
10 Island Street

3 messages

Sandra Ste George <stegeorge@gwi.net>

Mon, Sep 11, 2017 at 9:51 AM

To: cstacey@portlandmaine.gov

Cc: Phil Hoose <hoose@gwi.net>, Michael A Ferrante <atlasinsure@aol.com>

Christine,

I sent an email last week with a couple of questions and have not heard back from you.

One question is, since the survey of the 10 Island Street property was done in 2015 when the HAT was 11.5, had or will it be remeasured to the 2017 HAT, which is higher??

The other question has to do with front and side setbacks. Do they meet the zoning standards?

Thank-you for your time.

Sincerely,

Sandi Ste. George

Sent from my iPhone

Michael A Ferrante <atlasinsure@aol.com>

Mon, Sep 11, 2017 at 10:18 AM

To: stegeorge@gwi.net

Cc: cstacey@portlandmaine.gov

Sandi

I believe Christine has stated that the proposed 2 story house can not be built as proposed because it fails to meet the side setbacks of 14 feet on each side. The only way for that home to be built given the 46 ft frontage is for that house to be shrunk to only 18 ft wide. Only midgets could live in such a place and given what I see the lot owner(s) aren't midgets. The other alternative is to reduce it to 1.5 stories or less. Christine please confirm this from our last email exchange. Christine let me reiterate that it is a crime that the city is allowing this to even be considered. To raise a few measly thousand dollars in add'l tax revenue the city is drastically effecting the value of the abutting properties whose owners paid a premium because of the water views which will now be lost. I for one will ask to be re-valued. None of the properties on that side of the street will have any privacy. They will literally be on top of one another.

Mike Ferrante
11 Island St

-----Original Message-----

From: Sandra Ste George <stegeorge@gwi.net>

To: cstacey <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>

Cc: Phil Hoose <hoose@gwi.net>; Michael A Ferrante <atlasinsure@aol.com>

Sent: Mon, Sep 11, 2017 9:51 am

Subject: 10 Island Street

Christine,

I sent an email last week with a couple of questions and have not heard back from you.

One question is, since the survey of the 10 Island Street property was done in 2015 when the HAT was 11.5, had or will it be re measured to the 2017 HAT, which is higher??

The other question has to do with front and side setbacks. Do they meet the zoning standards?

Thank-you for your time.

Sincerely,
Sandi Ste. George

Sent from my iPhone

Christina Stacey <cstacey@portlandmaine.gov>
To: Michael A Ferrante <atlasinsure@aol.com>, hoose@gwi.net
Cc: stegeorge@gwi.net

Mon, Sep 11, 2017 at 11:59 AM

Dear Sandi,

I apologize for not being able to get back to you more quickly. We face a high daily volume of inquiries, permits, etc. and therefore are not always able to write back as quickly as we would like. In addition, I have still not had a response from the project architect to the questions I posed, so I have not been actively reviewing this permit recently.

In regards to your question about the HAT line and 75' setback, I am not sure what the 11.5' elevation you refer to is based on? The city goes by the [HAT table provided by DEP](#). The second column, showing the HAT levels for various points in the NAVD88 datum, is the one that most surveyors use to locate the HAT on a survey (not the MLLW method, which you might be referring to). I believe the closest point to the Island Street property is the Presumpscot River bridge, which shows a HAT elevation of 6.9'. The survey for 10 Island Street shows a HAT elevation of 7.4', which is different because the survey was created using the NGVD 1929 datum, so a conversion needed to be made. It is my understanding that the conversion from NAVD88 to NGVD 1929 for this area is about +0.7', which jibes with what is presented on the survey. Therefore I believe the HAT elevation shown on the plan to be correct and perhaps even conservative. If you have further information that you believe shows this level to be incorrect, please let me know.

Michael is correct that the required side setbacks for this zone are 8' for a 1- or 1.5-story house or 14' for a 2-story house. Therefore I do not believe the current plans meet the zoning requirement for a 2-story side setback and I have let the architect know.

Section 14-90(d)(1) generally requires a front setback in this zone of 25 feet. However, that section of the ordinance goes on to say that "A front yard need not exceed the average depth of front yards on either side of the lot." The applicant provided information showing that there is one front yard on the left side of the lot, with a depth of 10.7' to the closest building (garage). The property on the right side of the lot has its front yard upon Watson Street and therefore does not need to be averaged into the calculation as interpreted by this office. Therefore I believe that the plans do meet the minimum setback requirement of 10.7' based on the "average" of the one abutter.

I have gotten numerous e-mails expressing concern about the design of the building, but the city does not have any design requirements for new homes in the R-3 zone, so the style of the home and siding materials will not be reviewed except for building and fire code compliance.

Sincerely,
Chris

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Chris Stacey - Zoning Specialist
Permitting & Inspections Department
City of Portland
389 Congress St.
Portland, ME 04101
(207) 874-8695
cstacey@portlandmaine.gov