



TOWN OF BRUNSWICK, MAINE

INCORPORATED 1739

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
28 FEDERAL STREET
BRUNSWICK, ME 04011

ANNA M. BREINICH, AICP
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PHONE: 207-725-6660
FAX: 207-725-6663

**VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
AGENDA
BRUNSWICK STATION
16 STATION AVENUE, ROOM 217
Tuesday, March 20, 2012
7:15 P.M.**

1. **Discussion:** The Board will discuss its programming for National Historic Preservation Month in May
2. **Review:** The Board will review a draft letter to realtors for the informational brochure
3. **Staff Approvals:**
12-04 – 22 Pleasant St
4. **Minutes**
- January, February, June, July 2011

Village Review Board meetings are open to the public. Please call the Brunswick Department of Planning and Development (725-6660) with questions or comments. This meeting is televised.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

Dear Realtor,

The Brunswick Village Review Board has recently produced a new brochure explaining its procedures and how they affect owners of property within the Village Review Zone, which is Brunswick's protected downtown historic area. Several copies are enclosed. We encourage you to make these brochures available to clients in your office, especially to clients considering purchases in the Village Review Zone. A map of the zone can be found inside the brochure.

There are many advantages to owning a home in a historic neighborhood, and we hope this brochure will help make that clear to potential purchasers of houses in the zone. The brochure also outlines procedures homeowners must follow when they wish to make major changes to their homes and directs them toward resources that can help guide their planning process.

Our purpose in producing this brochure is to give people information about property ownership in the zone before they move into it so they will know in advance what procedures apply to them and what resources are available to help them make the most of their historic property. Many thanks for your assistance in getting this information out to the public.

BRUNSWICK VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
January 20, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Emily Swan, Janet Roberts, Jane Crichton, Jeff Pelletier, Laurie Leader

STAFF PRESENT: Kris Hultgren

Emily opened the meeting at 7:15.

Village Review Board Information Brochure – Tabled to next meeting. Kris suggested that in the meantime the Board think about future distribution of the brochure.

Village Review Board Design Guidelines – The Board discussed additions to the Design Guidelines to meet situations previously encountered that are not included in the current Design Guidelines; i.e. handicap ramps, wind turbines and solar panels. Kris noted that the Board had previously reviewed samples of some current ramps in other areas and he suggested putting this item on an agenda and then coming back with additional information. Considering present time and priorities he asked for a recommendation on which item to prioritize. Janet felt that handicapped ramps should be the first and the Board agreed. Emily suggested addressing solar panels secondly. The discussion will continue at the next meeting.

Historic Preservation Month – Scheduled for May, Emily suggested the Board think about a theme and what could be included. She noted that Betsy Marr had mentioned conducting tours of buildings that were recognized for historic preservation by the Brunswick Downtown Association: the Richard Nemerow building on Park Row, the Captain Daniel Stone Inn and People Plus. Kris also mentioned green technology retrofits which are happening more and more, and its impact on historical buildings and how to preserve the character and style and still allow green technology. Emily mentioned several other educational topics that had previously been mentioned. Some of those are history all over town, use of intern developed maps and clues to the past. A previous team-up with the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee was very successful and could possible be done again.

Other Business

Emily noted the need to rewrite the Demolition Ordinance to include site visits and to address consideration of the overriding of public good. The Board expressed its desire to move forward quickly on this rewrite.

Minutes

MOTION BY JANET ROBERTS TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 19, 2010 AS AMENDED. SECONDED BY JANE CRICHTON, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Meeting adjourned.

Attest:

Joan Edwards
Recording Secretary

BRUNSWICK VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
February 15, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Emily Swan, Janet Roberts, Betsy Marr

STAFF PRESENT: Kris Hultgren

Emily opened the meeting at 7:15.

1. Review of Section 216.10 – Certification of Appropriateness for Demolition

Kris stated that the Planning Department staff put together a list of other towns in Maine that have demolition standards. They chose standards from three towns, Portland, Freeport and Bar Harbor, to include in the packet for consideration by the Board.

The Board discussed the various portions of Brunswick's standard 216.10 as compared with the standards from those other towns. Kris explained that Freeport and Bar Harbor towns classify their buildings as either historic or not and if the building met the specific historic criteria, a demolition permit was required. Both Emily and Janet agreed that the language used by Brunswick should not be changed allowing all buildings within the historic district to require a demolition permit. Freeport and Bar Harbor both have notification requirements and it was agreed that was something that could be included in Brunswick's ordinance along with the inclusion of a site walk.

The Board members reviewed the Secretary of Interior Standards of Demolition referred to in Brunswick's ordinance and determined that it applied to guidelines for rehabilitation, not demolition and therefore should not be referred to in Brunswick's ordinance. It was thought that Brunswick's Design Guidelines belong in 216.9 and not in 216.10. The members of the Board decided that their suggestions for language changes to the ordinance be brought back to the staff for further consideration.

2. Village Review Board Information Booklet.

Since Board member Jeff Pelletier has been working on design of the booklet and was not present, it was decided to defer further discussion until the next meeting.

3. Historic Preservation Month

Emily noted that this year's theme has yet to be determined. She noted that it was suggested that the Brunswick Downtown Association award winning buildings could possibly be included in this year's tours. Emily said she had spoken with a member of the Bike & Pedestrian Committee who indicated he would also be interested in participating in the activities. It was suggested that access to the significant building database be made available to the public encouraging people to look at various architecture styles in Brunswick. It was noted that a new location is needed for the photo contest this year. Discussions will be continued to the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned.

Attest:

Joan Edwards
Recording Secretary

DRAFT

BRUNSWICK VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD

June 13, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Emily Swan, Janet Roberts, Betsy Marr, Jane Crichton, Laurie Leader

STAFF PRESENT: Anna Breinich, Kris Hultgren

Emily opened the meeting at 7:15.

1. **Staff Update on First Parish Church Intersection Project** – Town Manager Gary Brown updated the Board, noting that it has been almost 3 years in the planning and included compromises and sacrifices by each party. The project was approved by the Village Review Board in August 2010. It is anticipated that MDOT will advertise by the end of June. The condition placed on the demolition was to wait until the project was advertised and was going forward. He noted that there is a great deal of construction going on in Brunswick at the present time with ensuing bottlenecks all summer long. He therefore requested if the Board is satisfied that the project is going on and meets the essence of their established criteria that Bowdoin College be allowed to proceed with the demolition at 4-6 Cleveland Street before the month of July begins.

Emily asked why MDOT has not advertised before this. Gary stated that the greatest delay was caused by a required Federal 4F Review of the project because of the Spanish War Memorial Real Estate which was established by the Town of Brunswick 70-80 years ago. This review only occurred in late April or May 2011.

Betsy asked if there weren't any additional obstacles to the approval, why isn't MDOT advertising right now? Gary indicated that MDOT advertises in cycles and the next advertising cycle is the end of the current month.

MOTION BY JANET ROBERTS THAT THE BOARD FINDS THAT THE INTENT OF THE SECOND CONDITION OF APPROVAL FOR DEMOLITION OF AUGUST 3, 2010 HAS BEEN MET AND THE BOARD NO LONGER REQUIRES THE ACTUAL BID TO GO OUT BEFORE DEMOLITION IS ALLOWED. SECONDED BY JANE CRICHTON, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. **Six Month Work Plan** – Betsy noted that the following items have been temporarily postponed due to other priorities and need to be addressed in the next months.
 - a. Demolition Standards –
 - b. Design Guidelines – handicapped ramps, solar panels, alternate energy.
 - c. VRB Brochure
 - d. Betsy suggested adding signs for historical buildings
 - e. VRB Zone Expansion – Kris noted that the staff is actively working on updated the zoning ordinance and implementing the comp plan and VRB zone expansion is a part of that and part of the Downtown Master Plan. The summer agenda is completing Chapter IV and V (development review standards and findings of fact). After that the districts and tables of uses, etc. and they anticipate looking at zone expansion in the fall. Anna noted that in accordance with the Comp Plan

they are looking at the town core plan and have gotten as far as the town center district. What they are recommending is the Town Center district, Fort Andross and Park Row and trying to get them less cumbersome

Betsy felt the VRB zone should be expanded and thought there should be a discussion about what to include before a decision is made. Kris said that if the boundaries outlined in the comp plan need to be addressed the VRB could certainly make their suggestions. Janet suggested delaying these discussions until they have maps. It was decided to put the issue on the next agenda.

Work Plan:

VRB Brochure – Emily will contact Board member Jeff Pelletier to find out when it will be available and hopes they will have it by the next meeting. Anna suggested printing just some as needed and put them on a PDF format on the Town website. Kris is currently working on the redesign of the website. Brochure discussion scheduled for next agenda.

Demolition Standards – Emily felt this item deserves the highest priority. Jane Crichton found a useful model on line for Newburyport, MA that was very clearly defined. Newburyport is a town the approximate size of Brunswick which is why she looked at their standards. She feels that Brunswick needs to have a tighter structure although perhaps not six pages as is Newburyport's. It was suggested that they start looking at other towns that are doing a good job and where their demolition standards would fit in.

Emily asked Kris when this work could be scheduled, he indicated possibly September. Anna asked Jane if the demolition standard were included in the Zoning Ordinance. Jane said it is part of the Newburyport Historical Commission and is called the Demolition Delay Ordinance and includes plan, procedure, filing for delay, emergency demolition, etc. It is more closely defined and requires the need to bring in a registered, licensed structural engineer. Kris asked if their commission has the authority to approve the demolition. He said he asked that question because the standards he has looked at have the board in an advisory role and he would be interested in looking at Newburyport's to see how they handle it. Jane said it appears that they have to authorize it. Hopefully they will have language to propose to the Planning Board in late fall.

Design Guidelines – Kris stated that design guidelines are probably last on the list for the Planning Department as they will be coupled with the zoning ordinance and districts. Scheduling will probably be toward the end of the year.

Betsy brought up handicapped ramps indicating that the Tedford Shelter has what she feels is an outstanding example. Emily suggested the members look for hopeful handicap ramp models on the internet or anywhere they see them around town or elsewhere and share them with the Board.

Emily said she is waiting for Claudia Knox to found the Brunswick Preservation Society and when it is established she feels it will be a very good clearing house for things like house signs, etc. She felt it probably needs to take a back seat to

DRAFT

other items. Perhaps the Board could find out what other towns have; who is the sponsoring entity, where the money comes from, is it 100% voluntary, etc. Anna suggested reaching out to the Pejebcot Society to find out if they would be interested.

Emily said she will make up a suggested work plan schedule and email it to the Board members.

3. **Historic Preservation Month Recap** – Greg Paxton had a good presentation but not very well attended. One of the items discussed with Greg was having some documentation of the economic benefits of historic preservation. A brochure was received in the mail from the Maine Historic Society with some good information on this topic and Emily noted it would be helpful to keep that for future reference. Betsy noted that previous discussions have indicated that these presentations are historically not very well attended and wondered if they should continue to have them. Jane stated that May is a difficult time of the year and perhaps presentations would be better received in the fall. The tours were again very well attended and everyone did a good job. The bike tour was also well attended. Janet noted that tours are always well attended, but lectures in general generate interest but something always seems to preclude attendance. The Photo Contest was at the Visitors Center and Frank Connors indicated an interest in keeping it going. The pictures are now at the People Plus Center, probably through July. Frank indicated he will further publicize it in their newsletter.

Another item discussed was an interactive online repository of photos of the houses on the list of the 100 most significant structures in Brunswick where people could also upload more information about these houses. At a meeting when this was discussed Jane and Laurie indicated they had contacts regarding implementing something along these lines. Emily hoped that additional information could be gathered so that it could be discussed in the fall to implement as an ongoing project. She said the Times Record is usually happy to cooperate with them on projects that fit in with the newspaper.

Betsy suggested looking at other locations during the year for the photo contest where there would be better exposure.

Meeting adjourned at 8:15pm.

Attest:

Joan Edwards
Recording Secretary

DRAFT

BRUNSWICK VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD

July 19, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: Emily Swan, Janet Roberts, Betsy Marr, Laurie Leader, Brooks Stoddard

STAFF PRESENT: Anna Breinich, Kris Hultgren, Town Attorney Pat Scully

Emily opened the meeting at 7:15.

Case #11-015 – Village Review Board Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition – The Board will review and take action on an application from the Brunswick Development Corporation to demolish buildings located at 1 Stanwood Street (Map U15 Lot 76), 3 Stanwood Street (U15, Lot77), 85 Pleasant Street (Map U15 Lot 75) and 81 Pleasant Street (Map U15 Lot 74).

Emily opened the meeting at 7:15.

Kris introduced the application. The Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted by the Brunswick Development Corporation is for the demolition of four buildings located at 81 and 85 Pleasant Street and 1 and 3 Pleasant Street. The Board conducted a site visit of the properties prior to the meeting.

Larissa Darcy representing the Brunswick Development Corporation presented the application. The Brunswick Development Corporation purchased the properties both single and double family dwellings and propose to work with Habitat for Humanity and Portland Architectural Salvage to salvage and reuse as much of the buildings as possible. None of the buildings are currently on the National Historic District and are not eligible to be on the National Register for Historic Places for their architectural merit. None of the buildings are listed on the 100 Most Significant Properties as determined through historical surveys in 2001. The power point presentation showed the properties under consideration for demolition. 1 Stanwood was previously used as a 4 unit dwelling, 3 Stanwood Street was also a multi-unit. She said most of the properties were in somewhat ill repair. 81 Pleasant Street was unoccupied for a number of years and has sustained a lot of vandalism and does not present much for salvage.

Kris updated information on 81 Pleasant Street based on a memo from the Brunswick Codes Enforcement Officer dated July 23, 2010 that speaks to the condition of 81 Pleasant Street. Larissa Darcy highlighted several of the materials at 85 Pleasant Street that will be salvaged after demolition; front doorway and sidelights, wood flooring as well as wood used for the roof.

Brooks asked what will replace the buildings. Janet Roberts emphasized that the future use for the properties was not a concern for the Village Review Board. Emily noted that the previous demolition on Cleveland Street was part of a larger project and a condition placed on the Certificate of Appropriateness was that if the project did not go through then the approval was void. Their ordinance provides standards such as leaving historic neighborhood unaltered to the greatest extent possible. She said she understands they are to look at things in the larger context, but if the larger context is not being presented it is kind of hard to weigh and is a different determination.

Pat Scully noted that the situation with Cleveland Street was different in that context; the request for demolition was tied directly to a particular project. Given that circumstance it was appropriate for the Board to say fine, but let's be absolutely sure you are going to do that project. With the current situation although there has been some discussion about one potential use, it is his understanding

DRAFT

that no decision has been made on what's to be done with the property. It is owned by Brunswick Development Corporation purposely for redevelopment but that future redevelopment is not before the Board.

Larissa Darcy said it is important to note that the purchase of the properties that are in question is intended to enhance one of the gateways to Brunswick and to improve that blighted property. She believes that any future development site would be subject to review by the Village Review Board.

Betsy noted that on 3 Stanwood it appears that most of what was done happened after the property was bought, breaking things off and tearing things out she does not imagine it was that way when it was bought. Larissa said that no repairs or damage has been done by BDC or its members. It was stated that the items removed had been done by the previous owner. Janet stated that she did not know if they should look at the properties one by one or in a lump and that the interiors are irrelevant to the Board except as they relate to whether the property has deteriorated too much (economic value of the building). First, you have to decide if it contributes to the character of the Village Review Zone and then secondly economic viability and if the owner has contributed to the deterioration.

Brooks made a point that they could look at the buildings one at a time, some are better than others, but he believes their job as a board is to try to think of the buildings in aggregate in terms of how much it is going to hurt in some way the Village Review Zone. Part of their job is to decide if what is taken down is replaced by something better and that is not happening. Janet asked if they were voting on each building or all together. Pat Scully noted that the application was to demolish all four buildings, they can handle deliberations in what order they chose, but the final decision has to be for all four buildings. Emily noted that she has never had a proposal to demolish a structure and put nothing there, it makes it very hard to apply the standards of the zone. Larissa explained that they would grade the properties and make it attractive until determination and approval of future development. Emily asked if assuming that the discussed use for the property went forward, what is the timeline on the police station. How long does the property sit like that? Larissa said the BDC purchased the properties regardless of what the future use was for. Pat Scully said he believes that the police station is in the 2011-2012 budget, but the location has not been determined.

Emily opened the meeting to public comment.

Claudia Knox of 36 Cumberland Street wanted to address some of the Board's concerns. She said she reviewed the materials very thoroughly and she really thinks the application before the Board is an application by this property owner for a certificate of appropriateness and is not in a position to bring plans and designs for what is to take place. She expressed appreciation for the care given by the applicant to demolition, recycling, and preservation of those pieces that can be preserved. She said she lives not far from the area and it is an area that is familiar to her. She said she sees residential neighborhoods as being thin, vulnerable and fragile and hopes they will approve the application. She believes that blight that will never repaired get nowhere. It seems to her the application for demolition is supportive of creating an environment for better investment, for property values and neighborhoods being supported. At the moment the properties have been abandoned, are not safe and in a location where they will never, ever draw residential reinvestment. No matter how you slice it these buildings will not remain long term. She believes that even if the properties were opened for commercial investment, no investor would buy the buildings. She stated she really hopes the Board can find a way to move forward with this application.

Public comment closed.

DRAFT

Betsy Marr indicated that Claudia's comments made things clearer for her.

Brooks asked if, in the context of development, if any has been given to trying to rehab one or any of the buildings? Larissa said at this time no, there has not been any consideration given to rehab probably from an economic standpoint.

Emily noted one of the points in the Town Attorney's letter under Section 216.10(C) the VRB must consider a) the condition of the structures; and b) the availability of permitted alternative uses of the structures that would maintain their economic viability. With that in mind her sense is after looking at the condition of all of the buildings they went into on the earlier site visit were not beyond repair except for the one they could not go into which is beyond repair as noted by the Codes Enforcement Officer. The others had some problems because all the appliances had been yanked off the walls, but were not worse than many buildings that have been seen and been rehabilitated. In the absence of a use that is superior, she is hesitant to say there is no economic use; once you take them down they are never coming back. 85 Pleasant Street did have a viable use not too long ago. She said she is hesitant to say yes take all four down. She has no problem with taking down 81 Pleasant Street because of its condition or 1 Stanwood because it's lack of architectural merit and she does not see it as contributing to the character of the neighborhood, the other two fit in with the traditional styles of the neighborhood and fit in with the traditional streetscape patterns.

Janet said looking at the three things they are legally bound to; first, to *the greatest possible extent, structures that contribute to the character of the Village Review Zone shall remain unaltered.* second regarding demolition, look at the condition of the structure and the availability of permitted alternative uses that would maintain its economic viability. She would say 81 Pleasant contributes to the character but the condition is bad, 85 Pleasant contributes to the character of the neighborhood and the condition is fine. The building on the corner, 1 Stanwood does not architecturally contribute to the neighborhood in terms of it's massing on the corner it contributes some, condition looks fine and 3 Stanwood contributes to the character and condition is fine. No evidence has been presented to them about economic viability so she can't consider it as a mitigating factor.

Larissa made a point of clarification, it was stated that if it was known what the proposed use of the lot would be you might not be opposed to the demolition of all four and she is having trouble understanding the difference. Emily replied that if you lose something of architectural value, buildings that are 175 years old. you can never get them back. If you have nothing to wave that value against, no beneficial value to the neighborhood, for them to say sure take them down we are suggesting that we are abdicating our responsibility by giving something up that to the greatest possible extent shall remain unaltered. Larissa responded stating that the Maine Historic Preservation Commission stated that these buildings are not eligible because they don't have the architectural merit. they did not meet the standard because of the changes made over the years they are no longer the original structures. Emily noted that most buildings in the downtown area would be eligible for demolition if they applied that standard.

Pat Scully added a word of caution, his letter addresses one narrow issue, does the ordinance prohibit demolitions in any case other than if the building is essentially falling down and in his view it does not prohibit demolition, you still have to go through those listed criteria that have already been identified. He said he also doesn't think there is anything in the ordinance that ties the approval or disapproval of a demolition to what will follow, and the analysis of the criteria is really the same, do you permit the demolition of this structure or structures essentially irregardless of what is going to follow it. The focus on individual criteria that are really applicable to this application is correct, 216.9a.1a; *to the greatest practical extent structures that contribute to the character of the*

DRAFT

Village Review Zone shall remain unaltered. He thinks it is applicable and in that context you have to ask do these structures contribute to the character of the zone and is there some practical manner in which they can remain unaltered given the condition they are in. Also 216.10 have its three listed criteria, the first doesn't seem to apply because the properties are not listed nor eligible, the letter from the State indicates from their perspective these are not properties of historical significance. The 2nd and 3rd criteria do apply. He said he believes the Board has to focus the ultimate vote on are whether those three criteria are met in this case or not and it seems to him that would be the same whether or not you knew exactly what was to follow. But he believes that does not seem to bear on whether or not the demolition goes forward.

Emily asked if a building is not falling down and has architectural merit and say all the buildings are where Maine Street Station is now which for twenty years was a vacant lot with a half built foundation, and you gave them up and then that's what you got. We don't know what the proposed use is going to be so whether or not these buildings could contribute depends on what it could be. If it turns out it is a police station they probably couldn't contribute. It seems like a different question, because if the development was commercial you think well that development needs to include these things, but a police station is different. If you approve a demolition in a vacuum you don't know and you give up the opportunity to ever know.

Brooks stated following that discussion, he would like to submit a resolution that they deny the application of the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition. Janet asked if that was a motion, Brooks indicated it was, Janet seconded the motion. Emily asked if they didn't approve the motion could there be an alternate motion covering perhaps some of the buildings. Kris stated that all four of the buildings are part of the application and so approval is for all four buildings.

Anna addressed the issue of economic viability. Property assessment records had been distributed to the Board, for the most part they have all gone down in value, and 85 Pleasant Street has been up for lease since House of Pizza left. The corner is not livable and has been brought up many times, there is a tremendous amount of traffic, and it needs improvement from Stanwood Street down. She understands what they are saying about losing structures that have been there for quite some time, but changes that have been made to those buildings affect the architectural value of those properties. NHPC experts also pointed out those changes affect the architectural values of the buildings. If a building does not contribute then it is not looked upon in the same way. Betsy also indicated that she felt that even though they are not what they were, you do not see that from the street.

Kris noted that there has been a lot of attention paid in the newspapers about there perhaps being a police station at that location and also significant opposition, so it is certainly not a foregone conclusion that it is going to be a police station.

Emily noted that if they do not approve the demolitions, BDC can still proceed to find a user or entity to convey the properties to for economic or civic development and then come in with a proposal for demolition and development. Larissa said that would open the time frame of those blighted properties being in ill repair and being a significant liability. If the properties are cleared you have something that can be developed. Larissa noted that the way the BDC is looking at it is they want to improve the property by demolishing. Again, it is a gateway to Brunswick and it would be a disservice to leave blighted properties there indefinitely. With the approval they could look forward to making improvements, grading it and making it an attractive entrance to Brunswick.

DRAFT

Pat Scully said they do have the option under the ordinance section 216.10a to propose a 90 day moratorium which allows some alternatives to be pursued including an opportunity for the applicant to learn what the Board needs for the criteria to be met.

Brooks indicated that he would like to vote on the motion and perhaps considering a 90 day moratorium allowing the applicant to come back with alternate ways for the criteria to be met.

Janet asked if there was any double jeopardy sort of thing, can they vote to deny, can the applicant come back next month and try to persuade the Board on the basis of economic viability. Pat Scully said if they want to go that way he would suggest to deny without prejudice. Pat explained the difference between the 90 day moratorium and denial without prejudice.

The original motion by Brooks Stoddard and seconded by Janet Roberts was amended to deny the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition without prejudice and was approved unanimously.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Review Standards from Section 216.9 of the Town of Brunswick Zoning Ordinance

216.9.A. Buildings and Other Structures

1a) – *To the greatest practical extent, structures that contribute to the character of the Village Review Zone shall remain unaltered. The buildings located at 81 and 85 Pleasant St and 3 Stanwood St contribute to the character of the Village Review Zone. The building located at 1 Pleasant St does not. The Board finds that the buildings at 81 and 85 Pleasant St and 3 Stanwood St would not remain unaltered to the greatest practical if demolition took place. The Board finds the provision of Section 216.9.A.1.a. is not met because the buildings at 81 and 85 Pleasant St and 3 Stanwood contribute to the character of the Village Review Zone and demolition would not result in the structures remaining unaltered to the greatest practical extent.*

1b) – *Any alteration of existing properties shall be compatible with their historic character, as well as with any surrounding properties. The buildings are proposed for demolition and as a result this standard is not applicable. The Board finds the provision of Section 216.9.A.1.b. is not applicable.*

1c) – *New construction shall be compatible with surrounding historic properties. No new construction is proposed. The Board finds the provision of Section 216.0.A.1.c is not applicable.*

1d) *All Certificates of Appropriateness for new construction, alterations or demolition shall be in accordance with applicable requirements of both this Ordinance and the US Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings. The Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition is not applicable to the U.S. Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings. The Board finds the provisions of Section 216.9.A.1.d. are not applicable.*

1e). – *The Village Review Board's application of the US Secretary of Interior's Standards will be in accordance with the Board's Design Guidelines. The Village Review Board's application of the U.S. Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings and the*

DRAFT

Board's Design Guidelines do not apply to the demolition of structures. *The Board finds the provisions of Section 216.9.A.1.e. are not applicable.*

Demolition Standards from Section 216.10 of the Town of Brunswick Zoning Ordinance

C.1) – *The significance of the structure proposed for demolition, as evidenced by its status as listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. None of the structures are listed on the National Register of Historic Places or eligible for listing. The Board finds the provision of Section 216.10.C.1. is satisfied.*

C.2) – *The condition of the structure provided that the applicant has not contributed significantly to the deterioration of the structure. The condition of the structure at 81 Pleasant St supports demolition but the condition of the buildings at 85 Pleasant St, 1 Stanwood St and 3 Stanwood St does not support demolition. The applicant has not contributed to the existing condition of the structures. The Board finds the provision of Section 216.10.C.2 is not satisfied because the condition of the buildings at 85 Pleasant St and 1 and 3 Stanwood St does not support demolition.*

C.3) – *The availability of permitted alternative uses of the structure that would maintain its economic viability. The Board was not presented any evidence that the buildings are not economically viable. The Board finds the provision of Section 216.10.C.3 is not satisfied because it was not presented with any evidence that alternative uses of the structures could maintain their economic viability.*

Other Business – there was no other business.

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Attest:

Joan Edwards
Recording Secretary

Joan Edwards
Recording Secretary