

**Old Orchard Beach Design Review Committee Meeting Agenda  
Monday, April 4, 2011 at 6:00pm in Town Council Chambers**

<b>PLEDGE TO THE FLAG</b>	
<b>Meeting Called to Order at 6:00 pm.</b>	
<b>ROLL CALL:</b> Don Comoletti, Ray DeLeo, Kim Schwickrath. Excused: Shirley Holt. <b>Staff:</b> Mike Nugent.	
<p><b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</b> February 07, 2011, February 28, 2011.  <b>Ms. Holt</b> pointed out there was only 4 members present, and the minutes reflected 5 members.  <b>Mr. DeLeo</b> moved to accept the minutes from February 07, 2011 with the correction.  <b>Ms. Schwickrath</b> seconded.  <i>Motion passes unanimously</i>  <b>Ms. Schwickrath</b> moved to accept the minutes from February 28, 2011.  <b>Mr. DeLeo</b> seconded.  <b>Ms. Holt</b> abstained, as she was not present.  <i>Motion passes 3-0-1</i></p>	
<p><b>ITEM 1:</b> Review application and determine Design Review Certificate recommendation for vertically expanding and remodeling the single family home at <u>6 Bradbury Street</u> (MBL 205-19-12) in the DD2 Zone. Owner and Applicant is Renald Fluent. Agent is Tim Boardman.</p>	<b>ITEM 1:</b>
<p>Mr. Boardman explained the scope of the building and the project.  Chairman Comoletti felt that the application was absolute bare bones.  Mr. Nugent hoped that the staff notes would fill in the blanks.  Chairman Comoletti asked if the staff notes come from discussion with staff and the builder/applicant.  Mr. Nugent stated yes.  Chairman Comoletti asked for a motion.  Ms. Hold moved to accept as complete.  Ms. Schwickrath seconded.  <i>Motion passes unanimously.</i>  Chairman Comoletti went over the staff notes with the committee and all were in agreement with the findings of the staff notes.  Ms. Holt asked if the window sizes were changing.  Chairman Comoletti asked if the size of the windows could be changed, as they are very small.  Mr. Boardman stated he did not have that conversation with the owners.  Mr. Nugent pointed out that because the way the building is laid out there is not much that is able to be changed. The ordinance does not say that it has to be, but that it should be.  Chairman Comoletti asked if staff is requiring egress windows.  Mr. Nugent stated one in each sleeping room.  Discussion ensued regarding window size. The committee was concerned of the sizes being different from the first and second floor.  Mr. Boardman stated with the substantial changes that would ensure the applicants</p>	<b>Motion Vote</b>

would have a larger cost.

Mr. DeLeo asked if maybe they went with a garden window or something in the kitchen.

Chairman Comoletti asked to move on and come back to the window issue. He asked for specific material for the outside of the home.

Mr. Boardman stated vinyl clapboards.

Chairman Comoletti stated that is one of the things in the ordinance that are discouraged. Discussion ensued regarding the difference in vinyl siding and what the applicant would be using. He asked to move on and come back to this as well. He asked if the applicant is rebuilding the entryway portico.

Mr. Boardman stated that was not discussed, but they would do what needs to be done to make it seamless and match.

Chairman Comoletti asked if the add-ons on the back of the building are changing.

Mr. Boardman stated everything is going to stay. There is a shed and a hot tub he believes and this is not changing.

Chairman Comoletti asked if the applicant would be using vinyl siding would they be using it around for trim.

Mr. Boardman stated they will be using aluminum wrap for the trim.

Chairman Comoletti went back to the window question.

Ms. Schwickrath felt they should require a change in the window.

Chairman Comoletti felt that the 12 pitch roof would exaggerate the size of the addition.

Mr. DeLeo asked if this is just windows or size and scale.

Chairman Comoletti felt the window size and scale is what bothered him. If there were similar sized windows in both stories the difference would not seem so great. He asked if there could be a larger window put in the bathroom and the kitchen.

Mr. Boardman felt there could be larger windows in both areas. To be able to get an adequate header in the first floor could be problematic due to the lower height on the first floor.

Ms. Holt felt the dormers were taller than they need to be for the windows. That might help the scale. She does not have a problem with the 12 pitch.

Mr. Boardman stated they chose that for the headroom.

Mr. DeLeo asked how far the door will come out. Ms. Holt explained this was a roof over the landing with two columns.

Mr. Boardman clarified there will be a roof there.

Chairman Comoletti went back to siding.

Mr. Nugent stated what you see on the submission is what the siding will look like.

Mr. Boardman stated the shingles would be a more rigid product and is more aesthetically pleasing.

Ms. Schwickrath asked if there is a large price difference and Mr. Boardman confirmed this.

Chairman Comoletti questioned the estimate. Mr. Boardman stated this is for just what the board is seeing, but they wish to finish the inside as well. This committee can decide to push this further back and have the applicant come back in front of the board or the board can make the changes necessary at this meeting.

Ms. Schwickrath wanted one window to be larger.

Ms. Holt pointed out which window it was (one opposite the door on the first floor). If the applicant does this the board can accept the porthole window.

Mr. Nugent clarified a casement or porthole window and a larger window in the bathroom.

They discussed a shed dormer. Mr. Boardman asked if this would be more desirable to the board.

Chairman Comoletti was not sure, but aesthetically it may be better. The problem is that Mr. Boardman would need to come back in front of us for approval.

Mr. DeLeo felt that the board could have a special meeting and approve this due to time constraints.

Mr. Boardman asked if the board would like to see a rendering of a shed dormer.

Ms. Holt stated it would be a choice.

Mr. Boardman said he could probably talk him into that.

Comoletti stated they will send him off with a list regarding the windows how they discussed, vinyl shingle siding rather than clapboard siding.

Ms. Schwickrath asked if Mr. Boardman came back with the shed dormer would the money saved be enough for the applicant to afford the vinyl shingle siding.

Mr. Boardman stated that the applicants are still on the fence about doing this due to the time constraints and the tourist season approaching quickly. There is not really much time.

Chairman Comoletti asked what the board would like to do.

Ms. Holt stated the board can change the windows and the shingle siding, as we discussed, and I would be comfortable with approving that. She felt that due to the cost differences it would be beneficial for the applicant to look into the shed dormer and come back to us in a week.

Mr. DeLeo commented that most of the houses in the neighborhood have vinyl siding.

Chairman Comoletti stated that is true, but the board tries to stay away from that.

Mr. Boardman stated he prefers shingles, but when the customer asks for this it is what he needs to do. He explained there is no J-channel in the proposal.

Ms. Holt stated that helps and is good.

Chairman Comoletti asked the board how to act on this.

Ms. Holt asked the applicant if he would be interested in coming back in a week.

Mr. Boardman stated if he can get with the owners and convince them to do this.

Chairman Comoletti stated that he is going to have to do that for approval.

Mr. DeLeo commented that he did not like forcing people to do something they cannot afford and is above and beyond what they want to spend. He understands the windows and the dormers, but the vinyl within the neighborhood is not going to make a big difference.

Mr. Boardman stated the vinyl clapboards they manufacture now are a lot better then they have been ten years ago.

Chairman Comoletti asked if the board will consider accepting vinyl siding.

Mr. DeLeo asked if it is written in stone that no vinyl siding is allowed.

Chairman Comoletti stated no, but it is discouraged.

Ms. Schwickrath asked if the board wishes the applicant to go back to the owners for a plan with the other dormer.

<p>Mr. Nugent pointed out that Mr. DeLeo's observation was correct, and that is why the door is left ajar because the neighborhood around them is consistent with vinyl siding.</p> <p>Ms. Holt stated she can accept the vinyl siding the way it is presented, as long as the rest of the board does.</p> <p>Chairman Comoletti stated that the board can then accept the paperwork the way it is presented and not have any changes.</p> <p>Ms. Holt stated the one window change is the only thing the board would like to change.</p> <p>Chairman Comoletti stated that will be the only change.</p> <p>Mr. Nugent clarified the kitchen window will be either casement or porthole, but the bathroom window will need to be larger.</p> <p>The chair concurred.</p> <p>Mr. Nugent stated when the applicant brings that back he can scan and send it to the board via email.</p> <p>Ms. Holt moved to accept the application with the modification that the window in the bathroom being larger and a recommendation and willingness to consider a shed dormer option with a different fenestration.</p> <p>Ms. Schwickrath seconded.</p> <p><b><i>Motion passes unanimously</i></b></p>	<p><b>Motion</b></p> <p><b>Vote</b></p>
<p>Mr. DeLeo asked about existing lights on a façade grant project.</p> <p>Mr. Nugent stated there are prior pictures, and he will get back to him regarding that.</p>	
<p><b>Meeting Adjourned at    pm</b></p>	<p><b>ADJOURN</b></p>

*I, Tori Geaumont, Secretary to the Design Review Committee of the Town of Old Orchard Beach, do hereby certify that the foregoing document consisting of two(2) pages is a true copy of the original minutes of the Design Review Committee Meeting of February 28, 2011.*

*Tori Geaumont*