

**VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 23, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Emily Swan, Karen Topp, Vice Chair Brooks Stoddard Gary Massanek, Laura Lienert, Connie Lundquist, and Sande Updegraph

MEMBERS ABSENT: No members were absent.

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich; Bryan Cobb, Town IT Manager

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Wednesday, February 23, 2016 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at 85 Union Street, Council Chambers. Chair Emily Swan called the meeting to order at 5:00 P.M.

Adjustment in the agenda to move item 1 to the bottom of the agenda.

2. Tabled Case # VRB 16-001 – 15 Jordan Avenue – The Board will remove from the table, discuss and take action regarding two Certificates of Appropriateness for the demolition of a portion of an existing commercial structure and the construction of replacement structure at 15 Jordan Avenue (Map U08, Lot 41).

Anna Breinich said that staff has received additional material examples and information as requested at the February 2, 2016 meeting.

Leo Theberge pointed out that, per his application, they wish to demolish only a portion of the existing structure to make way for the new building and then demolish the remaining building. Leo is concerned by the way the agenda item is written. Anna Breinich confirmed that the motion is written for a full demolition. Connie Lundquist asked what color they plan on using. Leo replied that they plan on using soft green on the bottom and a cream yellow in the top. Laura Lienert asked what manufacturer they are using. The contractor replied that they would be using pressured cedar. Brooks Stoddard suggested to avoid using the big shakes in this area. Connie Lundquist pointed out that the applicant has asked for leeway in deciding which shakes to use, but said that she prefers to see what the project will look like before approving it. Connie further clarified this by saying she does want to approve the project and have the applicant go with a style half the cost that looks nothing like the examples presented. The contractor replied that he included a picture with cedar planks and said that they are thinking about the straight edge 5 inch, yellow. Emily asked if the applicant was still preferring to go with the windows with the muntins between the glass. Leo replied that they were planning to go with the muntins between the glass, but if this is an issue, they can go with plain glass, no muntin. The contractor referenced two pictures regarding the difference in the muntins in the windows.

Chair Emily Swan opened the meeting to the public comment period. No comments were made and the comment period was closed.

Gary Massanek asked Emily Swan if she was still concerned with the corner trim. Emily asked if the corner trim would be similar to the trim on a building the applicant refered the Board to on Baribeau Drive. Leo Theberge replied that it would be. The contractor added that the corner board material is composite. Brooks Stoddard asked if the cedar shingles will butt the end board or rabbit the end board. The contractor replied that it would be rabbited. Connie Lundquist said that she is not comfortable with either of the choices the applicant has presented for windows and said that going with the option of no division is not consistent; the internal muntins are not acceptable. Leo replied that there are a few houses on both Jordan Ave and Federal Street that have internal grids. Emily agreed, but said that a house without grids does not fit into the historic character of the neighborhood. Laura Lienert said that she concurs with Connie regarding the windows. Emily asked the Board if they would be comfortable with no muntins; Gary and Laura both replied “no”. Emily asked Board members what they wanted for windows, 6 over 6 or 4 over 4 or 6 over 1. Connie asked if the applicant planned on going with the Craftsman style window included in the packet and Leo replied “yes”. Laura pointed out that in following with new construction in the VRB Guidelines, number 4, they need to match historic window configuration. Emily asked Laura how she wanted the windows matched and Laura replied with muntins and mullions; Craftsman is not consistent. Laura suggested 6 over 6 or 4 over 4. Gary agreed with Laura; true divided or exterior muntins. Laura asked if there was any discussion regarding the dumpsters in the February 2nd meeting and Emily referenced the draft condition pertaining to dumpsters that stated that they will be adequately screened. Laura asked if this meets the required 25 feet away and Anna Breinich replied that this should be adequate; Emily added that by placing the dumpsters in the rear this should not be an issue.

Emily Swan reviewed the conditions proposed and asked Laura Lienert if she had any suggested language regarding the windows. Laura replied that she did not, but pointed out that she does not like the Craftsman windows. Laura reviewed the guideline criteria and Gary replied that he would go with 2 over 2 or 4 over 4, but that he agrees that the craftsman style does not go with the neighborhood. Gary proposed that the 3rd condition be that the windows be 2 over 2 or 4 over 4 with divided light or external muntins. Laura agreed with Gary’s configuration. Leo replied that a majority of the windows in the neighborhood are 2 over 2 or 1 over 1.

In terms of the clapboard, Brooks Stoddard said that he prefer that it butts the corner and is grouted, not rabbited. The contractor replied that the proposed materials would go in and behind the corner boards. Gary referenced page 65 of the brochure provided by the applicant and said that the corner is fluted but there is a corner that you can see a section. Emily said that if the look is similar to the look the applicant referred to on Baribeau Drive she is comfortable. Gary Massanek agreed with Emily.

Emily Swan again asked for suggested language for a condition regarding the windows. Gary Massanek said he would be comfortable with 2 over 1, simple cottage style, divided

lights. Laura Lienert said a 2 over 2 or 4 over 4 would be fine as well. Leo Theberge replied that if the Board does not like the idea of internal grids, he would be willing to go 1 over 1 and again pointed out that these are found in the neighborhood. Leo said that he was under the belief that the Board was not supposed to go with a monochrome design for the neighborhood and if the Board does not want to see internal grids, he will not use grids at all. Emily replied that she understands, but pointed out that there are building changes that were not before the VRB. Anna Breinich reviewed the proposed language for the addition of condition number 3.

MOTION BY GARY MASSANEK THAT THE CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS JOINT APPLICATION IS DEEMED COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY GARY MASSANEK THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR DEMOLITION OF STRUCTURES LOCATED AT 15 JORDAN AVENUE AS OUTLINED IN THE APPLICATION WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

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.

MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW COMMERCIAL STRUCTURE AT 15 JORDAN AVENUE AS OUTLINED IN THE APPLICATION 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 windows have exterior grilles or divided lights of two over two, two over one, or four over four.

3. That any mechanical equipment and dumpsters be located to the rear of the property with adequate screening to be determined during development review.

MOTION SECONDED BY LAURA LIENERT, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Leo Theberge reiterated that he did not want external grids and again said that internal grids are found in the neighborhood. Emily Swan replied that he will need to discuss this with his contractor and that the Board has voted on what they want to see. Leo expressed that this decision is encouraging a mono-culture. Leo added that there are 2 houses, closer to Federal Street that were both just resided with cheap vinyl. Connie Lundquist replied that if the houses are within the VRB Zone, they should have been before the Board and that staff will look into this and appropriate action will need to be taken if they did not come before the Board.

3. Case # VRB 16-003 – 14 Maine Street (Fort Andross) - The Board will discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness for the tower placement of a broadband antenna and related equipment at 14 Maine Street (Map U14, Lot 148).

Anna Breinich introduced the application for the installation of a broadband antenna on top of Fort Andross. Anna said that this is similar to what was proposed in the early 2000's that was going to be camouflaged by the flagpole.

Gary Massanek stated that he understands the use of the tower, but asked the applicant representative why they haven't chosen a back corner instead of placing it front and center. Cam Kilton of Redzone Wireless replied that there would be no way to camouflage and that elevation is key. Benjamin Madden, of Tilson added that there is also an attachment issue and the antenna would have to sit on the roof. Emily Swan asked if the antenna would be attached to the parapet and Benjamin replied "yes". Emily asked what the issue is with the previously approved application. Cam replied that there were two types of mounts that they could use. He said that the sled mount may not be structurally sound given the age of the building as the type of antenna they would be using would require more weight. The mount they have chosen, a single mass mount, would require less weight to be placed on the mount and would be able to handle the wind load. Emily clarified this by saying that this mount would be the less intrusive of the two mounts. Cam added that they can also better camouflage the single mass mount. Connie Lundquist asked how they would camouflage the antenna. Cam replied that they have vinyl brick that can go over it, it can be painted or they place a white dome over the antennas. Cam said that each antenna is about 18 inches wide by 5 feet tall. Laura Lienert asked if they have had a structural survey done and Cam replied that the company, Omnipoint, has stated based on the wind load and the age of the building, the single mass mount would be a better choice. Cam said that they can go with either mount, they are just trying to be cautious. Karen Topp asked if you would see the top of the antenna if you were looking up from the parking lot depending the angle. Ben replied "probably not, but definitely from Maine Street". Karen asked if the extra 10 feet was that important and why they couldn't shrink the antenna down to fit on the tower with

similar reception. Cam replied that the higher you go the less you run into other obstructions: the height is key, but ideally 10 feet is the typical standard pole.

Emily Swan asked what the status is with regards to MHPC procedure. Anna Breinich replied that the applicant needs to consult with MHPC as it isn't very clear as to whether this consultation with MHPC needs to occur before or after VRB approval. Anna added that there was another application that MHPC did approve of aside from the previously approved sled antenna. Anna said she does not know if this would be the same response, and noted that in 2000 there was an internal Staff Review of the flag pole and Waterfront Maine was involved in this process. Gary Massanek again asked how big the dome would be compared to the flag pole. Laura Lienert replied that the previously approved flag pole antenna was roughly 6 inches in diameter and 4 feet tall; much smaller. Cam Kilton replied that the previously approved size would be too small. In reply to Gary's question, the dome would be roughly 2 feet to 32 inches. Sandy Updegraph clarified that the applicant plans to camouflage the proposed antenna. Emily said that she sympathizes with the applicant, but she wonders whether they need to worry so much about the camouflaging of the support given the area that it will be located on the building. Laura Lienert replied that she does not agree with Emily, but would like to know how much flexibility they have with height and depth. Gary agrees with Laura and said he would like to see a rendering of what the pole and dome would look like. Connie Lundquist said she too would like to see what the dome would look like and any other pictures of similar projects. Cam replied that he can provide some pictures, but noted that there may not be many example within driving distance from Maine. Karen asked if they have looked into internal routers. Cam replied that they are not only providing Fort Andross with internet, but the Town of Brunswick and some of Topsham as well.

Chair Emily Swan noted that there were no members of the public present.

Karen Topp asked if this antenna was not just for the building, but a data tower. Cam Kilton replied that she was correct. Brooks Stoddard said that other Towns have been dealing with similar issues and asked the applicant if they have looked into hiding the antennas in the steeples of churches or tower. Cam replied that the antenna would not penetrate or receive through brick if placed in a steeple. Bryan Cobb, IT Manager for the Town of Brunswick, said that he does get requestS frequently from residents for other competitive broadband providers and has met the owner of Red Zone and is very excited for the opportunity to have them serve Brunswick. Bryan's concern is that if they reduce the tower in height that it won't serve as many potential customers / residents. Laura Lienert asked where the other towers are in Brunswick and Bryan replied that this would be the only wireless broadband in Town; there are no other propositions. In terms of the MHPC, Emily pointed out that the Board could approve one type and then MHPC could not agree. Emily asked Anna for direction and Anna replied that MHPC has 30 days to render a decision and that the applicant still needs to submit a proposal to them.

**MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO TABLE THE APPLICATION
PENDING MORE VISUAL EXAMPLES OF THE CONTAINMENT
STRUCTURE AND MATERIALS OF SIMILAR STRUCTURES BY THE**

APPLICANT. MOTION SECONDED BY GARY MASSANEK, MOVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Adjustment: 1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

MOTION BY EMILY SWAN TO NOMINATE GARY MASSANEK TO CHAIR OF THE VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD. MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY GARY MASSANEK TO NOMINATE CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO VICE CHAIR OF THE VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD. MOTION SECONDED BY SANDY UPDEGRAPH, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Other Business: no other business.

5. Approval of Minutes

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 15, 2015. MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY AMONG THOSE PRESENT.

6. Next Meeting Date – time to be determined.

Staff Approvals:

- 16 Union Street – Solar Panels

Adjourn

This meeting was adjourned at 6:24 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,



Tonya Jenusaitis,
Recording Secretary