Anna Breinich

From: Greg Paxton <greg@mainepreservation.org>
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2016 1:45 PM
To: Anna Breinich
Subject: 15 Bath Road

Anne

I am writing in response to your telephone call relaying the desire of one of the members of the Village Review Board for clarification of the end of Maine Preservation's letter concerning 15 Bath Road.

Our mission is: *Maine Preservation promotes and preserves historic places, buildings, downtowns and neighborhoods, strengthening the cultural and economic vitality of Maine communities*. We work with a small staff throughout the state of Maine.

This is an early building built at or just after the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century. We encourage and support owners of historic buildings to find feasible means to retain and reuse historic buildings, especially buildings of this vintage. And we have an excellent track record of success. We never encourage demolition, but we also recognize that we cannot save everything.

Maine Historic Preservation Commission has noted some specific significant features of the house. Because of the unsanitary state of the house well documented by several who have visited the site, and because we have not been able to visit this house and do not anticipate doing so prior to your final deliberations, we do not know about the reusability of the house as a whole or of any of its parts. We hope, consistent with our mission, that someone will come forward to preserve the house as a whole. Failing that, perhaps some of its parts could be preserved, although in our field, parts are a very small consolation and it is very difficult to find an appropriate place to reuse them. So in light of these circumstances we expressed the hope that Bowdoin College will take note of the significant features enumerated by Maine Historic Preservation Commission and do what may be possible.

Best wishes,

Greg

Greg Paxton
Executive Director
Maine Preservation
233 West Main Street
Yarmouth, Maine 04096
(207) 847-3577 (o)
(207) 232-5995 (c)
www.mainepreservation.org

Bowdoin

August 17, 2016

Planning Board
Town of Brunswick
85 Union Street
Brunswick, Maine 04011

Re: 15 Bath Road, Brunswick, Maine

Dear Planning Board Members:

I am writing to inform you that Bowdoin College purchased a property at 15 Bath Road in May of this year that was in significant disrepair at the time of purchase. The property is located within the boundaries of the Federal Street Historic District and within the boundaries of the Village Review Zone. In July the College applied to the Village Review Board for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to demolish the structure.

Listed as the Aaron Dunning House in the Federal Street National Register of Historic Places Inventory – Nomination Form, it is described as a Transitional Federal/Greek Revival style house built c. 1828-1846. The Federal Street Historic District was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1976.

Since the purchase, Bowdoin has engaged consulting firms to evaluate the environmental and structural conditions of the building. These reports find that the condition of the structure is such that it will not be economically feasible for the College to bring the building to a habitable condition. The College intends to demolish the structures and landscape the property – retaining shade trees, leveling the building sites, loaming, seeding, and mulching the area. The College has no plans to build on the site at this time. The property will provide green space between two adjacent campus buildings.

Under the requirements of the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance, prior to any issuance of a COA for demolition, the College must consult with Maine Preservation or the Maine Historic Preservation Commission "in seeking alternatives to demolition, including the reuse and/or relocation of the resource." Additionally, the College must provide notice to the Town Council, the Planning Board, and the Pejepscot Historical Society of our plans to demolish the structures should no alternative to demolition be found *(Brunswick Zoning Ordinance Section 216.8.B.2.c.(1)(b)ii.1and 3)*.

TREASURER'S OFFICE
Bowdoin College 5600 College Station, Brunswick, ME 04011-8447 207.725.3242 Fax 207.721.5161

While we are not certain that the structure can be relocated, if anyone knows of parties interested in this type of building, please forward the contact information to cferdina@bowdoin.edu. The College is advertising the availability of the building for relocation in *The Times Record* and the *Portland Press Herald* and has posted a sign on the property.

Sincerely,

Del Wilson
Director of Finance & Campus Services

Cc: Anna Breinich
Catherine Ferdinand

Bowdoin

August 17, 2016

Town Council
Town of Brunswick
85 Union Street
Brunswick, Maine 04011

Re: 15 Bath Road, Brunswick, Maine

Dear Council Members:

I am writing to inform you that Bowdoin College purchased a property at 15 Bath Road in May of this year that was in significant disrepair at the time of purchase. The property is located within the boundaries of the Federal Street Historic District and within the boundaries of the Village Review Zone. In July the College applied to the Village Review Board for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) to demolish the structure.

Listed as the Aaron Dunning House in the Federal Street National Register of Historic Places Inventory – Nomination Form, it is described as a Transitional Federal/Greek Revival style house built c. 1828-1846. The Federal Street Historic District was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1976.

Since the purchase, Bowdoin has engaged consulting firms to evaluate the environmental and structural conditions of the building. These reports find that the condition of the structure is such that it will not be economically feasible for the College to bring the building to a habitable condition. The College intends to demolish the structures and landscape the property – retaining shade trees, leveling the building sites, loaming, seeding, and mulching the area. The College has no plans to build on the site at this time. The property will provide green space between two adjacent campus buildings.

Under the requirements of the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance, prior to any issuance of a COA for demolition, the College must consult with Maine Preservation or the Maine Historic Preservation Commission "in seeking alternatives to demolition, including the reuse and/or relocation of the resource." Additionally, the College must provide notice to the Town Council, the Planning Board, and the Pejepscot Historical Society of our plans to demolish the structures should no alternative to demolition be found *(Brunswick Zoning Ordinance Section 216.8.B.2.c.(1)(b)ii.1and 3)*.

TREASURER'S OFFICE
Bowdoin College 5600 College Station, Brunswick, ME 04011-8447 207.725.3242 Fax 207.721.5161

While we are not certain that the structure can be relocated, if anyone knows of parties interested in this type of building, please forward the contact information to cferdina@bowdoin.edu. The College is advertising the availability of the building for relocation in *The Times Record* and the *Portland Press Herald* and has posted a sign on the property.

Sincerely,

Del Wilson
Director of Finance & Campus Services

Cc: Anna Breinich
Catherine Ferdinand

TREASURER'S OFFICE
Bowdoin College 5600 College Station, Brunswick, ME 04011-8447 207.725.3242 Fax 207.721.5161

VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
MAY 24, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Gary Massanek, Brooks Stoddard, Karen Topp, and Annee Tara

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Connie Lundquist, Laura Lienert and Emily Swan,

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Tuesday, May 24, 2016 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at 85 Union Street, Council Chambers. Chair Gary Massanek called the meeting to order at 7:15 P.M.

1. **Tabled Case # VRB 16-003 – 14 Maine Street (Fort Andross) – The Board will remove from the table, 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).**

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA TO REMOVE TABLED CASE #VRB 16-003, 14 MAINE STREET TO TAKE ACTION ON AND DISCUSS FURTHER. MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP, MOVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Anna Breinich updated Board members and said that she has heard back from Maine Historic Preservation Commission (MHPC) as stated in her Memo to the Board. MCPH has concluded that the placement of the antenna in the west tower would have an adverse effect upon the property and even though Fort Andross is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places, it has been determined to be eligible and therefore the FCC agreement for colocation for facilities on historic structures still applies. Anna said that she did speak with Robin Reed (of MHPC) to get direction and Robin said that the VRB can take action one way or the other. Anna said that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is supposed to consult with MHPC and the purpose of this is to seek ways to avoid the adverse effect on the structure. Gary asked if they had a timeline on the feedback from the FCC. Anna said that there she was told that there is no timeline at this point.

Gary Massanek asked Board members if they wished to discuss the issue or retable pending more information. Annee Tara suggested allowing the applicant to decide.

The applicant, Cam Kilton of Redzone Wireless, said that typically anything to do with the FCC takes roughly 9-12 months. Cam pointed out that the proposed antenna is 3 feet smaller and about 3 inches narrower than the initial antenna; they are trying to mitigate any possible eyesore. Cam said that the renditions included in the packet do not give the antenna justice. He has spoken with Anthony Gotti of 14 Mane Street who could only see the top 1.5 feet of the original antenna from Cabot Street. A better representation is the

view from the Sea Dog Parking Lot in Topsham, although Cam pointed out that the scale is not completely accurate. Cam said that the proposed antenna will be about 1 foot above the tower line and showed the Board an example of the panel that would encase the antenna. Cam said that they have done just about everything to limit the visual effect and have looked into other locations; they will continue to do what they need to in order to make this happen. Cam said that what is interesting is that the FCC rule only applies to licensed frequencies. If they came before the Board with an unlicensed frequency, the antenna of which is twice as big, there are no Federal regulations that they can't do this type of installation.

Annee Tara asked if the applicant has gone back to MHPC with the new design. Cam replied that they have, but he has heard from others who say that MHPC never approves any applications. Brooks Stoddard said that he is impressed that they have gone to the efforts that they have gone through in order to make this work and if the second photograph is at all accurate, this has minimal visual effect. Cam replied that the picture Brooks is referring to is, in his opinion, is the worst; Brooks feeling that this is minimal makes him happy. Cam added that he believes once everything is up against the pipe, people won't see it. Brooks replied that Boards similar to the VRB will have to take into consideration new kinds of technology and it behooves them to put in all the care that they can. Cam said that in his mind, MHPC has worded their conclusion in such a way to say that overall, the decision is a local decision and appreciates any comments. Cam reiterated that they are trying to minimize any visual impact.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment. Hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

Karen Topp asked what the size of the Fort Andross tower was. Cam Kilton replied that he believes that it is 20 * 20 feet. Annee Tara stated that she felt any decision regarding the application should wait until the absent members can be present as they were included in the original discussions. Gary Massanek said that he is inclined to move forward with the action as the applicant has stated that they have done as much as they can to minimize the visual impact. Karen replied that she could go either way in terms of making a decision or tabling the application again. Anna Breinich suggested the Board do a site visit with a mock up on the roof. Gary said that he feels as though this project is going to become an eye grabber and that people are going to see this building as a communication tower. He does not know if that maintains the historic integrity of the building; at this point, he cannot support this. In defense of the visual aspect, Cam Kilton replied that the first thing he sees when he comes into Town is the flagpole and he does not feel that eyes will wander too much farther than the flagpole. Cam offered to temporarily install a mockup of the antenna. Cam said that the reason why they are striving for a location at Fort Andross is because other companies are already occupying other potential alternative locations and have no space; these were discussed in previous meetings. Karen asked about the water tower in Topsham. Cam replied that the water tower sits in a poor location, but if they were allowed to extend the antenna 30 – 40 more feet he may consider it. Gary said that installing the antenna on Fort Andross would "deface the most prominent, historic building in Town because it happens to be the tallest". Cam replied

that Fort Andross is not the tallest, but that Bowdoin College will not work with them (Coles Tower). Cam asked if the Board would suggest other locations where they could place the antennas if they stayed at Fort Andross. Gary said that although it would be a cost issue, they could build a tower. Cam replied that it was his belief that the tower ordinance was fairly strict. Anna replied that there are 2 different types of tower standards; very large towers are done by overlay zones and the smaller type, usually shorter, are allowed in any industrial district. Anna said that the shorter types of towers are around 120 feet and the taller ones are around 300 feet. Cam said that towers are expensive structures, and again asked if the board would suggest other alternative locations on Fort Andross as they are willing to consider other locations. Cam passed around another alternative rendering which has 3 ballasts in the middle of the roof where they can still accomplish their goal with shorter antennas. Cam said that the exact locations still need to be determined as the Board just allowed the installation of solar panels in the area, but asked if this idea would be a better alternative. Gary replied that this idea would be an avenue to follow, but that it would still be worthwhile to mock something up for the Board to review. Cam said that he has no problems with generating a mock up, but stated that he would still like a site visit with an example on the roof. Karen said that what would be important for visibility is how close the antenna are to the edge; if they were 7 feet tall then they would need to be roughly 70 feet in, but she would need the dimensions of the roof. Karen added that this scenario seems like a better alternative. Returning back to the water tower, Karen said that because of the shadowing, it would cut off broadcasting to the north and asked if they wanted to broadcast that way (north). Cam replied that they want to broadcast 360 degrees and they are trying to reach the towers over on the Topsham Fairgrounds as well; they have just submitted an application for that this week.

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA TO TABLE THE APPLICATION PENDING A MOCK UP OF BOTH ANTENNA LOCATIONS AND A SITE WALK. MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Anna Breinich to set up a date and time for a site visit.

2. Case # VRB 16-019 – 26 Cumberland Street (former Skolfield House) – The Board will discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed buildings renovations and the construction of a 10-bay garage over existing parking spaces at 26 Cumberland Street (Map U14, Lot 63).

Anna Breinich introduced the application for reuse of the former Skofield House into the McLellan. The proposal is for 5 full apartments and 13 senior living units which would include meals as part of the monthly fee. Anna said that as it stands right now, there are exterior alterations as noted as well the construction of a 10 bay garage over the existing parking area. This application still needs to go before Planning Board and this has been scheduled for May 31, 2016.

The applicant representative, Dick Campbell, said that it is exciting to come upon buildings that they can reclaim and reuse. Dick said that the building was built in the

1880's as the Skofield House and then rebuilt into a fairly generic brick split face building with some Native American design to it. Dick said that Amy McLellan, registered nurse and owner of the building, has been working with CEI to put together a business plan that has been accepted by the bank. Dick said that it is Amy's mission for a purpose driven life for seniors; this is a different approach to senior living. Dick said that they are proposing minor changes to the building and that the changes they wish to make would make the building warmer. Alterations include things such as window boxes and to warm up the brick with forest green shutters with and to paint some of the trim on the top of the building and some of the metals above the brick forest green as well. Dick said that they would like, at some point, to pull some of the detail from the building on the east corner of Cumberland and union into the canopy on the Union Street entrance; this will also help to pull the two corners together. In terms of the garage, they prefer a simple design. Materials will be clapboard with corner columns and a little border over the single window with carriage type doors.

Karen Topp said that it looks lovely. Gary Massanek asked about the line of trees in the back of the garage. Dick replied that they are hoping not remove the trees and are working with the Town to do a dry well. They are removing 1/3 of the surface water from the parking area and retaining it onsite. Brooks Stoddard commended the applicant on working on the design of this building and said it would be nice to get some Italianate, double bracket design of the original 1880's cornice put back on the building. Brooks said that this cornice design was on the hospital. Annee Tara asked if the Skofield house looked different than the building did when it was the hospital. Brooks replied that the hospital had an Italianate design, wooden, and was demolished; the Skofield house was constructed in its place. Karen said that the applicant has 2 proposed shutters and asked which one is preferred. Dick replied that they prefer the panel shutters, but could go with either. Karen asked what the neighboring houses have for shutters. Dick replied that he did not know, but said that they plan to do more of a design on the window boxes.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment. Hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

Annee Tara said that she is excited that this building is going to be repurposed for this type of living. Karen Topp said she thinks this is a great idea. Gary Massanek appreciates the drawings that were included in the packet.

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA TO DEEM THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY KAREN TOPP THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR PROPOSED BUILDINGS RENOVATIONS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 10-BAY GARAGE OVER EXISTING PARKING SPACES AT 26 CUMBERLAND STREET 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 BROOKS STODDARD.

Annee Tara asked if the applicant planned to put trees in between the parking lot and Cumberland Street as suggested by Town staff. Dick Campbell replied that they prefer not to so that you can see the architecture of the building. Anna Breinich replied that it is a requirement to landscape the parking lot to screen the cars. Anna said that this requirement can be seen this on the CEI building and if you walk down Federal Street you will not see a car up against the sidewalk, but landscaping in between. Anna said that Morning Glory, because of snow removal, are using planters. Gary Massanek said that in looking at the site plan, he feels that there is very limited space to do this type of screening. Dick said that from the sidewalk, it is close to 50 feet to the parking lot and even then it is a handicapped spot that will probably not be used full-time. Gary said that they could defer this issue to the Planning Board.

MOTION MOVED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Other Business: Annee Tara asked about scheduling the workshop that has been discussed at past meetings. Gary Massanek suggested that they send out the list of topics again and get staff opinion of things that they would be able to provide some background on.

4. Approval of Minutes:

MOTION KAREN TOPP TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 23, 2016 MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED. MOTION SECONDED BY BROOKS STODDARD, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY AMONG THOSE PRESENT.

5. Next Meeting Date – 6/21/16

Staff Approvals:

- 100 Maine Street – Signage (Nest)
- 21 Town Hall Place – Garage Doors

Adjourn
This meeting was adjourned at 7:44 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted

Tonya Jenusaitis,
Recording Secretary

VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
JUNE 21, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Gary Massanek, Vice Chair Connie Lundquist, Laura Lienert, Karen Topp, and Annee Tara

MEMBERS ABSENT: Emily Swan and Brooks Stoddard

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich; Bowdoin Intern, Amanda Perkins

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Tuesday, June 21, 2016 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at 85 Union Street, Council Chambers. Chair Gary Massanek called the meeting to order at 7:15 P.M.

1. Tabled Case # VRB 16-003 – 14 Maine Street (Fort Andross) – The Board will remove from the table, 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).

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA TO REMOVE TABLED CASE #VRB 16-003, 14 MAINE STREET TO TAKE ACTION ON AND DISCUSS FURTHER. MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, MOVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Anna Breinich updated Board members and said that the revised location was approved by Maine Historical Preservation Commission (MHPC) who stated that there would be no adverse effect on any historic properties by approval of the proposed application. Anna said that the location is MHPC is referring to is similar to where the antenna was held during the site visit when members were standing on Mill Street and were looking at the west tower. Anna said that the proposed antenna would be 5 feet and the Board needs to decide whether they want 3 different locations or if the Board prefers that all 3 antennas are located in one spot. Anna said that the weight of the equipment will be significant and the cabinet will be located towards the river side; a photo from Redzone depicting this equipment is available. Anna said that although the applicant has approval, by MHPC, the VRB has the ultimate decision.

The applicant, Cameron Kilton, said that he feels like they are where they want to be and said he would be happy to answer any questions that the Board may have. Gary Massanek asked Cameron to describe the equipment cabinet as this is new to the Board. Cameron replied that originally, the cabinet was going to be bolted to the west tower, but now it will be free standing on the roof with no attachment to the brick; this satisfied MHPC. Cameron said that there is very little likelihood that you will be able to see the cabinet. In referring to the photo simulation, Annee Tara asked if the structure that sticks out is new or if it is an existing structure. Gary replied that he believes that this is the tower.

Gary opened the meeting to public comment. Hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

Laura Lienert asked if there was discussion regarding one location vs three at the site walk as she had to leave early. Gary Massanek replied that there was not any discussion of consolidation, but of the two other locations, members were having the issue of being able to see the antenna. Connie Lundquist agreed with Gary and said that her assumption is that if you cannot see one, then you will not be able to see 3 and would be in favor of consolidating all 3 at this location.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION IS DEEMED COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY ANNEE TARA, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Members discussed and proposed changes to the Conditions of Approval.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR INSTALLATION OF A BROADBAND TOWER AND RELATED EQUIPMENT ON THE ROOFTOP OF FORT ANDROSS 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 rooftop wireless antenna system shall be installed 20 feet to the west of the West Tower at the exact center of the roof, at a height not to exceed five (5) feet above the building's parapet height and shall not be visible from Maine and Mill Streets.

3. That the accompanying equipment cabinet being installed directly behind the West Tower shall not be visible from the Topsham Historic District.

MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Case # VRB 16-022 – 86 Maine Street – The Board will discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed façade renovations at 86 Maine Street (Map U13, Lot 17), located within the federally-designated Brunswick Commercial Historic District.

Anna Breinich introduced the application and said that this application is for façade improvements to Berrie's Hearing to include removal of the existing shingle roof, realignment of windows, and replacement of siding, trim and entryway. Anna added that this application is one of the façade grant projects being funded through the BDA program.

Applicant Representative, David Matero, said that the new owner is interested in minimizing the very heavy rooftop and replace while extending the roof to cover the storefront windows, changing the height of the upper windows on the front, maintaining the wrap-around sign, and proposing to put concrete panels along the Lincoln Street side to prevent snow plow damage. David said that the entire façade on Maine Street and Lincoln will have new clapboard and all the windows will be changed out to Marvin Ultimate aluminum / wood with simulated divided light. David added that although you cannot see the back of the building, it will have new siding and windows as well. Gary Massanek asked why they are not going with regular double hung windows. David replied that double hung windows are not as energy efficient. David added that there is an exterior checkrail so the windows look like they are double hung with an aluminum exterior and wooded interior. Laura Lienert asked if the applicant is trying to mimic the 1910 look of the building, David replied that they are not necessarily trying to mimic the look and are not proposing going back to single windows or adding shutters.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment. Hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

Karen Topp asked if the top front window was a casement window. David Matero replied that it is a vent for the attic. Laura Lienert asked what they were proposing for the front door. David replied that the door is set back as it is currently. The door and side glass will be completely replaced with a commercial grade aluminum door with glass siding and mill colored finish. David pointed out that the door that is currently being used is a residential grade door. Connie Lundquist brought up the point that the proposed windows are casement and not double hung and that this will be noticeable when the windows are open. Laura and Gary Massanek agreed with Connie. Gary said that there is some energy efficiency with the single window, but does not feel that there is a difference big enough that the Board would not ask for a double hung. David replied that they chose this window because they meet energy needs better and feels as though this is a logical step to take as the energy needs of the country increase. Connie replied that the Board is sensitive to energy issues, but pointed out that all of Maine Street has double hung windows. Gary asked for more information about the concrete paneling and the joints. David replied that they are butt joints with a water detail at the base with a covering over the top of the panel. David reiterated that this is due to the issues with the snow removal in the winter. Annee Tara asked if the applicant had a hardie plank example to look at. David replied that he did not, but explained that the material is fibrous, more durable, comes pre-finished and is typically used in historic districts in place of cedar or pine clapboards. The color will be gray. Anna Breinich replied that this product has been used in the VRB District and she will forward the address along to

Annee so that she may see an example. Connie said that Bowdoin College's Ashby House is hardie plank and she is planning on redoing her house with the same material.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION IS DEEMED COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY LAURA LIENERT, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Eli Strange, the applicant's husband, asked what the difference is over the proposed window and double hung windows. Laura Lienert replied that when the window is opened, it is a casement window the flips open which is not consistent with the rest of Maine Street or the Maine Street guidelines.

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR FAÇADE RENOVATIONS AT 86 MAINE 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 double-hung windows shall be installed instead of casement windows as proposed.

MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUDNQUIST, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Case # VRB 16-023 – 15 Bath Road – The Board will discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a residential structure located at 15 Bath Road (Map U08, Lot 108), located within the federally-designated Federal Street Historic District.

Anna Breinich said that this is an application to demolish a residential building and is the first application for demolition within a historic district, this one being the Feral Street Historic District since the VRZ language was changed to require a 90-day delay. Anna pointed out that the 90-day delay starts after the application is deemed complete. Anna said that there are requirements that Bowdoin will need to meet and reviewed these requirements that were included in her Memo to the Board dated June 16, 2016 and part of the packet materials. Annee Tara asked if the Board needed to do anything other than deem the application complete. Anna replied that the Board may offer guidance if they wish to do so.

Karen Topp recused herself for the application as she worked for Bowdoin College.

Gary Massanek asked when the applicant would need to come back before the Board. Anna Breinich replied that the deadline is September 19th and she believes that the Board will be meeting again before this date.

Applicant Representative, Catherine Ferdninand, said that they would be able to have the structural engineer at the July meeting. Laura Lienert asked what the date of purchase was. Catherine replied that it was May 16, 2016. Connie Lundquist asked if Bowdoin had any ownership interest in this property prior to the purchase. Catherine replied that they did not and said that the previous owner had ownership since 1985. Laura asked if the minimum sanitation requirements by the Deputy Fire Chief were taken care of yet. Catherine replied that they are working with the Town to get resolution and are awaiting cost estimates to meet the minimum sanitation requirements.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment. Hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

Annee Tara suggested that the applicant keep the Board apprised of the progress prior to the September deadline. Catherine Ferdinand said that they planned on attending the July meeting and are willing to conduct a site walk. Anna Breinich replied that per the Deputy Fire Chief, anyone wishing to do a site walk will have to do so from the outside as the inside is off limits. Catherine asked for guidance as to the expectation of movability and said that in order to make this building habitable, it would not be moveable. Gary Massanek replied that the focus should be on maintaining the structure and not the cleanliness or the fact that the building has lead be the leading factor in demolition.

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA THAT THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION IS DEEMED COMPLETE. BY APPROVING THIS MOTION, THE REQUIRED 90-DAY DELAY SHALL COMMENCE JUNE 21, 2016AND END ON SEPTEMBER 19, 2016. MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY AMONG THOSE VOTING.

Karen Topp returned to the meeting as a voting member.

4. Other Business: Gary Massanek to send out a preliminary list of workshop discussion topics and Anna Breinich to research a workshop date.

5. Approval of Minutes: No minutes were approved at this meeting.

6. Next Meeting Date – 7/19/16

Staff Approvals:

- **o** 80 Pleasant Street – Signage

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

Respectfully Submitted

Tonya Jenusaitis,
Recording Secretary

VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
JULY 19, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Gary Massanek, Vice Chair Connie Lundquist, Laura Lienert, and Annee Tara

MEMBERS ABSENT: Karen Topp, Emily Swan and Brooks Stoddard

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Tuesday, July 19, 2016 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at 85 Union Street, Council Chambers. Chair Gary Massanek called the meeting to order at 7:15 P.M.

1. Case # VRB 16-023 – 15 Bath Road (90-Day Demolition Delay begun 6/21/16) – The Board will receive a progress update and consult with the applicant per Section 216.8.B.2.c.1) b) ii) (Additional Processing Requirements for Relocation or Demolition Activities). The applicant, Bowdoin College, has requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a residential structure at 15 Bath Road (Map U08, Lot 108), located within the federally-designated Federal Street Historic District.

Anna Breinich reviewed the 90-day delay period for 15 Bath Road that began on June 21, 2016 and reviewed her MEMO to the Board dated July 15, 2016. Catherine Ferdinand of Bowdoin College, presented a PowerPoint presentation addressing the concerns of the Deputy Fire Chief as well as an update of where they are in addressing the terms of the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance. Laura Lienert asked if they had heard anything back from the Maine Historical Preservation Commission or Maine Preservation. Catherine replied that they have not received anything back yet, but have based much of their photo documentation upon discussion with Kirk Mahoney (of Maine Historic Preservation) and Larissa Picard (of Maine Preservation). Gary Massanek said that the College has addressed the topic of relocation and asked if they have given thought of possibly selling this building to a buyer interested in rehabilitating the structure. Catherine replied that the land under the building would not be offered, but if someone wants to move the building then they would consider selling it. Connie Lundquist asked if Bowdoin has considered moving the building. Catherine replied that they have not and will not be considering this as an option.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment. Hearing none, the public comment period was closed.

Paul Becker of Becker Engineering provided a PowerPoint presentation reviewing the structural inspection of the building in more depth and detail. Paul said that the building has structural issues and contamination issues stemming from a leaking roof, settlement, and contamination issues that cannot be contained by cleaning methods. Annee Tara asked about the value of the property. Paul replied that he is going on purchase cost.

Anne asked if she was correct in that Bowdoin has no plans to move the building or keep it in its current location. Catherin Ferdinand replied that given the conditions of the building, they do not have a use for a building of this size in this or any location and would most likely build something if they needed to. Anna Breinich said that she has checked with the Deputy Fire Chief and he stated that he was happy with the cleanup that was done on the property but he does not want a site walk inside the building. Connie Lundquist asked if potential buyers could go inside. Catherine replied that she was told by the Deputy Fire Chief that he would make allowances, but she is still waiting for a letter stating this. Laura Lienert asked if the Board would want Bowdoin to advertise into September as they have stated that they have a cutoff date of August 30th. Laura suggested that Bowdoin advertise until the end of the 90 days, September 19th. Catherine replied that if the Board wants the advertising until the 19th then they will do so. Laura asked if there is no buyer and the VRB chooses demolition, how long does the "green space" last; when could they potential build on this lot? Anna replied that if Bowdoin decided to build, they would need to come back to the VRB.

2. Case # VRB 16-024 – 185 Park Row – The Board will discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed renovations to front staircase at 185 Park Row (Map U08, Lot 111), located within the federally-designated Federal Street Historic District.

Anna Breinich introduced the application for renovations to the front landing and staircase at 185 Park Row and reviewed the project summary dated July 19, 2016. Anna said that at this time they have not identified the material for the railing.

Applicant representative, Dee Perry, said that the brick / concrete stairway is falling apart and they propose to replace this will granite. Dee said that the rail will be steel, similar in style to what is currently there, but will be custom made after the steps are in place. Laura Lieneret asked how big the landing currently is. Dee replied that she does not have those dimensions, but added that the architect explained that the landing did not need to be the same size as it currently is because the door swings in. This building was originally residential and the door did not swing in. Connie Lundquist asked if they attempted to see what the stairway was originally. Dee replied that she did go back to the Historic Preservation Survey, but the pictures were not very clear. Anna Breinich replied that staff went back to the 1954 tax card and the photos. The photos look like granite and the tax card states that they are granite. Connie asked if there were any indications of size. Anna replied that you could not really tell as there was either difficulty with the angle or trees in the way; no size was listed on the card. Connie asked the applicant if she knew the size of the proposed stairway / landing. Dee added that the dimensions for the granite were included in the packet. Annee Tara pointed out that in Staff Review, someone hinted that the proposed stairway would be smaller. Anna replied that this was an eyeball estimate, but that they would probably be taking about a foot off on each side. Annee asked if concrete or granite are historically accurate for this building. Gary replied that it is not original. Dee said that the building was rehabilitated in the mid 1990's and added that the walkway would remain brick.

Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment. Hearing none, the public comment period was claosed.

Laura Lienert asked if Board members felt that the railings could be more appropriate then the dated railing design. Gary Massanek agreed that they could do something better in terms of the railing design. Dee Perry said that she believes the owners are open to suggestion for the railings and anticipate the railings being done on-site. Gary asked if the applicant would replacing the rail along the walkway. Dee replied that she is sure that they would want the stair rail to match the walkway rail. Gary asked if they needed the walkway rail. Dee replied that there is a slight incline. Anna noted that there is a difference in the railing on the steps and the railing along the walkway. Connie stated that she does not feel that this application is compete as they do not know what the railings will look like. Laura agreed with Connie. Dee asked what the Board would like to see for a railing. Connie said that the applicant might want to research what a railing would look like in 1798. Laura pointed out that the rendition does not show the railing along the walkway and suggested that the applicant discuss this as well. Gary said that he does not believe that the application is incomplete, but does agree that they need more information. Anna reviewed what is required to deem an application complete. After reviewing the requirements, Gary, Connie and Laura agreed that they feel as though the application is incomplete and a unanimous decision to table the application was made.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO TABLE THE APPLICATION TO THE NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING. MOTION SECONDED BY LAURA LIENERT, MOVED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Case # VRB 16-025 – 124 Maine Street (Senter Place) – The Board will discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness for a partial roof replacement at 124 Maine Street (Map U13, Lot 66), located within the federally-designated Brunswick Commercial Historic District.

Anna Breinich introduced the application to replace 1937 clay roofing with metal roofing at 112-124 Maine Street and reviewed the project summary dated July 19, 2016. Anna said that she did discuss with the applicant alternative composite materials instead of the clay tile and have asked for additional information which staff has not received at this time.

Applicant Representative, Dee Perry, said that the mission of AMS Title Co. is to give away money to the community in the form of grants as well as to create attractive and safe buildings. Dee said that the clay tile is very heavy and extremely expensive to remove and that they have received pricing for slate tile, metal seemed roofing and asphalt roofing. Dee said that they would prefer to go with something that will last longer then asphalt. Dee pointed out that the pictures included in the packet are taken from across the street as it is difficult to see the roof otherwise. Connie Lundquist asked what the coast of asphalt would be. Dee replied that the asphalt would be $78,000, the slate would be $103,000 and the metal would be $73,000. Connie asked what the life expectancy of the asphalt would be. Dee replied about 20 years. Gary Massanek asked if

they looked into the composite. Dee replied that it is more expensive then the slate. Gary and Laura both said that they are surprised to hear that the composite is more expensive. Dee replied that the roofer informed her that a grade A composite would be $30,000 more and a grade C would be $5,000 more than the slate.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment.

James Whittemore, Attorney and member or the AMS Title Board, stressed that all of the revenue generated from this building, aside from the money spent to maintain the building, goes back into the community in grants to non-profit organizations in Brunswick and abutting towns. James said that AMS Title supports the Senter fund and if there is $25,000 that they do not need to spend on roofing materials, then that is $25,000 more that can go back into the community.

Chair gary massanek closed the public comment period.

Annee Tara said that she believes that in keeping with the community the applicant should want to maintain the architectural significance; in her opinion metal roofing wouldn't be the same. Laura Lienert reference the VRB Design Guidelines and said that clay tiles are one of the longest lasting roofing materials. Laura reiterated that she is surprised of the cost estimate for the composite material and wonders if the applicant needs to do a little more research with this in mind. Connie Lundquist agrees with Annee and Laura and said that metal does not approach the guidelines. Connie suggested that the applicant do more research. Dee pointed out that many roofers have denied the roof due to its logistics, but she is happy to go back and do more research on the composite material if that is what the Board wants to see.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO TABLE THE APPLICATION. MOTION SECONDED BY ANNEE TARA, MOVED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Case # VRB 16-026 – 0 Abbey Road/22Pleasant Street (Tao Yuan Restaurant) – The Board will discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness for an updated design of renovations/new construction previously approved on March 17, 2015(now expired) at 0 Abbey Road/22 Pleasant Street (Map U13, Lot 52).

Anna Breinich introduced the application and reviewed the project summary dated July 19, 2016 for Tao Yuan Restaurant. Anna pointed out that the Certificate of Appropriateness was never issued for the previous application because the Conditions of Approval were never satisfied.

Applicant representative, David Matero, asked what materials staff did not receive information on. Anna Breinich replied that they are still waiting on information for the doors and garage door. David replied that Cecile Stadler, applicant, forwarded this information along via email. Cecile confirmed that she sent a very lengthy email with large attachments. Anna replied that she did not receive it. David reviewed the project materials and said that the garage door will be similar to the adjacent townhouse garage

door. David reviewed the polycarbonate greenhouse, retail space, office space and commercial kitchen. Gary Massanek said that he didn't remember the north end being closed off in the original application. Kate Holcomb, representative, replied that they realized that they do not need the light from the north end as much for efficiency. Kate said that by closing this end off, it aids in heat retention and will also provide a better buffer to the adjacent residential property. Kate pointed out that lighting, sound and exhaust fans were a concern previously. Connie Lundquist asked how they plan to keep the light inside at night. Kate replied that there would be a heat curtain and a light blocker as discussed during the previous approval. Kate added that they won't be lighting the greenhouse throughout the night and will be using LED lights. David pointed out that the lights will be sitting 6 inches off the floor, not hanging. Laura clarified that the curtain is horizontal across the whole floor. Laura asked about dumpster location and screening. David replied that there will be a cedar fence and that the dumpster is closer to Tao Yaun and the post office; the location is the same as in the previous approval. Gary asked what they plan to do in terms of retail. Cara Stadler, applicant, replied that they will be opening a bakery / café.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment.

Stew Russell, of Topsham, said that the applicant has worked very hard to bring the finest restaurant to this area and believes that anything the Board can do to support this business would be beneficial to the community.

Chair Gary Massanek closed the public comment period.

Laura Lienert pointed out that the conditions imposed upon the applicant were based upon a different design then what is being proposed now. Anna Breinich noted that this is not an amendment, but a new application and suggested that applicant pull up the email sent to staff that describes the materials better. Cecile Stadler reviewed the email of 7/13/2016 and forwarded it again to Anna. Gary Massanek asked if they still planned on using aluminum clad windows as listed in the application. David Matero replied that he would prefer aluminum, but that this is a mistake and the proposed windows are fiberglass. Anna asked if the windows were double hung or casement. David replied that they are proposing casement and pointed out that the adjacent Townhouses have some casement windows. David said that the windows have divided light, and double glazed and would be for the lower office and lower retail sections. David said that the garage door is a Raynod panel door and is located on the bottom floor facing the Townhouses; the door looks similar to the Townhouse garage door. Gary said that he feels that the design is very exciting and that it has really been improved. Gary pointed out that this is not a historic building and it is not going to look like one, but it will be very nice. Gary said that he wishes that the north end would be open, but that this is the least visible and can work. Connie agrees that this particular rendition meets the standards better than the previous rendition. Laura said that she did like elements of the old design that were more residential and can't get past the fact that the new design reminds her of the train station. Laura said that she does not like the casement windows, but she does like that there is siding on the north side. Laura asked why the applicant abandoned the decking and

moved towards metal grading. David replied that this is lighter material and will prevent water and snow from accumulating. Per Annee's request, Kate described the greenhouse / aquaponics.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS BE DEEMED COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY ANNEE TARA, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW STRUCTURE AT 22 PLEASANT STREET / 5 ABBEY ROAD 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. The specifications shall be provided for residential style cut-off lighting fixtures for review and approval by the Director of Planning and development.

MOTION SECONDED BY ANNEE TARA, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Case # VRB 16-027 - WORKSHOP - 35-39 Pleasant Street (St. John's Church) – The Board will offer guidance regarding the new construction of a 14,685 sq. ft. events center at 35-39 Pleasant Street (Map U16, Lots 47-48).

Anna Breinich said that she did not have anything formal to present and that in subsequent meetings with the applicant representative, Kevin Clark of Sitelines, suggested that this be handled as a workshop setting first.

Kevin Clark, of Sitelines, presented a PowerPoint presentation reviewing the status of the project to date. Scott Simons reviewed the conceptual plan for the building.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment.

Charlie Wiercinski, one of the four chairs heading the project, addressed the lack of facilities available for All Saint's Parish gatherings and the status of fundraising. Charlie expressed that they want to have feedback in order to address any concerns that the Board may have so that they can move forward with this project.

Mitchell Brown, resident of 46 Pleasant Street, expressed his concerns that this building will change the composition of this neighborhood and the multiple uses it will have.

Mitchell asked if the school needs a building this big and asked if this building really adds to the residential area that he resides in. Mitchell is concerned with the way the Common Development Plan will be used to override the Zoning District. Mitchell asked what happens to noise and the mulit-uses of this building.

Chair Gary Massanek closed the public comment period.

Connie Lundquist said that she does not have any recommendations at this point. Laura Lienert said that in moving forward she understands what Mitchell Brown has expressed with the size, and questions whether the size is compatible with the existing neighborhood. Laura suggested that the applicant look at screening more as well as eliminating portions, such as the kitchen, to cut down the scale of the building. Laura said that 104 feet, even with windows, should also be looked at further. Per Laura's request, Anna Breinich described the intent of the Common Development Plan. Charlie Wiercinski expressed that he is uncomfortable with the discussion over mass and scale and the Common Development Plan as this is outside the VRB. Anna said that mass and scale is under the VRB purview. Charlie said that they cannot build the building under 14,000 sq. ft. and still meet the needs of the parish. Gary Massanek suggested that they rethink the location of the back door as the preliminary plans show the entrance on the residence side. Gary said that he likes the design, but that the design turns inward and does not great the public.

6. Other Business: Workshop to be scheduled for September.

7. Approval of Minutes:

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 26, 2016 AS AMENDED. MOTION SECONDED BY LAURA LIENERT , APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY AMONG THOSE PRESENT.

8. Next Meeting Date – August 16, 2016

Staff Approvals:

o 80 Pleasant Street – Signage o 50 Maine Street – Replacement Awning

Adjourn

This meeting was adjourned at 10:17 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted

Tonya Jenusaitis,
Recording Secretary