December 14, 1956

AP 6-16 Portland Pier—Reconstruction of part of wharf and alteration of building for S. Seiger & Co.,

Copy to Louis Bernstein, Esq.,
97 Exchange St.

A. H. Hudson Co.,
P. O. Box 914

S. Seiger & Co.,
22 Portland Pier

Gentlemen:

Rather than hold out for a complete plan thoroughly analyzed by some specialist in marine structural work, we have undertaken to investigate as best we could the proposal contained in Mr. Lewis's revised plan, received here December 7, modified by some later conversations with him. On the basis of this plan and our investigation, the permit for the work is issued to the contractor, herewith, with the following comments:

It appears that the worst condition, as to the stability of the new concrete wall, would occur between the 12x12 crossbeams which are intended to transmit the load of the building to the top of the wall and back into the fill under the building. The main questionable feature appears to be the unequal bearing of the "toe" of the base of the wall (the edge toward the water) on the ground beneath it since the theoretical resultant of the loads appears to cut the base well outside of the "middle third" of the base. Thus, under conditions figured, the heaviest load upon the soil beneath the wall could likely run to about 3500 pounds per square foot while there would be practically no load upon the soil at the ohter edge of the base. Like all retaining wall designs this reasoning is quite theoretical, and must be based upon assumptions as to the loads which might not be the same in practice as theassumptions.

For a considerable portion of the length of the wall there would be no piles under the "toe" but in some places there are piles under the opposite edge of the base, or the "heel". The possibility of trouble, of course, lies in the fact that if the soil beneath the toe of the wall should settle substantially more than that soil in back, the tendency would be for the wall to tilt with the top of it moving out toward the water. The more movement of this character which took place, the more the tendency of the loads behind the wall to revolve it more about the "toe". If this tendency should take place at a point where there is a pile under the heel and none under the toe, the threat to the stability of the wall would be greater than otherwise.

I feel that we have gone as far as we should in this analysis, certainly further than the duty of this department requires. Therefore, the permit is issued on the basis that Mr. Kriger and Mr. Lewis will consult about the matter and decide whether or not the owner will accept the risk that the above figures may indicate in the light of Mr. Lewis's knowledge of the true conditions as to piles and capacity of the soil beneath the wall.

If you are to go ahead on the basis shown on the plan, you are at liberty to proceed. If any substantial changes are decided upon, it is important, in compliance with the Building Code, that a revised plan showing the changes be filed with application for an amendment to the permit now issued.

A number of unusual proposals are presented as regards the balance of the work which would not be allowable under the Building Code, if this were a new building. These features largely involve leaving wooden timbers in contact with the ground and in case of the 12x12 girders almost completely buried in the ground at a level where preservation cannot be hoped for by being steadily immersed in water. I have mentioned this both to Mr. Kriger and Mr. Lewis, neither of whom seem to be concerned by the prospect of permanency of the work. It seems to me that different details could be worked out, which would eliminate this promise of ~~early~~ deterioration —early or late. It would then be but a short step to find out how much more cost would be involved to follow the more permanent details.

The plans not showing the details, inquiry from Mr. Lewis develops that either a new concrete floor or an asphalt paving floor will be used in the building (not decided which), and that the under surface of the floor will be at the same level as the top of the 12x12 cross girders. Thus, the bottom at least of the new sills would be in contact with the ground and something beneath the sills would be needed to retain the earth under the floor. Mr. Lewis was not certain what would be used here. Neither is it clear how the fill under the floor would slope off to the top of the new retaining wall.

The Plans show the 12x12 cross girders at their inner ends to bear merely upon the existing fill. It has been suggested to Mr. Lewis that he provide an adequate concrete footing beneath the inner end of these girders, and perhaps extend them a little further toward the driveway of the wharf, thus to give the assurance that the 12x12s would act as beams and would not rely in any way upon support upon the new fill.

It was noted that the existing column under the farther end of the center truss under what will be the roof (the truss nearer Commercial St.) is considerably out of plumb. This, of course, is to be made plumb and well supported.

Very truly yours,

Warren McDonald
Inspector of Buildings

WMcD/B

Enclosure to Mr. Lewis: Permit card and copy of application

WHcD 12/10/56

December 3, 1956

AP 6-16 Portland Pier—Alteration of building by removing second story to make a one story structure with new roof, thus to correct a dangerous condition

A. H. Hudson Co.,
P. O. Box 914
Att: Mr. Lewis

Center Realty Co.,
22 Portland Pier
Att: Mr. Lewis H. Kriger, Treas.

Gentlemen:

We are unable to issue the permit for the above work because the plans do not show compliance with Building Code requirements. I have talked the proposition over with Mr. Lewis before the plans were filed. We have great confidence in the ability of the Hudson Co. to perform any marine structural work according to the plans decided upon, but the plan submitted contains neither enough information to show us precisely how the work is intended, nor evidences of rational engineering design supported by the statement of design of a party experienced in such design.

Such work around the water, and especially around tide water, has its peculiarities not only as to methods of construction, which the contractor can easily devise, but in methods of design as well, such design being a specialty. It is strongly recommended that you employ a thoroughly experienced designer of marine structural work to figure out a design according to the principles used everywhere in such work, and that you file his design plan with the statement of design, called for by the Building Code, attached to it.

The plans submitted have not been turned aside lightly, but have been considered at some length and our examination raises a considerable number of questions, among them the following, which cannot well be answered verbally or any other way than by showing on the plans:

—there is a note to cover the second floor with roll roofing, but the second floor is presumably approximately level at the present time while the plans show a definite pitch downward toward the water.
—no detail is shown of the trusses under present second floor on spans of more than 22 feet. It is not sufficient to assume that these will be alright because they have existed for a long time.
—the exterior wall toward the water is evidently a bearing wall intended to support the roof. Presumably this wall is to be supported on a sill of uncertain size to act as a beam between the new concrete block piers and supported upon the piers by bearing upon 12x12s, which would get a bearing on the new concrete block piers and extend for an undetermined distance away from the water.

[illegible] Hudson Co.,
[illegible] Realty Co., — 2 —

[illegible], 1956

—the [illegible], with relation to [illegible], [illegible] concrete [illegible] and against existing [illegible] is not [illegible], [illegible] to give a uniform bearing for the bottom of the wall to avoid the tendency toward overturning.

—what is to be the situation between the new concrete block piers and the inside face of the concrete retaining wall is not clear.

—the function of the [illegible] which would bear upon the concrete block piers is not clear.

—also, the position where the concrete retaining wall is to be built, it appears that the [illegible] is [illegible] which seems to mean that the new retaining wall is to support not only the fill under first floor but also the [illegible] of whatever load reaches the concrete block piers, including part of the load of the rear and exterior wall.

Since the proposal originates quite largely because of a written order from this department to correct a dangerous condition, the time period of the order having long since passed, we shall expect to hear definitely, of the constructive steps which you mean to take to comply with the order, before December 10, 1956

The original order expressed the opinion that total demolition appeared to be the most likely remedy. We shall be glad, indeed, to have as much of the building as can be safely maintained restored to safe condition rather than to demolish, but this department also has a definite responsibility to see that the work thus restored can be checked against Building Code requirements as required by the code before a permit can be issued.

Very truly yours,

[illegible]
Inspector of Buildings

WRCD/B

14.

INDUSTRIAL ZONE

APPLICATION FOR PERMIT

PERMIT ISSUED
02211
DEC 14 1956
CITY OF PORTLAND

Class of Building or Type of Structure Third Class

Portland, Maine, Nov. 16, 1956

To the INSPECTOR OF BUILDINGS, PORTLAND, MAINE

The undersigned hereby applies for a permit to ~~erect~~ alter ~~repair demolish move install~~ the following building ~~structure equipment~~ in accordance with the Laws of the State of Maine, the Building Code and Zoning Ordinance of the City of Portland, plans and specifications, if any, submitted herewith and the following specifications:

Location 6-16 Portland Pier Within Fire Limits? yes Dist No.

Owner's name and address S. Seiger & Co., 22 Portland Pier Telephone

Lessee's name and address Telephone

Contractor's name and address A. H. Hudson Co., P. O. Box 914, Telephone 3-0688

Architect Specifications Plans yes No. of sheets 1

Proposed use of building warehouse No. families

Last use " No. families

Material wood No. stories 1 Heat Style of roof Roofing

Other buildings on same lot

Estimated cost $ 2500. Fee $ 5.00

General Description of New Work

To remove entire second story and provide new roof, as per plan.
To repair existing foundation as per plans.

Permit Issued with Letter

CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENT IS WAIVED

It is understood that this permit does not include installation of heating apparatus which is to be taken out separately by c ad in the name of the heating contractor. PERMIT TO BE ISSUED TO contractor

Details of New Work

Is any plumbing involved in this work? Is any electrical work involved in this work?

Is connection to be made to public sewer? If not, what is proposed for sewage?

Has septic tank notice been sent? Form notice sent?

Height average grade to top of plate Height average grade to highest point of roof

Size, front depth No. stories solid or filled land? earth or rock?

Material of foundation Thickness, top bottom cellar

Material of underpinning Height Thickness

Kind of roof Rise per foot Roof covering

No. of chimneys Material of chimneys of lining Kind of heat fuel

Framing lumber—Kind Dressed or full size?

Corner posts Sills Girt or ledger board? Size

Girders Size Columns under girders Size Max. on centers

Studs (outside walls and carrying partitions) 2x4-16" O. C. Bridging in every floor and flat roof span over 8 feet.

Joists and rafters: 1st floor, 2nd, 3rd, roof

On centers: 1st floor, 2nd, 3rd, roof

Maximum span: 1st floor, 2nd, 3rd, roof

If one story building with masonry walls, thickness of walls? height?

If a Garage

No. cars now accommodated on same lot, to be accommodated number commercial cars to be accommodated

Will automobile repairing be done other than minor repairs to cars habitually stored in the proposed building?

APPROVED:

Miscellaneous

Will work require disturbing of any tree on a public street? no

Will there be in charge of the above work a person competent to see that the State and City requirements pertaining thereto are observed? yes

S. Seiger & Co.

Signature of owner by:

INSPECTION COPY

Permit No. 56/2211
Location 611 Portland Ave
Owner S. Seigel + Co.
Date of permit 12/14/56
Notif. closing-in
Inspn. closing-in
Final Notif.
Final Inspn.
Cert. of Occupancy issued
Staking Out Notice
Form Check Notice

NOTES

– Going toward Commercial St. to [illegible] level –

12/26/56 2nd floor [illegible] [illegible] – Allen

1/7/57 [illegible] work progressing – Allen

1/29/57 – [illegible] – Allen

3/19/57 work done – Allen

(I) INDUSTRIAL ZONE

PERMIT ISSUED
02176
DEC 7 1956
CITY of PORTLAND

APPLICATION FOR PERMIT

Class of Building or Type of Structure Third Class

Portland, Maine, Dec. 7, 1956

To the INSPECTOR OF BUILDINGS, PORTLAND, MAINE

The undersigned hereby applies for a permit to ~~erect, alter, repair~~ demolish ~~and/or use and occupy~~ the following building ~~structure, equipment~~ in accordance with the Laws of the State of Maine, the Building Code and Zoning Ordinance of the City of Portland, plans and specifications, if any, submitted herewith and the following specifications:

Location 6-16 Portland Pier Within Fire Limits? yes Dist. No.

Owner's name and address S. Seiger & Co., 22 Portland Pier Telephone

Lessee's name and address Telephone

Contractor's name and address A. H. Hudson Co. P. O. Box 914 Telephone 3-0688

Architect Specifications Plans no No. of sheets

Proposed use of building warehouse No. families

Last use " No. families

Material wood No. stories 1 Heat Style of roof Roofing

Other buildings on same lot

Estimated cost $ Fee $ 1.00

General Description of New Work

To remove entire second story in advance of providing new roof and repairing foundation.
See application filed No. 16, 1956

It is understood that this permit does not include installation of heating apparatus which is to be taken out separately by and in the name of the heating contractor. ***PERMIT TO BE ISSUED TO*** contractor

Details of New Work

Is any plumbing involved in this work? Is any electrical work involved in this work?

Is connection to be made to public sewer? If not, what is proposed for sewage?

Has septic tank notice been sent? Form notice sent?

Height average grade to top of plate Height average grade to highest point of roof

Size, front depth No. stories solid or filled land? earth or rock?

Material of foundation Thickness, top bottom cellar

Material of underpinning Height Thickness

Kind of roof Rise per foot Roof covering

No. of chimneys Material of chimneys of lining Kind of heat fuel

Framing lumber—Kind Dressed or full size?

Corner posts Sills Girt or ledger board? Size

Girders Size Columns under girders Size Max. on centers

Studs (outside walls and carrying partitions) 2x4-16" O. C. Bridging in every floor and flat roof span over 8 feet.

Joists and rafters: 1st floor, 2nd, 3rd, roof

On centers: 1st floor, 2nd, 3rd, roof

Maximum span: 1st floor, 2nd, 3rd, roof

If one story building with masonry walls, thickness of walls? height?

If a Garage

No. cars now accommodated on same lot, to be accommodated number commercial cars to be accommodated

Will automobile repairing be done other than minor repairs to cars habitually stored in the proposed building?

APPROVED:

Miscellaneous

Will work require disturbing of any tree on a public street? no

Will there be in charge of the above work a person competent to see that the State and City requirements pertaining thereto are observed? yes

S. Seiger & Co.
A. H. Hudson Co.

Signature of owner by:

INSPECTION COPY

NOTES

12/12/56 – work started. – Allen

Permit No. 56/2 1776

Location J. Leigey + Co.

Owner 6-16 Bethany Rd.

Date of permit 12/7/56

Notif. closing-in

Inspn. closing-in

Final Notif.

Final Inspn.

Cert. of Occupancy issued

Staking Out-Notice

Form Check Notice