

**BRUNSWICK PLANNING BOARD
APRIL 9, 2013**

MEMBERS PRESENT PLANNING BOARD: Chair Charlie Frizzle, Margaret Wilson, Bill Dana, Dale King, and Richard Visser

MEMBERS PRESENT VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD: Chair Emily Swan, Elizabeth Marr, and Brooks Stoddard (arrived at 7:10)

STAFF PRESENT: Anna Breinich, Jeremy Doxsee

A meeting of the Brunswick Planning Board was held on Tuesday, April 9, 2013 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at Brunswick Station, 16 Station Ave. Vice Chair Margaret Wilson called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

WORKSHOP – The Planning Board and the Village Review Board will hold a joint workshop session to discuss potential amendments to the Town Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 2, Section 216, Village Overlay Zone. This workshop will focus on demolition criteria and standards.

Anna Breinich stated that at the last joint workshop, they discussed review concepts for demolition and stated that from this discussion staff has devised a tiering method for decision making. Anna stated that after looking at best practices from other towns, staff has derived what is presented in the packet. Jeremy Doxsee stated that the tiers will be applicability, class of structure within the Village Review Zone and criteria.

Margaret Wilson stated that the only difference she sees is the 90 day delay period between Contributing and Non-contributing and noted that a time limit does appear in many other town reviews.

In Section 216.B, Classifications of structures within Village Review Zone, Margaret Wilson asked if it includes all the significant structures that they may want included. Charlie Frizzle pointed out that Section 216.B.1.iv, locally designated landmarks on a voluntary basis, will need a requirement so that people are not pulling in and out. Anna Breinich replied that the idea would be similar to the Brunswick Topsham Land Trust easement process; it will need more work. Anna stated that staff will conduct more research and get additional information out to members. Anna stated that staff will need to hire a consultant to research additional contributing vs. non-contributing structures and local landmarks and noted that Brunswick has the top 100 as well. Emily Swan replied, in reference to landmarks on a voluntary basis, that the process could be less than the easement process and suggested possibly a landmark designation. Emily stated that classification B could also include structures that have a cultural or historical significance or are associated with a significant event. Margaret Wilson asked who will determine what is significant or not, staff or the outside consultant. Anna replied that staff will go through the list with the consultant. Anna stated that they have a historical site survey for most significant structures which is in good shape and other contributing structures over 50 years need to be determined. Margaret stated that they need to reference the site surveys. Emily stated that they should have a map that shows the designations. Margaret asked how everyone felt about the 50

year cut off. Charlie Frizzle stated that the cut off seems arbitrary and asked what specifically about that age makes a structure significant. Jeremy Doxsee replied that in order to be eligible for the National Registry, a structure must be over 50.

Emily Swan stated that they need to clarify secondary structures and suggested classifying them separately.

Elizabeth Marr asked if applicability should include relocation. Charlie Frizzle replied that he would be opposed to characterizing relocation as something that should be avoided whenever possible. Margaret Wilson stated that the idea is that demolition is discouraged. Anna Breinich replied that relocation is a last resort to preserve the building.

Richard Visser asked why under the general requirements an applicant must adhere to the 90 day delay period and wonders why it is not listed under the others. Anna Breinich replied that the 90 day delay affects the structures that really count and are the ones that they want to try and preserve. Charlie Frizzle replied that he is torn because he does not care for anything that makes the process more time consuming. Emily Swan replied that she would hate to lose an opportunity to protect a building and noted that Freeport has an extremely broad noticing procedure and would like to see something similar in our ordinance. Margaret Wilson asked if a waiver procedure could be used. Elizabeth Marr asked if it would be beneficial to post a notice in the newspapers. Margaret replied that newspaper advertising is not as effective anymore. Charlie replied that he does not see a problem with making the advertising broader rather than making the procedure lengthier. Anna replied that they don't make an advertising list as things and people can change.

Margaret Wilson opened the meeting to public comment.

Claudia Knox read her prepared suggestions (please refer to file).

Chairman Charlie Frizzle replied to Claudia Knox's statement and stated that he strongly objects to imposing an 18 month notice of intent and pointed out that incentives such as tax relief may cause more problems with people deciding after the 18 months that they do not wish to demolish.

Curt Neufeld from Sitelines stated that he agrees with Charlie Frizzle that imposing an 18 month notice of intention is too long and stated that if an owner thinks they may want to demolish, the earlier you notify the town and committees and people who work with historic structures would be highly appropriate. Curt stated that he would like to see an alternative to the 90 day waiting period and suggested review at the Planning Director level for the second and third levels of criteria. Curt stated that he likes the idea of inventorying the significant structure and setting them into different categories and pointed out that this may be an opportunity to be proactive and reach out to the owners.

Catherine Ferdinand, representative of Bowdoin College, stated that she concurred with Curt Neufeld's statements and added that the 18 month notice of intention is problematic.

Emily Swan stated that she likes the idea of some sort of notice for demolitions for lead time. Emily liked Claudia Knox's suggestion of giving a buyer a historic structure for free, but they bear the cost of relocation; the owner then does not have to pay the cost of demolition. Emily asked if there was an ordinance with similar framework. Jeremy Doxsee stated that staff will research. Charlie Frizzle asked what happens if an owner does not want to contribute to escrow. Brooks Stoddard agreed with Claudia Knox's comments on time and stated that he would like to see the opportunity to work things out.

Non-Contributing Structures

Margaret Wilson reviewed the idea that an applicant does not need to go to the Village Review Board if the building is not in public view and stated that she would not mind if it were broader and included everything. Elizabeth Marr agreed and stated that the people around should be invited to come and state any concerns.

Margaret Wilson pointed out that the Village Review Board will now have the ability to weigh in on finances whereas the Zoning Board of Appeals is the deciding Board in the current ordinance.

Anna Breinich stated that at this time any application that comes in for non-demolition or relocation, the review standards are fairly minimal which has been an issue. Anna stated that one item that Emily Swan asked for was those less impacting projects be handled at the Planning Department level versus major projects which would be approval by the VRB. Anna stated that all they are doing is codifying what they currently do. Margaret Wilson asked how Emily felt about Section C.3.i.1, which states that "No Certificate of Appropriateness is required if the proposed demolition is not visible from the public right-of-way". Margaret stated that she is not convinced that public way should be the only criteria. Emily replied that she understands what Margaret is saying, but stated that it seems to be the standard that they are using. Discussion on how you decide whether tuck-pointing a chimney should be major or minor review; Charlie Frizzle stated that it will depend on who does it and the product. Emily stated that she does not have any issues with it being in minor review.

Richard Visser asked what is meant by "keep intended use" under the Standards for Evaluation in the discussion outline included in the packet. Anna Breinich replied that she would like to know if a building is residential does it stay residential or can it be used for a business and vice versa. Charlie Frizzle stated that this is something that they have discussed several times which is form based planning and in keeping with form based planning he does not think you worry as much about the use and it makes the building more valuable; he suggests not getting into use and Richard agreed. Emily Swan replied that she believes it is better to keep a building as its intended use but does not think it is something they can enshrine in the ordinance and may be counterproductive.

Emily Swan asked about landscaping and pointed out that many of the projects that the VRB reviews do not go to the Planning Board. Anna Breinich replied that our ordinance does allow for traditional landscaping but stated that we shouldn't go down to telling the applicant exactly what they can plant.

Catherine Ferdinand, representative of Bowdoin College, asked if there could be a streamlined process with the requirement to tie a future site plan to the demolition on a major project that also requires review by the Planning Board. Charlie Frizzle replied that this requirement will not only be in demolition but any project that will require major development review; with respect to demolition, Charlie stated that all they will need to bring is a rough sketch of what the applicant plans to do.

Other

No other business.

Minutes

No minutes were approved at this meeting.

Adjourned

This meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

Attest



Tonya D. Jenusaitis
Recording Secretary

