### OLD ORCHARD BEACH DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE August 3, 2015 - 6:00 pm Town of Old Orchard Beach Council Chambers

Call to Order at 6:00 pm		Call to Order
Comoletti.	Attending: Ray DeLeo, Kim Schwickrath, Mark Lindquist. Absent: Chair Don y Hinderliter; Town Planner, Valdine Camire; Administrative Assistant.	
The meeting	g was called to order at 6:15 pm.	
<u>ITEM 1</u> Proposal: Action: Owner:	Application Amendment- Remove existing building and construct three- story mixed use building Certificate of Appropriateness Ruling on Amendment Judd Sher	<u>ITEM 1</u>
Location:	55 East Grand Ave., MBL: 305-5-4, DD-2	
came back to a new revise so they deve height of the 45' and they cedar arbor, be PVC pair The base of larger than t	wid Lloyd from Archetype, P.A. introduced himself to the Board Members. DEP o them and said that they could not expand on the original footprint. He presented d proposal which is a smaller version of the other plans. They eliminated porches loped a white cedar arbor. Penthouse addition on top with a roof deck. The basic main building is 32'. The top is still within the towns zoning ordinance which is are at 44'9". The materials will stay basically the same. Cedar shingles, white where the addition was they have added some complimentary copper. Trim will ited, there will be a glass railing up on the top roof deck. the arbor will be set on concrete piers. The Northeast elevation windows will be ne original. On the Northwest there will be a fence railing detail. The rooftop xpanded. The "L" part of the house is gone.	
-	aist questioned the rooftop bbq pit. ated there will be an open fire pit fueled by propane.	
Jeffrey Hinderliter stated that this is basically an amendment to what they have already approved, so if the Board feels comfortable, they can move forward as such as an amendment to the approval.		
Kim Schwickrath made a motion to accept the amendment for 55 East Grand Avenue as stated on August 3, 2015. Seconded by Mark Lindquist.		MOTION
		VOTE
		(3-0)

Jeffrey Hinderliter called for the vote:         Mark Lindquist: Agree         Kim Schwickrath: Agree         Ray DeLeo: Agree         ITEM 2         Proposal:       Remodel 2 existing structures         Action:       Review application; Discussion; Recommendations to applicant; Certificate of Appropriateness;         Owner:       Karen Chandler         Location:       6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2         Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint on both buildings, eliminated the exterior staircase so everything sits on the original footprint.	<u>ITEM 2</u>
Kim Schwickrath: Agree         Ray DeLeo: Agree         ITEM 2         Proposal:       Remodel 2 existing structures         Action:       Review application; Discussion; Recommendations to applicant; Certificate of Appropriateness;         Owner:       Karen Chandler         Location:       6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2         Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	<u>ITEM 2</u>
Kim Schwickrath: Agree         Ray DeLeo: Agree         ITEM 2         Proposal:       Remodel 2 existing structures         Action:       Review application; Discussion; Recommendations to applicant; Certificate of Appropriateness;         Owner:       Karen Chandler         Location:       6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2         Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	<u>ITEM 2</u>
Ray DeLeo: Agree         ITEM 2         Proposal:       Remodel 2 existing structures         Action:       Review application; Discussion; Recommendations to applicant; Certificate of Appropriateness;         Owner:       Karen Chandler         Location:       6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2         Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	<u>ITEM 2</u>
ITEM 2         Proposal:       Remodel 2 existing structures         Action:       Review application; Discussion; Recommendations to applicant; Certificate of Appropriateness;         Owner:       Karen Chandler         Location:       6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2         Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	<u>ITEM 2</u>
Proposal:Remodel 2 existing structuresAction:Review application; Discussion; Recommendations to applicant; Certificate of Appropriateness;Owner:Karen ChandlerLocation:6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	<u>ITEM 2</u>
Proposal:Remodel 2 existing structuresAction:Review application; Discussion; Recommendations to applicant; Certificate of Appropriateness;Owner:Karen ChandlerLocation:6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	
Action:Review application; Discussion; Recommendations to applicant; Certificate of Appropriateness;Owner:Karen Chandler Location:Location:6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	
Certificate of Appropriateness;Owner:Karen ChandlerLocation:6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	
Owner:Karen ChandlerLocation:6 Brisson St., MBL: 304-1-10, DD-2Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	
Applicant John Petrocelli introduced himself to the Board Members. He informed them that they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	
they went back to the design of the house as more to the original house. They were told that they couldn't change the square footage (per DEP), so they went back to the original footprint	
Brought pictures of the abutting properties. They do not have an actual floor plan for the windows. The windows could vary. The elevation is approximately 5' with a half concrete foundation enough to get the egress windows for living area in the basement area. They will be using paradyne vinyl windows, on the front of the house the porch effect will be gliders to give it that front porch look. Kim Schwickrath stated that the Board Members would like to have renderings and a little more information about the project. She added that what the DRC approves gets built so that they need to be consistent about the requirements of the project. Mark Lindquist also agreed they need to create the finalized floor plan. Mr. Hinderliter went over the description of the property which seems complete in the application and the site plan represents some of the improvements. The applicant has submitted some of the materials; some cut sheets and proposed drawings of the proposed improvements. What would be up to the committee is to determine if 1) is what they have submitted and what was brought this evening is enough for them to approve or 2) provide your recommendation to the applicant and have them work with Jeffrey to do the final details. Jeffrey Hinderliter stated that he could do the void space to door/window calculation to figure out if it meets our standards. If the only adjustment that the board wants to see is the windows, Mr. Hinderliter stated that he feels comfortable working with the applicant.	

August 3, 2015 DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Town Council Chambers		
Jeffrey stated that if the board members feel comfortable with having him work with the		
applicant, his request is to get the exact cut sheets or manufacturing specs identifying what		
they will be doing with the windows and what is supposed to exist.		
The only other change that Mr. Hinderliter needs to see before he can sign off is the final		
elevation plans. All elevations and type of windows. Make sure that whatever is on the plan is		
shown.		
The applicant stated that he will being a completed set of plans showing all of the elevations,		
window locations, etc. at the next meeting.		
The applicant asked if decking is allowed? He would need to speak to DEP.		
Mr. Hinderliter added that if the Board agrees, the demo and rebuild can fall under the same administrative approval as long as it meets the applicable standards.		
Mark Lindquist made a motion to accept the proposal as revised application with a final components being reviewed by Jeffrey Hinderliter Administratively and when the final design meets the standards then we would be able to issue the Certificate of Appropriateness.		
Seconded by Ray DeLeo.		
Jeffrey Hinderliter called for the vote:		
Mark Lindquist: Yes	(2-1)	
Kim Schwickrath: No		
Ray DeLeo: Yes		
<u>ITEM 3</u>	ITEM 3	
Proposal: Demolish former parsonage, parking lot buffer		
Action: Review application; Discussion; Certificate of Appropriateness		
recommendation		
Owner: Good Shepard Parish		
Location: 6 Saco Ave., MBL: 206-30-1, DD-2		
David Gadbois, Business Coordinator and Robert Labelle, Project Coordinator for the Good		
Shepherd Parish introduced themselves to the Board Members.		
Ray DeLeo went over responses from the applicant:		
How many new parking spaces will be created?		
18-22 depending on amount of ledge.		
<ul> <li><u>Concerns about potential impacts of additional traffic introduced into the</u></li> </ul>		
neighborhood.		
	at 2 2015	

There should be no additional traffic. This will relieve some of the current on street parking. Currently our congregation parks along the neighboring streets when the existing lots are full. This includes A Street, Staples Street, Old Orchard Street and possible others.

• <u>Concerns about the additional traffic use of Adelaide Rd. as the exit to Saco Ave.</u> <u>They didn't seem concerned with the use of Summit St.</u>

The majority of the cars using the lot will do so during off peak hours (Sunday Morning).

We will encourage people to exit via Summit Street, but remain confident traffic will flow in the direction that leads to the most expedient route for egress.

- <u>Questioning whether a traffic study is needed. I informed them it is not, because</u> total vehicle trips at peak church service hours will not exceed 100 vehicles. I recommend you get a number of the vehicles that will use the parking lot. The current lot contains approximately 30 spaces. The total parking spaces for the current lot, plus the expansion, will total approximately 50 vehicles.
- <u>How will storm water be controlled and not impact abutting uses</u> (i.e.,flow,drainage systems).

Parking lot will be designed to conform to the natural topography of the site and preserve significant natural features and vegetative stands. Existing buffer zones will be added along A Street to created identifiable entrances. No additional impervious surfaces to be added to property. Upon completion of the project, storm water flows will be monitored and systems will be implemented should abutting properties be impacted.

- <u>When was the parsonage built?</u> Circa 1900 (Approximate per Lot Card)
- <u>Additional site lighting? If so, where will it be located and what type of fixtures</u> <u>will be used?</u>

No additional site lighting is planned at this time.

• They want a more detailed vegetation plan. Attached are the applicable parking lot landscaping standards. I recommend you demonstrate, in writing and on a plan, how the proposal complies with each of the 4 standards. This is part of DRC's review standards so I recommend you spend some time and do the best you can.

Screening: The current elevation provides visual screening from Saco Ave. and the lower part of Adeline.

Buffering: The entire perimeter of the parking lot (except along S St) is currently

August 3, 2015 DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Town Council Chambers	
buffered by vegetation. No changes to the current buffer along Saco Ave and the sole	
abutter on A Street (14 Summit St) are being considered.	
Street Trees: Existing healthy shade trees along Saco Ave and Adeline St. will remain.	
Island Plantings: (3) islands @ each of row terminus	
Shade trees: Add one shade tree in each island.	
Understory Plantings: To be added as needed.	
The Board Member discussed these Responses:	
Mark Lindquist had a concern about parishioners allowed to park in the turning lane	
along Saco Avenue on Sundays. Since St. Luke's Church closed as this adds to	
congestion and risk of safety for pedestrians.	
·····8······ ····· ······ ············	
Kim questioned why there is no ramp included in the design and what is the ADA	
requirements?	
Mr. Gadbois stated that the ADA requires 1 space for a 15 space lot. He added that	
most of the handicapped parking will be in the back parking lot.	
most of the numeroupped partning will be in the back partning for	
Mr. Lindquist mentioned that it makes sense that if they are going to create a whole	
new parking situation for the future needs of the church then consideration should be	
given to somehow creating greater accessibility.	
given to somehow creating greater accessionity.	
The board members were concerned with vandalism and lighting for the parking lot.	
The bourd memoers were concerned with valuation and righting for the parking for.	
Mr. Lindquist added that if the lot is used for other than parishioners then it should	
meet the standards for a commercial lot which would include lighting, proper buffering	
on the street entrances, etc.	
on the street entrances, etc.	
Ray DeLeo suggested to have some kind of screening to hide the cars that are going to	
park there.	
park there.	
Mark Lindquist stated that the board would like to see a plan of direction for the	
project needs to be created and put forth if it is going to be a church lot or everyday	
parking. And also make sure that everyone is not going to be negatively impacted.	
parking. And also make sure that everyone is not going to be negatively impacted.	
Laffrax mantioned to the board members that the board needs to concentrate on what is	
Jeffrey mentioned to the board members that the board needs to concentrate on what is	
under our jurisdiction such as lighting, vegetation, landscaping but not the details such	
as of where they can park and where they can enter or exit. Jeffrey also added that	
with codes signing off on it within our current ordinance standards it is a permissible	
use and that is how the parking was originally allowed to be established through the	
business licensing.	

The Board Members suggested that the applicant come back to the board with the following detailed list :	
• Lighting	
Landscaping	
• ADA documentation in terms of the number of spaces based on the 50 spots in that lot for this type of church usage (nonprofit).	
• Buffering on Saco Avenue, Adelaide Avenue and A Street.	
GOOD & WELFARE ADJOURNMENT	
The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.	

*I, Valdine Camire, Design Review Committee Clerk of the Town of Old Orchard Beach, do hereby certify that the foregoing document consisting of six (6) pages is a true copy of the original minutes of the Design Review Committee Meeting of August 3, 2015.* 

Valdine Camire

August 3, 2015 DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES