

A R C H I T E C T U R E

21 February 2014

Jeanie Bourke

**City of Portland
Planning & Urban Development Dept./ Inspections Division**

RE: Nathan Clifford Redevelopment – Portland, Maine

Ms. Bourke,

Following are responses to your comments on our team's application for permit:

1. Comment digitally attached to "Relevant Codes" on Cover Page CS1.1 by Ms. Bourke:

"Additional Occupancy Classifications

Please provide a code review to identify each of the accessory or occupied spaces in the building, ie. fitness room, library, yoga room, kitchenette and storage areas and specify the mixed use classifications as separated or nonseparated."

Response: The Nathan Clifford Redevelopment project is a renovation and repurposing of an existing school building into condominiums. In the lower level where units are not being located (previously used as a gym), excess space has been repurposed for the tenants as amenities; library, workout space, or storage. As such these amenities will be for the private use of the tenants and are considered as accessory use to R-2. Access to these spaces are intended for the use of building tenants only and controlled through keycard entry.

Table 503 allowable area and floors per occupancy;

A-3 – The allowable 9,500sqft for 2 floors is greater than the aggregate 2,492 sqft of the library, exercise, yoga, & kitchenette at the lower level, prior increases provided by 504.2

R-2 – The allowable 16,000sqft for 4 floors is greater than the average 11,500 sqft floor plate area of the building for 4 floors, prior increases provided by 504.2

S-1 – The allowable 17,500 sqft for 3 floors is greater than the aggregate 1,634 sqft of the storage rooms and trash room at the lower level, prior increases provided by 504.2

The following IBC exceptions provide for the fitness room, library yoga room, & kitchenette to be considered as accessory use to R-2.

IBC 303.1 exception 2 – 'demonstrate an occupant load of less than 50'

Fitness room – Table 1004.1 – 'Exercise Room – 50 gross' – At 1335 sqft the occupant load is 27 people

Kitchenette – Table 1004.1 – 'Assembly – standing – 7 net' – At 118 sqft the occupant load is 17 people

Yoga Room – Table 1004.1 – 'Exercise Room – 50 gross' – At 304 sqft the occupant load is 7 people

Library – Table 1004.1 – 'Assembly – tables & chairs – 15 net' – with a net area of 735 sqft the occupant load is 49 people.

The following IBC exceptions/provision provide exception for the storage to be considered as accessory use to R-2

IBC 508.3.1- "Non-separated occupancies shall be individually classified in accordance with section 302.1. the requirements of this code shall apply to each portion of the building based on the occupancy classification of that space except that the most restrictive applicable provisions of section 403 and chapter 9 shall apply to the building or portion thereof in which the non-separated occupancies are located."

Section 403- Nathan Clifford building at 50'-1" is less than 75 ft tall and therefor is not considered a high-rise. Therefor section 403 which regulates high-rise construction is not applicable.

Chapter 9- Nathan Clifford will be fully protected by an automatic sprinkler NFPA 13R, provided with a fire alarm and portable fire extinguishers as outlined in Chapter 9.

2. Comment digitally attached to “General Notes” on Page GN1.1 by Ms. Bourke:

“Specification Manuals

Provide specifications manuals or at the very least cut sheets on firestopping and structural components.”

Response: See the attached for firestopping and structural specifications requested.

3. Comment digitally attached to “Roof Plan” on Page 1/A1.05 by Ms. Bourke:

“Structural Assessment

Provide a structural assessment report of the roof structure for capability for additional loads imposed by equipment or insulation.”

Response: The addition of rooftop units has been reviewed by the project’s structural engineer and found that the existing roof structure is capable of handling the additional load included in the work. With this being said our structural engineer is currently on vacation and is unavailable. We request that the city proceed with the issuance of the construction permit with the condition that upon return the project’s structural engineer, he issue a letter confirming the existing structure’s capacity to accept the anticipated loading.

4. Comment digitally attached to “General Notes” on Page GN1.1 by Ms. Bourke:

“Historic significance

Please note the specific listing or significance of this "historic" building per Sec. 202 Definitions.”

Response: See the attached certification of National Park Service National Registration attached designating the building as historic.

A R C H I T E C T U R E

5. Comment digitally attached to “General Notes” on Page GN1.1 by Ms. Bourke:

“Window Glazing/Transoms

See Table 1018.1 for corridor partitions allowed to be .5 hour and Table 715.5 for window ratings in fire partions to be 1/3 hour, 20 min.”

Response: Transoms in historic buildings are not required to comply with assembly requirements of this code.

“Section 3409.1 Historic buildings. The provisions of this code relating to the construction, repair, alteration, addition, restoration, and movement of structures and change in occupancy shall not be mandatory for historic building where such buildings are judged by the building official to not constitute a distinct life safety hazard.”

It is our view that the NFPA 43.10.4.5 specifically exempts existing transoms in historic buildings. In addition transoms will be sealed to prevent smoke movement; therefore we feel this does not create a distinct life safety hazard.

Amended Response: Though allowed by code, it has been requested by Captain Pirone that we take a second look at the proposed transom conditions to remain. Upon further review, we have documented in four locations, the transoms to remain in the proposed corridor have previously infilled with wood panels and are no longer glazed. The attached sketch shows additional layers of gypsum applied to the transom panel to provide the required rating. Also shown in the attached sketch, the half lite wood door at these same locations, previously proposed as to remain, are called for to be removed and replaced with a rated unit door or fixed in place and fortified with an infill rated wall at the unit side. All other existing doors and transoms to remain are not located in proposed corridor walls.

*I trust these responses adequately address the comments from your review.
If you have any questions with regards to this letter, please contact our office.*

Respectfully,

Josh Crandall
Archetype Architects

End of Memo