

**VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD  
NOVEMBER 17, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Emily Swan, Vice Chair Brooks Stoddard, Gary Massanek, Connie Lundquist, and Sande Updegraph

**STAFF PRESENT:** Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Thursday, November 17, 2015 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at 85 Union Street, Council Chambers. Chair Emily Swan called the meeting to order at 7:15 P.M.

**1. Case # VRB 15-037 – 37 Mill Street** – The Board will discuss and take action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a second story emergency access on the front of the structure and complete associated window alterations. (Map U14, Lot 85).

Anna Breinich introduced the application for construction of a second story egress on the Mill Street side of the structure. Anna said that this egress is to be in compliance with Life Safety Codes. Anna said that she researched this location to see what was said when the previous addition was constructed and learned that this was not within the Village Review Zone until the last Zoning Ordinance amendment; this is one of the oldest houses in Town, but it has been altered greatly.

Mike Anderson, representing the applicant, reiterated that the egress is for Life Safety and said that they are proposing to take out a window and replace it with a door. Connie Lundquist asked why the egress could not go on the opposite side. Mike replied that way that the stairs are inside, the only place the egress could go is towards the front of the opposite side and this would be going into the structural part where the dormer is to the roofline of the cape; the way the building is built, the dormer is the structural support for the cape portion. Mike passed around the second-story floor plan for review and alternate location. The applicant and the Board reviewed the back of the building as a possibility. Emily Swan clarified that the reason, aside from the dormer support, that they do not want to go on the opposite side of the building is because of electrical wires. Mike replied yes and added that they also do not know if the other wall is a support wall. Mike pointed out that the side being proposed is also centrally located and if the egress is located on the opposite side, the egress will be more difficult to get to. Anna Breinich asked if the Fire Marshall's Office had chosen a location. Mike replied that they did not, but that the proposed location was the preferred choice. Connie said that her biggest concern that this structure is located in the Village Review Zone and it is located in a place that almost everyone driving into Brunswick will have to drive by. Connie is aware that there have been a lot of additions, but pointed out that the original structure can still be seen. Connie asked how much it would cost to add structural support. Mike replied that he has not looked into the cost, but that it would definitely go into the triple digits. Connie asked why the egress could not go on the same window being proposed on the

opposite side and Emily replied that this would not be centrally located. Brooks Stoddard stated that this is difficult because it seems as the only solution is locating the egress on the main façade. Connie suggested eliminating the back two closets. Mike replied that he runs into head height coming out because the roofline has changed. By going out the gable end, Mike has the ability to raise the window height to the appropriate height. Gary Massanek suggested tabling the application pending site walk.

Chair Emily Swan opened the meeting to public comment, no public comment was made and the public comment period was closed.

**MOTION BY GARY MASSANEK THAT THE APPLICATION BE TABLED PENDING SITE REVIEW. MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**2. Case # VRB 15-041 – 82 Pleasant Street** – The Board will discuss and take action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace existing asphalt roofing with metal roofing. (Map U15, Lot 54).

Anna Breinich introduced the application to replace existing asphalt roofing.

The applicant, David Gleason, stated that the building was built in 1877 as a school and was retrofitted in the mid 1980's as an office building and is now in need of a new roof covering. David said that the proposed roof is the same material and color as on the Curtis Memorial Library. Gary Massanek asked what the original material was and if there was ever a new roof put on. David replied that he could research this, but he does not believe a new roof was ever put on and that he would be surprised if it were metal. Emily Swan pointed out the Design Guidelines suggest not changing the type of material unless it is to return to the original material. David replied that he feels this material would be appropriate and stated that metal is used elsewhere in Brunswick. Anna Breinich pointed out that the Design Guidelines are only guidelines. Connie Lundquist replied that if the Board does not follow the guidelines, when there is a provision precisely on point, then she is not sure what the public should expect from the Board. Connie said that the guidelines are important and does not see any reason why the applicant should go with metal roofing instead of asphalt. Gary Massanek asked if the applicant ever considered slate as this would go well. David replied that he has not, but pointed out that slate wouldn't follow the guidelines either because it would be a different material than the original roofing material.

Chair Emily Swan opened the meeting to public comment, no public comment was made and the public comment period was closed.

Gary Massanek agrees with Connie Lundquist that the guidelines are very specific. Gary said that placing a green metal roof on this building would be wrong and after having done some research, asphalt gray is what should be on this building. Gary said that this building is one of the most important architectural buildings in Town and that it is the architectural gateway telling those driving from the south that you are entering an

interesting Town. Gary said he would support gray asphalt shingles or synthetic slate shingles. Connie agreed with Gary and said that she could not vote for a metal roof unless it was the original material. Sande Updegraph agrees with Connie in that the Board follow the guidelines and absent for the historical documentation, she thinks it would be unwise to change the material from what is existing. Emily Swan said that she agrees with the other Board members. Emily asked if the other Board members would be willing to go with a synthetic slate material if the applicant finds that it was originally slate. Connie said she would go with a synthetic slate material if the documentation was provided pending that she could see the synthetic first.

**MOTION BY GARY MASSANEK THAT THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS IS DEEMED COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, APPROVE UNANIMOUSLY.**

**MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR ROOFING MATERIAL REPLACEMENT AT 82 PLEASANT STREET WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the Board's review and approval does hereby refer to these findings of fact, the plans and materials submitted by the applicant and the written and oral comments of the applicant, his representatives, reviewing officials, and members of the public as reflected in the public record. Any changes to the approved plan not called for in these conditions of approval or otherwise approved by the Director of Planning and Development as a minor modification, shall require further review and approval in accordance with the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance.
2. That the replacement roofing material be the same as presently existing (asphalt) or, if different, the same as the original roofing material as historically documented by the applicant and approved by the Director of Planning and Development.

**MOTION SECONDED BY SANDE UPDEGRAPH, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**3. Case # VRB 15-027 – 4 Franklin Street** – The Board will discuss and take action regarding a joint Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a garage and studio addition to an existing residential structure and the demolition of an attached barn. (Map U08, Lot 15).

Anna Breinich introduced the application for demolition of attached garage and to construct a garage and apartment as well as replacement of all the windows.

Applicant representative, David Matero, said that they have a Greek revival house that is in need of updating and modernization, and noted that there are some disability issues. David said that in the interior they are adding first floor living, master bedroom suite as well as updated kitchen and living area. Because of the disability issues, they propose adding a garage to the west of the building to help with arriving in cover to get inside the building; the garage and first floor will be at the same level. David said that they propose removing an old attached shed to bring back the gable. Gary reviewed the exterior massing and said that they are attempting to keep the garage in similar design to the house. The applicant is proposing to replace the windows with clad wood, 2 over 2, with simulated divided lights and interior/exterior muntins. The cedar clapboard will be painted to match the house. On the back, they propose adding a door to one side. David said that the goal on the exterior is to match the garage to the existing house. Gary Massenek asked if the addition will be differentiated in any way from the existing structure in appearance. David replied not in siding, not in windows and not in scale. Brooks Stoddard asked if materials will be the same and David replied that on the trim they are hoping to use Boral and they are hoping to insulate from the inside so that they do not have to take off the siding. Emily Swan asked if they had looked into retaining or repairing the windows. Liz Nies, resident, stated that she took the class in Boston on restoring old windows and she said that it is very labor intensive, time consuming and with the cost of fuel these days, they would like to have energy efficient windows. David pointed out that there 3 different types of windows in the house currently, and they are trying to synchronize this. Liz noted that the 6 x 6 windows are replacements and those that are not 6 x 6 are 2 x 2 that have not been re-glazed for over 30 years. Emily asked if there are any original windows and Liz replied that there may be 1 that they moved, but it was added to the addition and not the original house. Connie Lundquist asked what the new windows will be constructed of. David replied that they will be wood with clad and either aluminum or fiberglass with simulated divided light on both sides. Connie clarified that the shed being removed is around the back.

Chair Emily Swan opened the meeting to public comment.

**Jane Millet, neighbor,** said that she appreciates that they are attempting to restructure for the elderly, but asked that the Board look at the elevations (mass and scale) as she feels that this is a huge addition to the property. Jane said that this will add about 600 sq. ft. to the living space and pointed out that most of the garages in the neighborhood are single car garages, 1-story high. Jane asked the Board to consider what is normally in the neighborhood.

Ruth Nies, applicant stated that they are removing a 2-story shed that is next to Jane Millet's driveway. Ruth added that the garage is a 1 car garage.

David Matero reviewed the abutting house locations per Connie Lundquist's request. Gary Massenek asked where the applicant was concerning their variance request. Anna Breinich replied that the application is scheduled to be heard by the Zoning board of appeals on December 3<sup>rd</sup>. Gary replied that he is sensitive to the size of the structure and noted that the guidelines state that it is important to differentiate between the addition and

the original structure; Gary said that he does not see the differentiation and is not bothered by this because it is a sensitive design. Emily Swan agreed with Gary and said that she feels the new construction is enough differentiation for her. Emily said that she would like to see the windows refinished, but knows that they are not original. Sande Updegraph said that she favors the idea of standardizing the windows. Connie Lundquist said that she agrees with the other members of the Board and that she feels this design meets the guidelines.

**MOTION BY GARY MASSANEK THAT THE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION IS DEEMED COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY BROOKS STODDARD, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**MOTION BY SANDE UPDEGRAPH THAT THE BOARD APPROVES TWO CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE: 1) DEMOLITION OF THE REAR ATTACHED SHED STRUCTURE AT 4 FRANKLIN STREET; AND 2) CONSTRUCTION OF A 2-STORY ATTACHED GARAGE ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE STRUCTURE AND REPLACEMENT OF ALL WINDOWS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. That the Board's review and approval does hereby refer to these findings of fact, the plans and materials submitted by the applicant and the written and oral comments of the applicant, his representatives, reviewing officials, and members of the public as reflected in the public record. Any changes to the approved plan not called for in these conditions of approval or otherwise approved by the Director of Planning and Development as a minor modification, shall require further review and approval in accordance with the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance.
2. That the construction of the 2-story attached garage, as located on the site plan contained in the application, is conditioned on the granting of a setback variance for a single-family dwelling by the Brunswick Zoning Board of Appeals.

**MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

4. Approval of Minutes

**MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO APPROVE THE AMENDED MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2015. MOTION SECONDED BY GARY MASSANEK, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY AMONG THOSE PRESENT.**

**Staff Approvals:**

- 137 Maine Street – Signage
- 90 Maine Street – Rear Egress
- 149 Maine Street - Signage

**Adjourn**

This meeting was adjourned at 8:19 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Tonya Jenusaitis". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Tonya Jenusaitis,  
Recording Secretary