** <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Seth Kearns <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)>

Wed, Apr 12, 2017 at 12:23 PM

Hi Seth,

Thanks for the information. I have some additional comments below in **RED**.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315  
Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

On Tue, Apr 11, 2017 at 11:54 PM, Seth Kearns <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)> wrote:

| Hello Jeanie, hope all's well.

| To answer your questions in sequence:

1.) Stair tread: 11" (5/4" decking)

Riser: 7 1/2"

3/4" over hang

OK

2.) Intermediate posts every 4-5'

Baluster spacing: 3 1/2"

Handrail profile: Colonial/Traditional/Ladieswaist (depending where you get the handrail the names differ from one company to another.), Handrail to die into each intermediate post.

This detail will not meet code as there needs to be one continuous graspable handrail without interruption, this can be attached with brackets and returned to the posts at the top and bottom at a height of 34"-38" off the tread nose. Please confirm.

3.) The architects did not represent the full dimension on the drawing for some reason. However, to maintain budget and streamline the functionality of the deck as to not be a lounging deck we want to decrease the length which does look equivalent to the architects drawing. The final dimension would be 22'x7'4". OK

4.) All fastening to be used: Galvanized or coated. Standard framing distances, 16"oc, joist hangers to be used for the top landing. The only new addition to our design from what is presently there is that we will have added 4x4 PT posts that support the end of the top landing which will be lagged into a ledger on the side of the building which it presently has. The 4x4 will also give us a frame work to apply our skirting to enclose underneath. The post will drop onto Galvi standoffs.

Please provide at least a marked up photo of the landing support framing details. None of the elevations either from the original permit or the amendment show this perspective. I don't follow what you mean by the post dropping onto Galvi standoffs, are there also vertical posts in addition to angled?

I also have concerns about the skirting enclosure as this cannot be used as a storage area under egress stairs. Will there be an access door to this space? I understand historic needs, however this may promote a storage area that is not allowed under stairs, please confirm.

Will the roof deck be attached to the building, and how?

5.) Ilma should have put \$10k for cost. Is this not what she put?

No, it came in as \$5K, so there will be an additional fee of \$75

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Seth Kearns <seth9er@hotmail.com>  
To: Jeanie Bourke <jmb@portlandmaine.gov>

Fri, Apr 14, 2017 at 9:02 AM

Back at cha in [Blue below](#).

\_sk

tidalsoundstudios LLC

---

**From:** Jeanie Bourke <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 12, 2017 4:23 PM

**To:** Seth Kearns

**Subject:** Re: 56 Pine St. Amendment BP# 2017-00426 plan review comments

Hi Seth,

Thanks for the information. I have some additional comments below in **RED**.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315  
Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

On Tue, Apr 11, 2017 at 11:54 PM, Seth Kearns <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)> wrote:

Hello Jeanie, hope all's well.

To answer your questions in sequence:

1.) Stair tread: 11" (5/4" decking)

Riser: 7 1/2"

3/4" over hang

OK

2.) Intermediate posts every 4-5'

Baluster spacing: 3 1/2"

Handrail profile: Colonial/Traditional/Ladieswaist (depending where you get the handrail the names differ from one company to another.), Handrail to die into each intermediate post.

This detail will not meet code as there needs to be one continuous graspable handrail without interruption, this can be attached with brackets and returned to the posts at the top and bottom at a height of 34"-38" off the tread nose.

Please confirm.

Ok, we don't care what the railing is. Rob at Historical was saying he wanted this. So I guess I'm stuck in the middle? Initially I just wanted to replace what's there, which is what your

asking for but Rob said he wanted a fancier hand/grab rail. Which also changed the whole railing design in general.. Just want to make sure everyone is satisfied. How to proceed?

3.) The architects did not represent the full dimension on the drawing for some reason. However, to maintain budget and streamline the functionality of the deck as to not be a lounging deck we want to decrease the length which does look equivalent to the architects drawing. The final dimension would be 22'x7'4". OK

4.) All fastening to be used: Galvanized or coated. Standard framing distances, 16"oc, joist hangers to be used for the top landing. The only new addition to our design from what is presently there is that we will have added 4x4 PT posts that support the end of the top landing which will be lagged into a ledger on the side of the building which it presently has. The 4x4 will also give us a frame work to apply our skirting to enclose underneath. The post will drop onto Galvi standoffs.

Please provide at least a marked up photo of the landing support framing details. None of the elevations either from the original permit or the amendment show this perspective. I don't follow what you mean by the post dropping onto Galvi standoffs, are there also vertical posts in addition to angled?

Pardon me, I should have said "post base" <http://www.homedepot.com/p/Simpson-Strong-Tie-ABA-4x4-ZMAX-Galvanized-Adjustable-Post-Base-ABA44Z/100374999>

There will be no need for angled bracing as the vertical post(s) will be taking the place. I can see using 3 vertical posts, 1 for each outside corner of the landing and 1 breaking the span of the outside stringer.

The Rise and Run of the stair and landing is: 10' x 16'

I also have concerns about the skirting enclosure as this cannot be used as a storage area under egress stairs. Will there be an access door to this space? I understand historic needs, however this may promote a storage area that is not allowed under stairs, please confirm.

This was another Historical advisement from Rob. Wanting us to do a slated design under the landing and under stairs. There was talk of a door. Wasn't so much intended to be a storage space.

Will the roof deck be attached to the building, and how?

We would use adhesives to secure the sleepers of the deck to the rubber roof. I would prefer not to penetrate the rubber roof as that is why we are replacing it... The landing is secured with lags through a 2x8 ledger. The inside stair stringer would be lagged to the side wall as well.

5.) Ilma should have put \$10k for cost. Is this not what she put?

No, it came in as \$5K, so there will be an additional fee of \$75

I'll have her drop off another check. Sorry about that.

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

 **58 Pine Stair and Landing Dimensions.pdf**  
176K

**Jeanie Bourke** <jmb@portlandmaine.gov>  
To: Robert Wiener <rwiener@portlandmaine.gov>

Fri, Apr 14, 2017 at 1:51 PM

Hey Rob,

When you get a chance can we discuss this one, thanks.

Jeanie  
*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315  
Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Seth Kearns** <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)>  
Date: Fri, Apr 14, 2017 at 9:02 AM  
Subject: Re: 56 Pine St. Amendment BP# 2017-00426 plan review comments  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

 **58 Pine Stair and Landing Dimensions.pdf**  
176K

---

**Robert Wiener** <[rwiener@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:rwiener@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Jeanie Bourke <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>

Fri, Apr 14, 2017 at 2:08 PM

How long are you here today? I may not have any time before 4 or so. Or Tuesday?

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Robert Wiener  
Preservation Compliance Coordinator  
City of Portland  
(207) 756-8023

---

**Jeanie Bourke** <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Robert Wiener <[rwiener@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:rwiener@portlandmaine.gov)>

Fri, Apr 14, 2017 at 2:45 PM

Tuesday is fine, have a great weekend!

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315  
Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jeanie Bourke** <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Seth Kearns <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)>

Fri, Apr 14, 2017 at 3:02 PM

Hi Seth,

I was not able to meet with Rob in historic today, but we will on Tuesday and I will get back to you. Often they like to see the balustrade and are ok with an attached graspable handrail on one side per code. I will also discuss the skirting.

Will you be posting down to sona tubes? What is the existing base? Frost protection is required.

Thanks,  
Jeanie

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315  
Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Robert Wiener** <[rwiener@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:rwiener@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Jeanie Bourke <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>

Fri, Apr 14, 2017 at 4:39 PM

Thanks you too!  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jeanie Bourke** <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Robert Wiener <[rwiener@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:rwiener@portlandmaine.gov)>

Tue, Apr 18, 2017 at 9:38 AM

Welcome back, when are you free to meet today....

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315  
Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Robert Wiener** <[rwiener@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:rwiener@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Jeanie Bourke <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>

Tue, Apr 18, 2017 at 9:47 AM

I have to go out at 10:45. Before then?  
Thanks,  
Rob  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jeanie Bourke** <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Seth Kearns <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)>

Tue, Apr 18, 2017 at 2:29 PM

Hi Seth,

I spoke with Rob this morning, he is still reviewing the amendment, however we have agreed on the following:

1. The guardrail design will be approved per the historic guidelines. Due to the interruption at each intermediate post, this cannot be considered the graspable handrail due to a break in continuity. One separate circular or other graspable shape per code will need to be installed at 34"-38" above the tread nose either on the building or on the balustrade. The ends need to be returned to the post or wall at the top and bottom.

2. The stair can have an open slat enclosure underneath with an access door as per historic design approval, however I will put a condition of approval that the enclosed space cannot be used, with a sign on the inside stating this and access is



controlled by the owners.

Please also confirm the following:

3. The risers are to be solid or partially open with less than 4" of space.
4. The landing posts are to be supported on frost protected piers.

Please reply with confirmation of all these items.

Thanks,  
Jeanie

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315  
Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

On Fri, Apr 14, 2017 at 9:02 AM, Seth Kearns <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)> wrote:  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Seth Kearns** <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)>  
To: Jeanie Bourke <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>

Wed, Apr 19, 2017 at 10:43 AM

Yes, we have no problem complying with these stipulations.

Sent from my iPhone  
[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jeanie Bourke** <[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)>  
To: Seth Kearns <[seth9er@hotmail.com](mailto:seth9er@hotmail.com)>

Wed, Apr 19, 2017 at 1:46 PM

Thank you Seth, per your responses I will approve this permit amendment for building code, it does remain in review with Historic.

Best,  
Jeanie

*Jeanie Bourke*  
*Code Enforcement Officer/Plan Reviewer*

City of Portland  
Permitting and Inspections Department  
389 Congress St. Rm 315  
Portland, ME 04101  
[jmb@portlandmaine.gov](mailto:jmb@portlandmaine.gov)  
(207)874-8715

[Quoted text hidden]