Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 05/29/15

Bourke - Re: 30 Salem St., BP#2015-00709 - Revision 2

From: Clifford Tremblay <cliff.tremblay@gmail.com>
To: Jeanie Bourke <JMB@portlandmaine.gov>
Date: 5/28/2015 12:49 PM
Subject: Re: 30 Salem St., BP#2015-00709 - Revision 2
Attachments: A1 Graef Wintergarten.pdf

Jeanie,

Thank you for your review again. Please find attached revised drawings addressing your comments. Below, in the thread, are a few notes in red regarding your comments.

Best regards,

Clifford Tremblay LEED AP
//

617.942.0884
cliff.tremblay@gmail.com
blueanchordsgn.com

On Tue, May 26, 2015 at 2:49 PM, Jeanie Bourke <JMB@portlandmaine.gov> wrote:

> Hi Cliff,
> Thank you for the details and the revised plan. I do have some additional comments for you to address:
> 1. Due to this roof being a cathedral with no rafter ties, the ridge will need to be a structural beam, it appears you are showing a single 2x8. There will also need to be additional connections noted at the ridge and the wall for lateral stability.

Using a 2-ply 3.5 x 9.5 LVL beam and added notes for the positive connections at the beam and at the headers.

> 2. If you plan to heat (condition) the room, the wall insulation is a minimum of R20, usually achieved with 2x6 construction or other insulation products.

Good point! We enlarged the walls to handle this larger insulation.

> 3. The bearing wall headers over the windows will need to be larger than 2-2x4 members. Please see IRC Table 502.5(1) for a 50lb snow load. The span looks to be about 8', which would require either 2-2x10 or 3-2x8.

Using 3-2x8's with 1/2" plywood laminated between to achieve the thickness of our enlarged 2x6 walls.

> 4. The longitudinal floor bearing wall below will need a minimum of 2-2x6 top plate (header noted on your plan), or if single will need to specify the joist bear over each stud and additional tie in with steel plates at the corners and the joists land directly over the stud below.

Using 2-2x6 top plates.

> 5. On the additional footprint of structures on the property. On the Graef's most recent permits (#2013-01789)

Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 05/29/15

> enovation, the zoning administrator referenced the Assessors data to use the footprint sketch for the nsion allowance. At that time the Unit B deck & entry showed to be 9'x5' or 45 SF. This now appears on the Assessors data as 9'x10' or 90 SF. My question is, was this inaccurate in 2013, or has the deck been expanded recently? I need to know this in order to determine the exact percentage of increase over the years.

The owner informed me that they have not increased the deck since they bought the house in 2007, so I do not know what the discrepancy is between assessments. I would assume the 2013 is accurate for this reason.

> I am attaching the plan with some markups to illustrate the points above.
> Let me know if you have any questions.
> Thanks,
> Jeanie
>
> >>> Clifford Tremblay <cliff.tremblay@gmail.com> 5/26/2015 10:38 AM >>>
> Jeanie,
>
> Thank you for your review. Please find attached the revised drawing addressing your comments. A few notes:
>
> - Added a longitudinal section showing the cathedral ceiling and ridge beam. Renamed previous longitudinal section to transverse.
> - Changed the ceiling insulation to R 30 Batt by Roxul as this isn't an attic and it will not be heated, but we wanted to provide some year-round comfort and plan for potentially adding heat in the future.
> - Added additional 2x4 on window header for support. Also increased the scope of the detail section for clarity.
> - Switched the floor joist direction. This was a mistake on my part. The span should be fine now.
> - Increased the detail of the site plan to clarifying extent of building footprint. The expansion is within the existing footprint. Also added existing entrances, driveway, and deck.
> - Did not add 1 hour fire separation between levels. The first floor is Unit A and the second and third level are Unit B, so there is no separation between units in this addition. I added notes on the sections clarifying this.
>
> Let me know if you have any questions or further comments.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Clifford
>
> **Clifford Tremblay LEED AP**
> //
>
> 617.942.0884
> cliff.tremblay@gmail.com
> blueanchordsgn.com
>
> On Wed, May 20, 2015 at 1:38 PM, Jeanie Bourke <JMB@portlandmaine.gov> wrote:
>
> > Hi Cliff,
> > I have completed the review of the above project for building code and have the following comments as

Reviewed for Code Compliance
Inspections Division
Approved with Conditions
Date: 05/29/15

ted on the attached file(s).
ease 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 file(s). Our Eplan program will automatically assign a version to the revised plans.
Let me know if you have any questions,
Thanks,
Jeanie

Jeanie Bourke
CEO/LPI/Plan Reviewer

City of Portland
Planning & Urban Development Dept./ Inspections Division
389 Congress St. Rm 315
Portland, ME 04101
jmb@portlandmaine.gov
Direct: (207) 874-8715
Office: (207) 874-8703
Permit status can be viewed at: http://www.portlandmaine.gov/792/Permit-Status

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.

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.