

69-73 ELM STREET

SHAW-WALKER

Full Cut #02011 • Mail Cut #02011 • Folded Cut #02031 • Flims Cut #02028

PERMIT TO INSTALL PLUMBING

11255

PERMIT NUMBER

Date Issued: 3-26-62
 By: J. P. Welch
 APPROVED FIRST INSPECTION
 Date: 3-23-62
 By: J. P. Welch
 APPROVED FINAL INSPECTION
 Date: JOSEPH E. WELCH

Address: 71 Elm Street
 Installation For: Earl Sewell
 Owner of Bldg: Earl Sewell
 Owner's Address: 79 Elm Street
 Plumber: E. N. Cunningham Co. Date: 3-26-62

NEW		REPL	PROPOSED INSTALLATIONS	NUMBER	FEE
			SINKS		
			LAVATORIES		
			TOILETS		
			BATH TUBS		
			SHOWERS		
			DRAINS		
			HOT WATER TANKS		
			TANKLESS WATER HEATERS		
			GARBAGE GRINDERS		
			SEPTIC TANKS	1	\$ 2.00
		1	HOUSE SEWERS		
			ROOF LEADERS (Conn to house drain)		
				TOTAL	\$ 2.00

PORTLAND HEALTH DEPT. PLUMBING INSPECTION

- By: TYPE OF BUILDING
- COMMERCIAL
 - RESIDENTIAL
 - SINGLE
 - MULTI FAMILY
 - NEW CONSTRUCTION
 - REMODELING

*Granted 9/14/61
61/95*

DATE: Sept. 14, 1961

HEARING ON APPEAL UNDER THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF LEWIS C. WEEKS

AT 69-73 Elm Street, corner of Oxford Street

Public Hearing on the above appeal was held before the Board of Appeals.

BOARD OF APPEALS

VOTE

	Yes	No
Franklin G. Hinckley	(✓)	()
Ralph L. Young	(✓)	()
Harry M. Shwartz	(✓)	()

Record of Hearing:

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
BOARD OF APPEALS

VARIANCE APPEAL

August 28, 1961

Lewis C. Weeks, owner of property at 69-73 Elm St., cor. Oxford St. under the provisions of Section 24 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Portland, hereby respectfully petitions the Board of Appeals for a variance from the provisions of said Ordinance to permit: Use of the vacant lot at this location for off-street parking of motor vehicles in connection with the proposed office building at 305-309 Cumberland Ave., cor. of Elm St. This permit is presently not issuable because the proposed parking lot is about 175 feet from the lot on which the building is located and Sec. 14-D of the Ordinance requires that accessory parking shall be located on the same lot with the principal building, or within 100 feet measured along line of public access, unless authorized by the Board of Appeals:

LEGAL BASIS OF APPEAL: Such variance may be granted only if the Board of Appeals finds that the strict application of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in undue hardship in the development of property which is inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the Ordinance; that there are exceptional or unique circumstances relating to the property that do not generally apply to other property in the same zone or neighborhood, which have not arisen as a result of action of the applicant subsequent to the adoption of this Ordinance whether in violation of the provisions of the Ordinance or not; that property in the same zone or neighborhood will not be adversely affected by the granting of the variance; and that the granting of the variance will not be contrary to the intent and purpose of the Ordinance.

Lewis C. Weeks
APPELLANT

DECISION

After public hearing held September 14, 1961, the Board of Appeals finds that all of the above conditions do exist with respect to this property and that a variance should be granted in this case.

It is, therefore, determined that a variance from the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance should be granted in this case.

Freddie G. Hurlley
Harri M. Roberts
Edith L. Smith
BOARD OF APPEALS

September 11, 1961

Mr. Lewis C. Weeks
68 Johnson Street
Portland, Maine

Dear Mr. Weeks:

September 14, 1961

ALBERT J. SEARS
INSPECTOR OF BUILDINGS

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
Department of Building Inspection

AP- 69-73 Elm Street, corner of Oxford Street

August 24, 1961

C
O
P
Y
Mr. Lewis C. Weeks
68 Johnson Street
Portland, Maine

cc to: Corporation Counsel

Dear Mr. Weeks:

Authorization for the use of the vacant lot at the above noted location for off-street parking of motor vehicles in connection with the proposed office building at 305-308 Cumberland Avenue, corner of Elm Street, cannot be granted under the Zoning Ordinance because the proposed parking lot is about 175 feet from the lot on which the building is located and Section 14-D of the Ordinance requires that accessory parking shall be located on the same lot with the principal building, or within 100 feet measured along lines of public access, unless authorized by the Board of Appeals.

We understand that you would like to exercise your appeal rights in this matter. Accordingly we are certifying the case to the Corporation Counsel, to whose office in Room 208, you should go to file an appeal.

Very truly yours,

Albert J. Sears
Building Inspection Director

AJS:m

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
IN THE BOARD OF APPEALS

September 1, 1961

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The Board of Appeals will hold a public hearing in the Council Chamber at City Hall, Portland, Maine, on Thursday, September 14, 1961, at 4:00 P.M. to hear the appeal of Lewis C. Weeks requesting an exception to the Zoning Ordinance to permit use of the vacant lot at 69-73 Elm Street, corner of Oxford Street, for off-street parking of motor vehicles in connection with the proposed office building at 305-309 Cumberland Avenue, corner of Elm Street.

This permit is presently not issuable because the proposed parking lot is about 175 feet from the lot on which the building is located and Section 14-D of the Ordinance requires that accessory parking shall be located on the same lot with the principal building, or within 100 feet measured along lines of public access, unless authorized by the Board of Appeals.

This appeal is taken under Section 24 of the Zoning Ordinance which provides that such variance may be granted only if the Board of Appeals finds that the strict application of the provisions of the Ordinance would result in undue hardship in the development of property which is inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the Ordinance; that there are exceptional or unique circumstances relating to the property that do not generally apply to other property in the same zone or neighborhood, which have not arisen as a result of action of the applicant subsequent to the adoption of this Ordinance whether in violation of the provisions of the Ordinance or not; that property in the same zone or neighborhood will not be adversely affected by the granting of the variance; and that the granting of the variance will not be contrary to the intent and purpose of the Ordinance.

All persons interested either for or against this appeal will be heard at the above time and place, this notice of required public hearing having been sent to the owners of property within 500 feet of the premises in question as required by the Ordinance.

BOARD OF APPEALS

Franklin G. Hinckley

Chairman

INQUIRY BLANK

ZONE B

FIRE DIST. 12

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

Verbal
By Telephone

Date 9/10/48

LOCATION 69 Elm Street OWNER _____

MADE BY W. P. Daniels, Jr. Est. Co. TEL: _____

ADDRESS _____

PRESENT USE OF BUILDING _____

CLASS OF CONSTRUCTION _____ NO. OF STORIES _____

REMARKS: He is thinking of turning part of lot
It is a main workshop for sales & service
at work

INQUIRY: How does zoning law apply to
the structures of lot?

ANSWER: Repair & remodeling of
a. this is a violation of the appeal
must be an allowable but
not storage of more than 1 truck

DATE OF REPLY 9/10/48 REPLY BY [Signature]

copy to
for at 69-73
E.M.

DIAL 2 3535

Redman, White & Willey
Counsellors at Law

FULTON J. REDMAN
ERNEST M. WHITE
JOHN E. WILLEY

The Press Herald Building

Portland 3, Maine March 17, 1947

Mr. Warren McDonald,
Building Inspector,
City of Portland,
Portland 3, Maine.

69-73
RECEIVED
MARCH 17 1947
DEPT. OF PLANNING
CITY OF PORTLAND

Dear Sir:

Mr. Harold B. Arey is contemplating leasing property owned by the Universal Laundry and located at the corner of Elm and Oxford Streets, and proposes to use the business of parking cars for hire as well as a filling station.

He plans to erect thereon a suitable building and will have stored there several cars for hire. I understand this is a limited commercial area under the building code, and will you kindly advise us if such business will be permissible on this location under the building and zoning ordinance.

Yours very truly,

Ernest M. White

EMW:H

Ernest M. White

INQUIRY BLANK

ZONE BB

FIRE DIST. No. 1B

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

Verbal
By Telephone

Date 3/19/47

LOCATION 69-73 Elm Street, corner of OWNER Universal Laundry
Oxford Street

MADE BY Ernest M. White, attorney for - TEL. _____
Harold B. Arey

ADDRESS _____

PRESENT USE OF BUILDING _____

CLASS OF CONSTRUCTION _____ NO. OF STORIES _____

REMARKS: _____

INQUIRY: See Mr. White's letter of March 17

ANSWER: See our letter of March 19

DATE OF REPLY 3/19/47 REPLY BY W McD

Inquiry 69-73 Elm Street,
corner of Oxford

March 19, 1947

Mr. Ernest M. White
Press Herald Building
Portland, 2, Maine

Subject: Inquiry as to use of the vacant lot at
69-73 Elm Street, corner of Oxford Street for
the business of letting cars for hire and for
a gasoline filling station, including the pro-
bability of erecting a suitable building on the
lot to store several cars in connection with the
car rental business

Dear Sir:

You and Mr. Arcy have discussed this matter with me before your letter was written. I believe these passenger cars to be rented out with or without a driver (Mr. Arcy says that he would not rent trucks) are commercial motor vehicles as contemplated in the Zoning Ordinance, and with some reservations you concluded that your client would concede that interpretation for the purpose of filing a variance appeal.

The use of the building which would be built on the lot for a garage for storing these passenger cars came up at the end of our conference, it being the thought at the beginning that any proposed building would be used merely for an office. In view of this later development, I believe you should include this building and the use of it in your zoning appeal. If, however, your client decided for the present such a building would be used only as an office, the building need not necessarily be mentioned in the appeal.

If the building is to be included in the appeal, it would be better for Mr. Arcy to apply for a building permit to cover the construction of the building together with a location plan on the lot and an outline plan of the building so that the Board of Appeals would have something very definite to go on in their consideration of the case; and the application should be filed with the plan before filing the appeal. No building permit is required to cover the use of the open land, but one is required for any building, and if that building were to be used as a garage for housing commercial motor vehicles, the permit would not be issuable under the Zoning Ordinance,--therefore the need of including the proposed garage in the appeal to avoid possibility of being granted a variance as far as the use of the land was concerned and then have to go through the usual procedure before the building could be constructed.

I am writing this letter then on the basis that you will file your appeal for the use of the land only, and that the building will be only an office not for storage of any of the cars. The statement of such an appeal would be:

The appellant proposes the use of this vacant lot for the business of letting passenger automobiles for hire, with or without drivers, and several such passenger cars would be parked or stored on the lot. The property is in a Limited Business Zone under the Zoning Ordinance where Section 5A4 provides that not more than one commercial motor vehicle shall be parked or stored except as authorized by the Board of Appeals after the usual appeal procedure.

Since it is my understanding that your client desires to file such an appeal, there is enclosed an outline of the appeal procedure, and I am told that the best time to file such an appeal is in the afternoon. If, however, Mr. Arcy wishes to include the construction of a building to accommodate any of these motor vehicles, it will work out best for him to put together his information as to location of the building and an outline plan to make clear what is intended--then file these with an appli-

ATH
ESS
BMT
AJS
PH
VOC
DJ
BS

Ernest H. Waite — 2

March 19, 1947

cation for a building permit here in this office and await another letter from me relating to the enlarged proposition before filing any appeal in the office of Corporation Counsel.

With reference to your inquiry also about use of the lot for a gasoline filling station, that is an allowable use in the Limited Business Zone where the property is located.

Very truly yours,

Inspector of Buildings

WHaD/S

Encl: Outline of appeal procedure

CC: Edward T. Gignoux
Assistant Corporation Counsel

File

Location 6-9 Elm St

Date 3/13/57

Permit _____
Inquiry _____
Complaint _____

Agg's
It seems to me the decision as to whether or not a vehicle is commercial would have to sum up down to what kind of license it carries. I believe these are only commercial if you don't properly inform on the state, take to have them again.

Then file
[Signature]

INQUIRY BLANK

ZONE "B"

FIRE DIST. 1B

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

Verbal
By Telephone

Date 3/11/47

LOCATION 29 Elm Street
corner of Oxford Street OWNER _____

MADE BY H. B. Arny TEL. 4-1160

ADDRESS 55 Spring Street

PRESENT USE OF BUILDING _____

CLASS OF CONSTRUCTION _____ NO. OF STORIES _____

REMARKS: _____

*Mc
11/11/47
3/13/47*

INQUIRY: 1 - Can a business for renting automobiles, with and without drivers, (all passenger cars), and tanks & pumps for sale of gasoline to general public be established at this location?
2 - Can a small ^{wood} frame building now in Cape Elizabeth be moved onto lot for use as office building.

ANSWER: 1 - It is permissible in Limited Business Zone where property is located, but parking of more than one commercial motor vehicle is not allowable. (Question: - Are passenger cars let for hire "commercial motor vehicles"?)
2 - Building would have to comply with BC requirements for framing, etc.; would have to be of ~~some~~ ^{wood} and height specified by Sect 402-b-11 of Code for wood frame.

DATE OF REPLY 3/11/47 REPLY BY Albert J. Jones
3/13/47 - Phoned Mr. Arny and told him that will. ~~con-~~
sidered these cars for hire as commercial vehicles and hence, only one could be legally parked on lot. (over)

buildings in Fire District #1 and be located on feet
and covered inside and out with incombustible ma-
terial as specified therein. Also told him that before
we can issue permit for moving we shall need
location plan, kind of foundation, and informa-
tion by plan or otherwise as to framing of existing
building and if it is not in compliance with
Code requirements how it will be made so; also
what type of covering is to be applied to walls inside
and out to meet requirements.

2-6067

P.K.

INQUIRY BLANK

ZONE "B"

FIRE DIST. 1B

CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING INSPECTION

Verbal
By Telephone

DATE 1/14/46

LOCATION 69 Elm, corner of Oxford OWNER ?

MADE BY Seth Walker for Benjamin Barrow TEL. _____

ADDRESS 82 Elm Street

PRESENT USE OF BUILDING Vacant lot

CLASS OF CONSTRUCTION _____ NO. OF STORIES _____

REMARKS: _____

INQUIRY: 1- Can a one story concrete block building for use as auto ^{top} repair shop be erected on this corner? Mr. Barrow wishes to purchase this lot and erect building here into which he can move from his present quarters at 82 Elm Street.

ANSWER: 1- Since this auto top repair shop is classed as a repair garage, which is not a permissible use in the District Business zone where property is located, a permit for erection of a building for such a use cannot be issued unless a favorable appeal to the City Council is obtained. This would require signatures of property owners within a certain area, but if proposed changes in Z.O. go thru written consent will not be required.

01
1/15/46

DATE OF REPLY 1/14/46 REPLY BY A. J. Sears

OFFICE OF STATE

317 State Street
State House Station #52
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 289-FIRE
FAX (207) 289-5163



FIRE MARSHAL

June 18, 1992

Ingraham Volunteers, Inc.
72 Elm Street
Portland, Maine 04101

RE: Group Home - Portland, Maine

Dear Sir:

After reviewing your plans submitted to this office, I find they are in compliance with the existing requirements of the Life Safety Code and will be considered for approval on submission of complete plans and specifications.
CONSTRUCTION SHALL NOT BEGIN UNTIL PERMIT IS ISSUED.

If I may be of further assistance to you in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Yours for better fire protection,

Donna L. Emerson
DONNA L. EMERSON, ASSISTANT
Fire Protection Specialist

DLE:map
cc: Normand Associates
Code Enforcement Officer - City of Portland