

**VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 15, 2017**

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: All members were present.

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Tuesday, August 15, 2017 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 17-009, 7 Maple Street –The Board will remove from the table, discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness to determine acceptable siding and windows for a new replacement residential structure, located at 7 Maple Street (Map U08, Lot 80).

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA TO REMOVE THE APPLICATION FOR 7 MAPLE STREET FROM THE TABLE AS DISCUSSED AT THE JUNE 20, 2017 MEETING. MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST.

Anna Breinich briefly reviewed the application and referenced the June 24th, 2017 Village Review Board meeting when the decision was made to table the application pending further clarification / information from the applicant.

The applicant representative, Scott Howard, explained the design for the building and referenced the letter dated August 15, 2017 by the applicant, Loretta Patrick. The letter addresses the windows and siding which were both Conditions of Approval. Scott stated that the applicant is economically conscientious and is concerned that the materials quoted start to raise the cost of the house beyond what the market value would be and in some cases the tax value for that neighborhood. Scott pointed out that with the new tax evaluation, the new tax for this lot is about \$36,800. The purchase, demolition and preparation for construction has the beginning cost well over \$43,000; the concern is to maintain some architectural consistency by keeping costs reasonable. They would like to use casement windows with grills, but would prefer the exterior grills and the divider on top. With regards to siding, the costs are dramatically different. The applicant is asking for the Colonial White Progressive Vinyl siding.

Claudia Knox asked if the demolition process has begun. Scott Howard replied that the house has been demolished and some trees have been removed; they are ready to begin the next steps. Connie Lundquist asked what the \$43,000 was. Scott replied that this is the cost to purchase, demolish and prepare for construction. Roughly \$7,000 was the cost

to demolish the old building. Scott pointed out that the previous evaluation was \$82,100 but that was at 70% market value before the reassessment. Scott explained that they are trying not to exceed construction costs that would be more than Loretta Patrick can pay in a mortgage. Scott said that he feels that the assessed value of the building will be more based on what they use for siding. Scott reviewed the appraisal process and said that one of the factors in all appraisals is curbside appeal. Scott stated that the applicant wants to build something that will have a lower tax rate, but will be appealing.

Gary Massanek asked Scott Howard if he really means to refer to casement windows or double-hung. Scott replied that this was a mistake. They are asking for double-hung windows. Gary asked if they are proposing 2 over 1 and why. Scott said that Mrs. Patrick is trying to use windows like the ones that were on the former structure.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment.

Keith Field, owner of property on Maine Street, said that in reviewing the ordinance, the materials presented tonight and the materials presented at the previous meeting, he feels that the applicant is making an attempt to recreate what was previously there and not a rehab, revamp or remodel. With regards to the curb appeal, he feels that the proposed siding would still maintain the appeal.

Chair Gary Massanek closed the meeting to public comment.

Laura Lienert said that the applicant has done a great job in designing a home that is in conjunction with the other homes, lots and other scales on the street. Laura pointed out that under the Ordinance, Section 216.9.A.1 for new construction, it mentions that the applicant may get additional guidance from the Secretary of Interior or Maine Historic Preservation. The ordinance also talks a lot about existing buildings, existing cladding, existing windows and how every effort should be made to rehab or repair, but in this case, they have approved demolition. As much as she would love to see wood or Hardi Plank, there is not much information for the Board to review for new construction in the guidelines or ordinance. Laura said that it would be nice if the applicant would consider brick or wood, but she does not think that there is anything in the ordinance that restricts the applicant from using something other than wood. Claudia Knox agrees with Laura and said that this is a modest home and needs a modest budget. Claudia feels that a credible job has been done on this application and this applicant is taking a building that was a loss. This will provide new housing, new value; the net result for the community is positive. Karen Topp agrees with Claudia and Laura and pointed out that most of the surrounding houses are not wood. Karen does appreciate the exterior grills on the windows. Laura noted that her comments have no reflection on cost. Connie Lundquist stated that based on the ordinance and lack of direction in the guidelines, she has to agree with Laura. Rebekah Beaulieu agrees with Connie. She is weary about the discussion of cost, but does not think that this would be relevant in every discussion.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO APPROVE THE DOUBE-HUNG WINDOWS WITH EXTERIOR GRILLS AND VINYL SIDING. MOTION SECONDED BY CLAUDIA KNOX, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

~~2. Tabled Case # VRB 17-010 147 Maine Street~~—The Board will remove from the table, discuss and take action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness to complete exterior renovations to the Field Block building, located at 147 Maine Street (Map U13, Lot 161).

Item #2 removed from the agenda on 8/7/17

3. Case # VRB 17-015 – 5 Abbey Road/22 Pleasant Street (Tao Yaun Restaurant) – The Board will discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness for a revised design of renovations/new construction previously approved on July 19, 2016 at 5 Abbey Road/22 Pleasant Street (Map U13, Lot 52).

Anna Breinich introduced the application and reviewed the project summary dated August 10, 2017.

The applicant representative, David Matero, explained that after meeting with the engineers to construct this building, they have run into some architectural problems and some problems with reuse of the existing foundation that was made to be a townhouse that they are attempting to put a two-story greenhouse on top of. David presented a slide show and reviewed the proposed changes to the greenhouse. Laura Lienert asked for more information about the relief on the fans. David replied that the fans are boxed shaped with a motor in the middle that blows out; they stick out roughly 18 inches from the building. David explained that this is the only way to get the warm air out of the greenhouse to keep the water cool for the fish.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment

Annee Tara stated that she appreciates knowing the reasoning why the applicant has made these changes. Laura Lienert stated that she too appreciates the changes and actually likes the look of the building more now as it looks more residential with the new entrance. Rebekah Beaulieu stated that she appreciated the renderings included in the packet materials as she was not part of the Board that originally approved this application and feels that the changes being asked are appropriate.

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA TO APPROVE THE MODIFICATIONS TO THE ORIGINALLY APPROVED CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS. MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Case # VRB 17-016 – 103 Maine Street – The Board will discuss and take action on a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior renovations to the contributing structure located at 103 Maine Street (Map U13, Lot 144).

Anna Breinich introduced the application and reviewed the project summary dated August 15, 2017.

The applicant Matthea Daughtry explained that they have a large southern facing wall to which they would like to add a window in order to allow for more sunlight. They would also like to add another egress in the rear to allow for easier pedestrian traffic where they will have seating during the summer months and a beer garden. Matthea said that in doing some research, they have found that there have been windows on the side of the building at different times. Matthea feels that adding the window will also be more in tune with their neighbors. Annee Tara asked what they plan to do with the front of the building. Matthea replied that they will be removing the awning and putting up a Moderation Brewery sign, but will be leaving the rest as is for now with the hopes to fully restore the façade later down the road. Karen Topp asked where the outside seating will be. Matthea said that the seating will be in the back on the vacant lot. Connie Lundquist asked if they plan on having exterior grills on the windows. Stephen Tibbetts, applicant representative, replied that they are looking into Anderson’s E Series, Woodwright, 2 over 2, simulated light. This is the closest that they can get to a historically accurate window with the modern-day amenities; the grills will be on the outside. They also looked at an aluminum clad Pacifica Series window.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment

MOTION BY CLAUDIA THAT THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS IS DEEMED COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR EXTERIOR RENOVATIONS AT 103 MAINE 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 KAREN TOP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Other Business:

- Next workshop will be on September 12th at 4:00 P.M.

6. Approval of Minutes: No minutes were reviewed at this meeting.

7. Staff Approvals:

- 29 Federal St – Solar panels
- 82 Pleasant St – Windows

This meeting was adjourned at 7:51 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted

Tonya Jenusaitis,
Recording Secretary

**VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
WORKSHOP MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 19, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Gary Massanek, Vice Chair Connie Lundquist (arrived at 7:20 P.M.), Rebekah Beaulieu, Claudia Knox, Laura Lienert, Annee Tara and Karen Topp

MEMBERS ABSENT: All members were present.

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Tuesday, September 19, 2017 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at 85 Union Street, Council Chambers. Chair Gary Massanek called the meeting to order at 7:15 P.M.

WORKSHOP: The Village Review Board will hold a workshop session to continue their review of Village Review Overlay zoning ordinance standards and design guidelines, including the development of a demolition application checklist.

Gary Massanek provided a brief introduction and invited Rebekah Beaulieu, head of the sub-committee that was formed to look into the Village Review Overlay zoning ordinance standards and design guidelines, to present their findings.

Rebekah reviewed the draft supplemental information that they would ask for in demolition applications that was generated by the sub-committee and checklist. Annee Tara suggested a second-tier checklist. Connie Lundquist and Laura Lienert both agreed that an explanation why “you”, the applicant is seeking demolition needs to be asked. Gary Massanek referred to the criteria for demolition. Laura likes the idea of separating the costs for demolition and repair. Claudia Knox stated that what would be most helpful to her would be for an applicant to provide a timeline; helpful for knowing that the current owner did not contribute to the deterioration. Rebekah replied that she is hesitant to be more specific as she wants to keep the dialog open. Anna Breinich suggested that they try and make it clearer that in cases of demolition, it is strongly suggested that the applicant(s) receive more guidance in preparing their application. With regards to certified appraisals, Anna stated that the sub-committee is going to be meeting again to discuss this, but she is going to reach out to some stakeholders. Members agreed that it is important that they know what is going to replace a demolished structure. Claudia discussed her concerns with putting applications on delay and Anna explained what occurs during the 90-day delay.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment.

Catherine Ferdinand, of Bowdoin College, stated that the checklist seems less relevant for the minor demolition applications. From the perspective as an applicant, she is

concerned with the value of the checklist for the applicant versus the value of the checklist for the Board and how the things that are being asked relate or apply to the standards. Catherine is concerned with the appraised value and stated that the market value comes out in an opinion of sorts. With regards to date of acquisition, she is concerned that this is subjective especially for an individual as she is not sure how that matters on how much you put forth in investment into that property. In general, the checklist is helpful, but what are the standards that the applicant will be judged upon. Rebekah replied that this is checklist is to assist the applicant, not to box them in. For many of the diversity of applicants, there are many different situations where different aspects of their data is important and is very valuable. The point is preparation and this is to make it easier for an applicant for a variety of situations. Connie Lundquist added that they are looking to be as objective as they can be.

Chair Gary Massanek tabled the discussion. Sub-committee to make recommended changes.

Anna Breinich reviewed the changes in the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance and section additions and changes.

Adjourn

This workshop was adjourned at 8:39 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted

Tonya Jenusaitis,
Recording Secretary

**VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 2, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Gary Massanek, Vice Chair Connie Lundquist, Rebekah Beaulieu, Claudia Knox, Laura Lienert, Annee Tara and Karen Topp (arrived at 4:45)

MEMBERS ABSENT: All members were present.

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Thursday, November, 2017 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at 85 Union Street, Meeting Room 206 (2nd floor) Chair Gary Massanek called the meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.

1. Tabled Case # VRB 17-010 147 Maine Street – The Board will remove from the table, discuss and take action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness to complete exterior renovations to the Field Block building, located at 147 Maine Street (Map U13, Lot 161).

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO REMOVE VRB CASE 17-010, 147 MAINE STREET FROM THE TABLE AS DISCUSSED AT THE JUNE 20, 2017 MEETING. MOTION SECONDED BY ANNEE TARA, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Anna Breinich reminded members that this item was tabled from the June 20, 2017 meeting pending a site walk and additional information from the applicant about what was behind the faux brick siding.

The applicant representative, Nancy Barba, of Barba and Wheelock, presented a PowerPoint Presentation and passed around a sample of the proposed siding. Connie Lundquist asked about the nail holes and if the nail holes can be filled on the current clapboard. Barba said that they can fill them, but there is the concern that they may split or be damaged when reattaching. Gary Massanek asked what product the trim, corner columns, and capital will be made of. Barba replied that it will all be Boral and consistent with the proposed clapboard. Rebekah Beaulieu asked if it was possible to paint this product to align with the original color of the building. Keith Field replied that they have several different photographs and a sample of the dark grey from the rear of the building where an addition was made. Barba replied that it will likely be a dark body with light trim. Gary asked about insulation. Keith replied that he has spoken to a few people about blowing in cellulose, but because of the height of the building they would need to make a whole strip of blow holes per level on the exterior whether the old clapboards stay or through the sheathing; 500-700 holes. Laurie DeCamilla added that because Boral is such a stable product, once they apply the paint, it will stay on for years. The sample that went around that exhibits the moisture issue, the actual product is very

stable and is the reason why the company is able to give the warranty. Keith noted that when properly painted they are expecting 20 plus years of paint life.

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

Connie Lundquist stated that she appreciates all the work Keith Field did in the research of the Boral product. Rebekah Beaulieu stated that she feels more comfortable with this revised application. Laura Lienert supports the application, but noted that she believes there are a lot of problems both structural and financial to prefer certain products over wood. However, the village is not special because it looks like it's made of historical stuff. It is special because it is made of historical stuff. In time they may begin to see an alteration in authenticity. The other thing being said is that the guidelines say very different things. Even with all the nail holes in the building, and with splitting, it is important to retain the original siding for future owners. With respect to shadow lines, the guidelines speak to this specifically. Lastly Laura noted that the guidelines state that the original siding should not be removed should an alternative product be used because a removal of original material is not a reversible alteration. Laura does like the choice of the proposed material, but she is not sure about removal of the wood. Gary pointed out that there is also the issue of insulation. Laura replied that having gone through this with her own home, they were able to salvage the clapboard and address the insulation, but she is not aware of every detail of this project. Annee Tara stated that she is always sad to say goodbye to wood whether it be a tree or clapboard, but all things considered the applicant has done an admirable job in explaining why this product is a better solution. Karen Topp stated that she supports this application as is and she knows what the guidelines say, but pointed out that they are guidelines. As a scientist, at some point wood is just not sustainable and at what point do you keep patching it up. Karen pointed out that the Village Review Guidelines are from the Secretary of Interior Standards who state that the guidelines are not mandatory unless the applicant is receiving federal funding; he is not. Rebekah replied to Laura's point that it is valuable to document the discussion where they recognize why there is a deviation from the guidelines. Claudia Knox read allowed the VRB statement of purpose and said that there isn't any question in her mind about removing the old clapboards. By removing the old clapboards, it allows the opportunity for this building to have its once a century tune up and for a faithful rendering of its historical appearance. Another merit of the Boral product is that it is resistant to unforeseen moisture issues. Connie added that she liked the presentation by Nancy Barba as it reminded her that the Board needs to take each project individually and for reminding them of the location of the building because even though she does not like the idea of removing the old clapboard, she does like that the siding is less important in this building than its features.

MOTION BY CLAUDIA KNOX TO DEEM THE APPLICATION COMPLETE.
MOTION SECONDED BY ANNEE TARA, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR FACADE IMPROVEMENTS AT 147 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.

MOTION SECONDED BY REBEKAH BEAULIEAU, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

~~2. Case # VRB 17-022 16 School Street – The Board will discuss and take action regarding two Certificates of Appropriateness to 1) demolish an existing two-unit residential structure, and 2) construct a replacement single-family home, located at 16 School Street (Map U13, Lot 182).~~

3. Case # VRB 17-023 26 Cumberland Street – The Board will discuss and take action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness to add four wrought iron balconies to The McLellan, located at 26 Cumberland Street (Map U14, Lot 63).

Anna Breinich introduced the application for the addition of four iron balconies to The McLellan. Anna stated that this is an amendment to a Certificate of Appropriateness that was approved in 2016. Anna noted that the primary concern is that they have other materials aside from wrought iron being used in the structure and it would be better if they chose one.

Dick Campbell, applicant representative, stated that they did look around to see the elevations, but noted that they do have a plain building. Dick stated that as they drove around Brunswick they didn't really find decks upon decks, but arbors over decks. Dick referenced photo #4 on page #4 and stated that they would like to put an arbor with an ornamental railing above. They have run into many surprises with this building in terms of things that they had to fix, such as the elevators, but they are also responding to the opportunity to appeal to the customers to customize. They didn't think that they would be customizing the outside as much, but it is what the customers are requesting. Dick stated that they noticed the upper windows have wrought iron decorative railings at the Pejepscott Historical Museum and another brick building towards Route 1 with a lower bracket and railing system all in wrought iron. When it came to the three levels they did not want the McLellan look like a condominium, they wanted to see if they could bring the building back to some elegance that the building never had. Dick noted that as you go up, the decks get smaller and they are maintaining the dimension of the windows themselves. They have had to special order the door to fit into the windows. Annee Tara asked if he disagrees with the staff recommendation that the materials stay consistent.

Dick replied that he doesn't disagree, but in this case, it would be too much white that it would detract from the look. They enjoyed the look of the black wrought iron. Claudia Knox agreed that the Lincoln Street example is a good example noted that the McLellan is looking much classier and stylish. Claudia clarified that there were only two balconies being added to the east side. Dick replied that two is all that can be done at this time and it is all that is being requested. Claudia asked if these are balconies or just decorative. Dick replied that they will be balconies and there will be a door. There will be a total of four balconies on the building, but right now they are only putting two up. Amy McLellan said that they just don't want to have to come back to the VRB if the other two residents also want balconies. Gary Massanek pointed out that the elevations that were approved last year showed shutters on every window, but the new elevations show shutters on less than half and asked why. Dick replied that it seemed to be overwhelming and the concept may be to go shutter then window box. Amy added that it was starting to look like a hotel; the wrought iron seemed natural in the neighborhood and with the flower boxes in the sprig it will break up the white even more. Laura Lienert asked for the details on the wrought iron they were going to use. Dick replied that they have included a sketch and they are going with quarter inch stock more traditional and the rails will be square. Laura likes the idea of intermittent shutters and flower boxes on the east elevation, but asked how the renovations for the entryway that were previously approved were going to fit into this. Dick replied that they have gone away from this because it looked "too cute" and although the Stetson building across the street is period, and stylish, it was going to be difficult to recreate. Anna Breinich pointed out that this change was not included in the application and that the application was specifically for the addition of balconies; not all the changes that are being proposed tonight and may not be able to be acted upon tonight. Laura clarified again that this is for the three balconies on the east side and one balcony on the south side. Claudia reiterated that the change in the building is remarkable and looks much more welcoming. Anna pointed out that this is more than four balconies. The three on the south side and the top one on the north side were not in the original approval. The top floor balcony on the north side has already been built. Dick explained that this was an oversight and apologized for not coming back before building the balcony.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment.

Helen Small, to-be resident of the McLellan building, said that she is moving to the third floor facing south and that she is really looking forward to the balcony.

Bob Taylor, McLellan resident, stated that this is a gorgeous retirement home and said that anything the Board can do to help is appreciated.

Chair Gary Massanek closed the public comment period.

Anna Breinich clarified that there are eight balconies being proposed per Annee Tara's request. Three on the south, three on the east and two on the north. Laura Lienert loves the balance, the change in the shutters and decks and the different materials is good, but there are many changes being discussed that she is not comfortable acting on at this

meeting that have been brought up. Rebekah Beaulieu agreed with Laura and seeing that there are multiple wheels in progress she would only be comfortable with approving the balconies. Connie Lundquist asked if they have a timeline within that they have to build the balconies. Anna replied that they have two years, but they can always come back for an extension. Anna said that they can act on what is proposed, on everything in total or table the application. Gary Massanek stated that the east elevation is without logic and there is no rhythm. What they had before was a nice entrance statement and it has all going away. He is uncomfortable with the current design and believes that all the changes need to come together as one so they know what the building will look like. Claudia disagreed with Gary and suggested that for the other matters brought up they may want to schedule a site visit. Annee is comfortable with voting on the balconies. Connie stated that she is sensitive to the applicant, but asked if the applicant is renovating a building that customers are asking for or a building that has a plan.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO TABLE THE APPLICATION UNTIL A COMPLETE APPLICANT CAN BE SUBMITTED. MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP. MOTION APPROVED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, GARY MASSENEK, ANNEE TARA, REBEKAH BEAULIEAU AND KAREN TOPP. MOTION OPPOSED BY CLAUDIA KNOX AND LAURA LIENERT. MOTION PASSED 5-2.

4. Case # VRB 17-025 8 Gilman Avenue – The Board will discuss and take action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace an existing garage door and front door railings located at 8 Gilman Avenue (Map U14, Lot 109).

Anna Breinich introduced the application to replace an existing wooden garage door with insulated steel and to replace the railings and ballisters on the front steps.

Dawn Fresch, Taggart Reality, stated that this is a 6-unit apartment building said that the wooden garage doors are falling apart and cannot be repaired. Dawn explained that they did have a garage door company come out with the intent of getting a new door that looks the same. The new garage doors will swing up as one instead of opening out. Dawn pointed out that she does not believe that this was ever a garage, but a barn and said that it is used for their tools. Anna Breinich pointed out that structure this is in the rear. Dawn replied that they are proposing a steel door replacement over wood and that the railings will be iron. Global Fabrication is the name of the company working on the railings and they installed the steel balconies. Laura Lienert asked if the railing being proposed are the same from the 19 High Street example. Dawn said yes, but not with as much detail. Anna asked if they will be wrought iron. Dawn replied that it is not cast iron, but she is not sure exactly what type. Laura asked if the handles at the front that are curly will be mimicked. Dawn replied “yes”.

Gary noted that there was no public present.

Laura Lienert hears what the applicant is saying about snow and does appreciate that this structure is far back on the property, but pointed out that guidelines speak specifically to

this application and reviewed the Village Review Guidelines. Laura stated that “The Village” is not special because it looks like it is made of special stuff, but because it is made of special stuff. Changing the swing of the door will have an impact and possibly more so than the material. Connie Lundquist also referenced the guidelines for replacement materials and pointed out that when it is not possible to match the material a substitute material is acceptable. Connie understands that these are only guidelines, but if they are going to ignore them over time or when the applicant asks, then what is the point in having the guidelines. She is aware that the structure is set back, none the less, she has concerns. It is not unreasonable to ask the applicant to replace the door with a like door. This is an instance where the guidelines are spot on. Claudia sympathizes with the applicant and agreed that in the event of a big storm, doors that swing out will be difficult to open. She believes that the substitute that the applicant has chosen, has a good look and it is practical. Annee pointed out that they do not have a true idea of what the doors will look like, just a sketch. Dawn replied that from the street the door will look exactly like it does now, just not rotting. Karen stated that she has been looking at garage doors since they received this application and agrees that from the street, it will be very difficult to tell that it is not a wooden door. Rebekah stated that she would like to have a better sense of what the material for the door looks like. Gary agreed that it would be helpful to have more information on the materials being proposed for the door.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE APPLICATION BE TABLED PENDING MORE INFORMATION REGARDING THE TYPE OF IRON BEING USED AND MATERIALS FOR THE PROPOSED GARAGE DOOR. MOTION SECONDED BY REBEKAH BEAULIEAU, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Other Business: No other business.

6. Approval of Minutes:

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 25, 2017. MOTION SECONDED BY LAURA LIENERT, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Staff Approvals:

- 45 Union Street – Enclose Rear Porch
- 17 Mill Street – Signage
- 10 Everett Street – Signage
- 11 Pleasant Street – Heat Pumps

This meeting was adjourned at 6:12 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted

Tonya Jenusaitis,

Recording Secretary

**This meeting was rescheduled from 10/17/17 and Item #4 was added.*

**Item #2 removed 11/1/17 at the request of the applicant and to be rescheduled for consideration at the 12/19/17 meeting.*

**VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 30, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Gary Massanek, Vice Chair Connie Lundquist, Rebekah Beaulieu, Claudia Knox, Annee Tara and Karen Topp (Arrived at 4:52 P.M.)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Laura Lienert

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Thursday, November 30, 2017 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at 85 Union Street, Meeting Room 206 (2nd floor) Chair Gary Massanek called the meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.

Adjustment to agenda.

2. Tabled Case # VRB 17-025 8 Gilman Avenue – The Board will remove from the table, discuss and take action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace an existing garage door and front door railings located at 8 Gilman Avenue (Map U14, Lot 109).

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO REMOVE FROM THE TABLE APPLICATION VRB 17-025, 8 GILMAN AVE, AS DISCUSSED AT THE NOVEMBER 2, 2017 MEETING. MOTION SECONDED BY CLAUDIA KNOX, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Dawn Frasch, applicant representative, pointed out that since the last meeting, they have changed the wrought iron railing to a wood railing and provided photograph examples. Connie Lundquist asked if the proposed garage doors open out. Dawn replied that they do not, but that they are wood; the photograph provided in the packet is from their Freeport office.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment. No public comment was made and the public comment period was closed.

Annee Tara thanked the applicant for changing the railing to wood and asked if they planned on placing the hardware that is meant to make the door look like it swings open in the same place as the Freeport Office example; it looks fake. Dawn replied that the hardware will go in the same place it is now, as depicted on the drawing, but noted that her measurements may be off slightly.

MOTION BY CLAUDIA KNOX TO DEEM THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR PROPOSED STRUCTURAL ALTERATIONS 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 CLAUDIA KNOX, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

1. **Tabled Case # VRB 17-023 26 Cumberland Street** – The Board will remove from the table, discuss and take action regarding a Certificate of Appropriateness to add four wrought iron balconies to The McLellan, located at 26 Cumberland Street (Map U14, Lot 63). **Adjustment to agenda pending applicant arrival.**

MOTION BY ANNEE TARA TO REMOVE FROM THE TABLE CASE VRB 17-023 AS DISCUSSED AT THE NOVEMBER 2, 2018 MEETING. MOTION SECONDED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST.

Anna Breinich introduced the application and pointed out that included in the packet, it included copies of the previously approved elevation photos along with proposed changes.

Dick Campbell, applicant representative, pointed out that they have added the *future* balconies to the drawings along with the canopy along the Union Street entrance as requested. Claudia Knox’s request, Dick pointed out the canopy as the drawing was not included in the packet. Members discussed the balcony that was not approved located on the east side, third floor and the proposed canopy. Claudia asked Dick if he felt that the addition of the balcony is a functional piece. Dick replied that they added it back to make the Board happy. Claudia stated that the building looked nice as is and reiterated that the applicant “added that because of us”. Dick added that the entrance doesn’t need cover as the entrance is already recessed. Connie Lundquist asked for clarification balconies because she counts eight balconies in total. Anna Breinich pointed out the balconies missing from the original application; seven balconies needing approval tonight. Claudia asked if the balcony in the middle on the Cumberland Street side was going to be built now because she feels as though it needs to be there and makes sense of the one above and the patio. Dick replied that this unit has not been sold yet and the request has not been made. Claudia asked if they would be willing to construct the balcony regardless of the unit being sold at this time if the application were approved. Dick replied that he could not answer that question as it is a business decision. Applicant, Amy McLellan

replied that they are headed in the direction of building the balcony and although the unit has been sold, but that she has not yet convinced the tenant of the balcony. She is hopeful that come spring, this will change. Per Gary Massanek's request, Dick described the construction of the wood canopy with asphalt shingles. Claudia asked if the applicant wanted to amend the application tonight by removing the canopy. Dick stated that they want to make the Board happy. Connie pointed out that if they approved the application, then the applicant has two years in order to build the middle balcony should the other two balconies on the Cumberland side be built. Claudia replied that this would be her understanding of the approval as well, but she would prefer that the applicant remove the canopy. Dick replied that Amy would prefer to put the canopy money into landscaping and passed out photographs of the landscaping at the Union Street entrance where the canopy would be located.

Connie Lundquist pointed out that the east elevation on page 2 of 2 is different from the east elevation on page 1 of 1. Anna Breinich clarified the elevation that was previously approved. Connie asked which of the east balconies would they be constructing right off. Dick Campbell replied that on the east, it would be the one on the far right, closest to Route 1. Dick added that they are also constructing the balcony on the far right of Union Street, and the one on the top, middle and bottom of Cumberland Street. Connie clarified that they are committed to begin construction on five balconies tonight with two others that are labeled as future. Claudia Knox asked if the third-floor balconies on Union Street are still intended to be wrought iron. Dick Campbell replied that they are. Connie asked if the ground floor patios are wood. Dick replied that they are wood and vinyl.

Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment. No comment was made and the comment period was closed.

Per Karen Topp's request, Claudia Knox summarized the discussion regarding possibly amending the application to remove the proposed canopy. Karen agreed that this seems unnecessary as this is already a busy entrance. Rebekah Beaulieu added that they also do not have a lot of information for the canopy.

Claudia Knox expressed that she is very happy about the proposed changes, especially the wrought iron, as the approach feels like an extension of the individual expression that is coming in the form of architecture. Annee Tara agrees with the wrought iron and appreciates the fact that the applicant is willing to make changes when something doesn't feel right, but pointed out that because of the district they are in, any changes will need to come back before the Board. Rebekah Beaulieu replied that she appreciates the applicant's flexibility and Claudia's point regarding individuality, but from an architectural point this is messy and from a design and appearance standpoint this is not her favorite. The use of mixed materials and the fact that this is a progressive project makes it potentially unattractive. Connie Lundquist agrees with Rebekah on every point. Gary Massanek replied that he agrees with Rebekah as well and what bothers him the most is the balcony that was built illegally and is now an anomaly on the third floor especially since it is not wrought iron, but white vinyl. Anna Breinich pointed out that the motion is drafted so that the applicant uses same material for the construction of the

proposed balconies. Prior to the meeting, Anna did ask the applicant if there would be any consideration given to painting the vinyl black so that it would all be similar in color, but she does not believe that it is a possibility. Claudia replied that you would not have the functionality of the vinyl once you painted it. Anna pointed out that the south side the balcony is very visible versus the north side where they are tucked in. Claudia clarified that what they have being proposed is that almost all the third-floor balconies on elevations that you can see are wrought iron. Dick replied that it is confusing because the west and north side elevations only have two stories and the only elevation with three stories all have wrought iron. Connie stated that it is important to remember that this structure is non-contributing and what they like is not relevant. Karen replied that she is inclined to approve the application.

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

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR PROPOSED STRUCTURAL ALTERATIONS 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 front door canopy shown on the Union Street elevation be eliminated.
3. That the 3rd story balcony on the Cumberland Street building side (south side) may only be built if a 2nd story balcony is built as well.

MOTION SECONDED BY ANNEE TARA. MOTION APPROVED BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST, KARENT TOPP, CLAUDIA KNOX, REBEKAH BEAULIEAU AND ANNEE TARA. GARY MASSANEK IN OPPOSITION. MOTION PASSES 5-1.

3. Case # VRB 17-029 11 Pleasant Street – The Board will discuss and take action regarding a joint request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolition an attached house and block building, and a Certificate of Appropriateness to complete additional renovations, both for a structure located at 11 Pleasant Street (Map U13, Lot 71).

Anna Breinich introduced the application for demolition in the rear of the structure and structural alterations along the back end of the property as well as some changes that were approved at the staff level for heat exchanges.

Applicant representative, David Matero, provided a brief history of the property and stated that this is not an easy building to find a good use for. Currently, there is a book store in the basement, events center on the upper level, 5 residences in the top and over 5,000 square feet in the middle that they have been struggling to find uses for. The applicant now has a partner with experience in the food industry and reviewed the first-floor floorplan that they would like to develop into a restaurant. David stated that the issue that they are before the Board is the removal of a two-story wood house and concrete building; they are not in very good shape. David reviewed photographs of different views of the building. David stated that when the plan was presented to the Fire Chief and Codes Enforcement Officer, they were happy to see the removal of the structure and noted that there is also a mold issue. David pointed out that by removing the house and concrete structure, they will be able to add a cedar fence and be able to screen the dumpsters, recycling, heating and be able to add three more parking spaces. They are proposing to add seating in the front that will need to be roped off. David reviewed the proposed elevation views. Claudia Knox expressed her well wishes to the applicant and stated that “buildings that survive are buildings that perform”. By making this space functional and income producing has everything to do with preservation. Claudia asked if it were possible to move the new door on the east side elevation a few inches to align with the window above and said that should would like to see some type of wood work. David replied that this door and stairs are really tight, but if they can’t exactly line the door up, they can do something architectural there and make an improvement.

CHAIR GARY MASSANEK OPENED THE MEETING TO PUBLIC COMMENT. NO COMMENT WAS MADE AND THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD WAS CLOSED.

Karen Topp asked if the bottom windows are boarded up on the east elevations. David Matero replied that they are boarded up and will remain boarded up; it is the boiler room.

Connie Lundquist asked if the house was a contributing resource. Anna Breinich replied that the whole structure is a contributing resource. She did go back through the deeds and there was mention of house(s), but then there is mention of a warehouse and there is no way of knowing. With regards to demolition, Connie believes they are looking at Section 5.2.8.4.a.ii and reviewed the ordinance language. Anne Tara asked how the building is a contributing structure if it is not on the contributing structures list. Anna replied that it is just not on the MHPC list, but that she did reach out to them. They stated that since there has never been an archeological study done on the structure, they cannot determine if the back portion is part of the original structure.

Mary Alice Trwergy, former owner, stated that her husband purchased the structure in 1971 and told her that his parents lived in the little house out back that is now connected to the 1825 building by the cinder block building; they lived there in roughly the 1920’s.

Connie Lundquist stated that if they look at the ordinance and the entire structure as one then they are looking to demolish a portion of the entire structure. Otherwise they have

to look at this as a little house and not part of the original structure. If the cinder portion is looked as part of the whole then they are being asked to consider demolition of a part of a contributing structure so that the whole can be use more economically. Anne Tara pointed out that to her this structure, although considered contributing, it does not seem as though it was part of the original structure and although the structure is visible from the street, it is only if you really wanted to see it. Rebekah Beaulieu does agree that they are dealing with demolition of a contributing structure and to a degree the structure in question is visible, but at the same time she does not think it is contributing to the architectural integrity of the structure. Rebekah thinks that this is a grey area and does not think that this is a significant component and determinantal on an architectural plain. Connie Lundquist agreed with Rebekah.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE JOIN CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATION IS DEEMED COMPLETE. MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR DEMOLITION OF THE REAR ATTACHED DWELLING AND TWO-STORY CONCRETE STRUCTURE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBSECTION 5.2.8.C(4)II, 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 REBEKAH BEAULIEAU, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS FOR STRUCTURAL ALTERATIONS 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 position of the new single doorway on the east side of the structure (closest to Pleasant Street) be aligned with the second floor window and be

designed with either decorative woodwork or “glass light” above the doorway so as to be in equal height to the existing fenestration of the east side windows.

MOTION SECONDED BY ANNEE TARA, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Other Business: No other business.

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

6. Staff Approvals:

- 4 Pleasant St – Signage

This meeting was adjourned at 5:52 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted

Tonya Jenusaitis,
Recording Secretary