

Town of Old Orchard Beach
Design Review Committee
October 6, 2014 6:00pm

Call to Order at 6:05pm	Call to Order
Roll Call: Don Comoletti, Chair of the Board, Kim Schwickrath, Ray DeLeo, Mark Lindquist, Staff: Larry Mead, Town Manager, Jeffrey Hinderliter, Town Planner, Molly Phillips, Meeting Minute Notetaker.	
Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag	
<p>Item 1: Replace windows and siding at Old Orchard Beach Town Hall: Review revised application and Certificate of Appropriateness recommendation. Town of Old Orchard Beach 1 Portland Ave., MBL 205-2-1</p> <p>Comments from Jeffrey Hinderliter: Outline of the information on notes from previous meetings: DRC requests and notes on changes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Older Pictures of town hall (pre 1992) to determine if the proposed siding and windows replicate what the building looked like with the intent to bring the appearance back to the original or near original look. 2. Considering the size/scale of the project, will the budgeted money allow for completion of the project? 3. Materials should be more specific. 4. Are historic architectural features to be reincorporated or maintained? <p>Response to DRC Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Town Hall pictures were gathered. Historic pictures of town hall are attached to this memo. According to Dan Blaney, the date of the pictures is around 1910. 2. Budget. I spoke to Larry Mead, Town Manager, concerning the budget and he stated the project is designed so it will not exceed the budgeted amount. When the project originally went out to bid, it was found the budgeted amount would not cover the costs of the project; therefore, did not move forward with permitting and construction. Post bid, the town discussed the project with several contractors and its consulting engineer. As a result of these discussions, dedicated funds were increased for the project in the FY15 budget to ensure the project will be fully funded. Total budget is \$192,000. 3. Materials: (more specific) <p><u>Siding:</u> CertainTeed Cedar Impressions Triple 5 Edge Perfection shingles-vinyl siding. The color is Sterling Gray and appears to match the existing color fairly closely. Actual samples versus images from the website will be used in selecting the final color for the siding to ensure the chosen color is as close to the existing as possible. See attachments.</p> <p><u>Trim:</u> The trim will be replaced with PVC trim boards manufactured by</p>	Item 1

Azek or CertainTeed. Trim board profiles and moldings will include rabbited edge trim boards that receive and conceal the edge of the siding similar to a quality installation of wood siding and trim. These materials come standard in white and would only require touch up painting at the nail holes. Finish will match existing. See attachments.

Windows: In keeping with a low maintenance approach of materials that do not require painting, the replacement windows will be PVC. Typical manufacturers of this type of window are again CertainTeed, Anderson and Paradigm. Paradigm offers more options for integral trim, but since the existing windows have a very limited trim profile any of these manufacturers would be suitable. Anderson 400 Series or A Series Double-Hung windows are the preferred choice as they are extremely energy efficient; allow for easy cleaning; include architecturally inspired design; and provide special protections for applications in coastal environments. White is the standard color which matches the existing windows. See attachments.

4. Are historic architectural features to be reincorporated or maintained? At this time, the project budget only includes siding, trim, and window replacement. There are no specific Architectural Details, as identified in 78-686 (6), to be altered as part of this project. Other items can be budgeted during future fiscal years but the current project is to address more immediate needs such as weatherization.

Kim Schwickrath asks: Are the railings going to be left untouched or are they included?

Larry Mead responds: The railings will be repaired in kind if time and budget allow. Also the trim that is rotted will be replaced.

Don Comoletti asks: Is our budget number still the same? In my experience that's not going to be enough. Are these Anderson windows?

Larry Mead responds: Yes, they are based on engineering firm pricing and proposals. I believe they are the same windows as the Historical Society which are Anderson windows.

Ray DeLeo asks if the roof will be included as well as the tower? Is the siding going to be replaced?

Larry Mead responds: We had a meeting with a structural engineer to inspect the towers which has some rot but not a significant amount. The roof is in need of maintenance as well as the tower but are not in immediate danger. With sufficient funds minimal work would be done this time around but the focus of the project this time would be the windows. The rot on the window sills is most immediate, because it appears to not be protected from water or installed correctly. Eventually all the repairs that need to be made will be, it's

a matter of requesting the capital funds from the Council.

Don Comoletti asks if the siding is being replaced could we consider insulation and increasing the R value?

Mark Lindquist asks does this include decorative molding and the compromised areas of the roof?

Larry Mead responds: I'm planning on bringing the engineer back and seeing the whole building from the outside to address those things as well.

Mark Lindquist asks once we remove the shingles, sheeting and discover these problems are we going to have the money to cover these costs or is there a long-range plan in place to fix these things?

Larry Mead responds: I would have to get these quotes in and do the requests from the Council. The current Council is in favor of investing in this building and staying here rather than finding other facilities. Which requires investment. It's adequate for the staffing and I wouldn't go to the voters to propose building a new Town Hall. (General agreement with that statement on the part of board members present.) This building has significant historical value.

Architectural Design Standards:

1. **Mass and Scale:** no change
2. **Building heights:** no increase or decrease
3. **Rooflines:** Will not alter rooflines
4. **Fenestration:** a.) Window and door arrangement will not change. b.) Windows will be replaced in the same location as they exist. New windows will not alter visual rhythm and symmetry in the façade. Doors are not part of this proposal. c.) Window dimensions are the same as what exists. d.) Proposed windows will have the same dimensions as existing windows. e.) Ribbon windows and curtain glass walls are not proposed. f.) Conservatories and curtain glass walls are not part of this proposal.

Don Comoletti asks if the original windows had a 6 over 6 configuration and if we are considering replicating the old sashes from the original drawing?

Ray DeLeo comments: The windows facing Old Orchard seem to be 2 over 2.

Jeffrey Hinderliter comments: These pictures are all that we received and I did contact Dan Blaney. I think Mark sent some.

Don Comoletti comments: I did search the internet and looked at old postcards. It's hard to believe there are no good pictures of this building.

Mark Lindquist comments: That's the picture I got from the Maine Historical Society and it actually hangs in the Biddeford Library. It's 20" X 30" which would provide more detail. I think in the last re-model these windows haven't done the building justice. I think we should try to replicate the historic nature.

Jeffrey Hinderliter comments: Clearly in the picture it shows in the windows facing Old Orchard that there are dividers looking like 2 over 1 in the 4th floor or upper story. The windows on the parking lot side seem to have no divider.

Larry Mead comments: I can only see dividers in the upper story 2 over 1.

Don Comoletti comments: It's difficult to tell from these pictures which have been hand colored. There are insertable grilles, depends on which windows are available, I think we need more research.

Ray DeLeo comments: There are things that I have been made to do to comply with this including inserting grilles. We are opening a can of worms for people in the area to say, 'I had to do this, why didn't the Town Hall?'

Don Comoletti comments: I think we have a responsibility to know what was historically accurate and then make compromises. We should do the best we can.

Back to standards:

5. **Façade Materials:** façade materials include vinyl and glass windows (preferred: Andersen 400 series or A series); Cedar Impressions siding with cedar shake design (Triple 5 Edge Perfection shingles); Azek or CertainTeed rabbited edge trim. The purpose is to replicate the existing siding, trim and windows with modern materials while maintaining the buildings historic appearance.
6. **Architectural Details:** There are no specific architectural details proposed.
7. **Fences, railings and steps:** Fences, railings and steps are not part of this proposal.

Don Comoletti: I believe we've already voted to complete the application.

Jeffrey Hinderliter comments: As I understand it, the committee will make a favorable recommendation but will require further historical research and if the windows are 6 over 6 we can then address that. We will move forward with the bidding process with the understanding that we are hoping for historical replication and accuracy.

Kim Schwickrath asks: How many bids are you getting? Is it union or non-union?

Larry Mead the engineering firm would put out the bids and then we could

<p>open it to the general bid. It does not have to be union.</p> <p>Motion to issue Certificate of Appropriateness by Kim Schwickrath with stipulation that the historical significance of the windows be investigated and put into the bidding process.</p> <p>Seconded: Ray DeLeo and Mark Lindquist</p> <p>All in agreement.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Motion</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Vote 3 Yes 0 No</p>
<p>Item 2 & 3:</p> <p>Proposal: Construct 50 X 100 building on a vacant lot Action: Review application; Provide recommendations Owner: Ike Naim Location: 29 Old Orchard Street, MBL: 206-31-5</p> <p>Proposal: Construct 50 X 120 building on a vacant lot Action: Review application; Provide recommendations Owner: Ike Naim Location: 36 Old Orchard Street, MBL: 205-3-8</p> <p>Representing Client: Jeffrey Halverty, Weger Architects We are trying to meeth the mass and scale, referencing design guidelines and the architectural details in the area.</p> <p>Don Comoletti comments: Does 36 have a flat roof? Does 29 have a flat roof too?</p> <p>Jeffrey Halverty: Yes 36 does but 29 doesn't. Either can be done in either way. The gable is just for a change.</p> <p>Don Comoletti asks: Has it been suggested to build a second story or use a second story?</p> <p>Jeffrey Halverty: That was the first thing we suggested to the client but he has no interest in building up. A neighbor had a not wonderful experience.</p> <p>Don Comoletti asks: Is there any additional equipment going on roofs?</p> <p>Jeffrey Halverty: Yes, we will have two condensing units that will be going on top and covered by a parapet which will hide them from the street.</p> <p>Don Comoletti asks: Would you consider a railing to cover up the equipment like the building behind it? (a false top that would extend beyond the actual building height in length and width to cover any rooftop equipment)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Item 2 & 3</p>

<p>Jeffrey Halverty: Yes.</p> <p>Any further comments:</p> <p>Jeffrey Hinderliter: Because this is a significant building project this is also under review by the Planning Board. Which gives us some time to think about this. Because of its prominent location I would suggest a scheduled site walk and get the feel of the project which won't delay the process but help us to give a better recommendation.</p> <p>Ray DeLeo: I would also like to suggest a picture to be made that would include the buildings 4-5 buildings down to help us compare with the other buildings on the street. It looks very similar to another building 2 buildings down the hill.</p> <p>Don Comoletti: It should be done. (to Jeffrey Halverty) Can you do this for us?</p> <p>Jeffrey Halverty: Yes. Absolutely we can. You want a peripheral view getting in the buildings on the sides.</p> <p>Kim Schwickrath: So, for lack of a better term, one is round and one is pointy? (referring to the profile of entry foyer on the front street side)</p> <p>Ray DeLeo asks: Is this seasonal? Will this building be heated?</p> <p>Jeffrey Halverty: Yes it will be heated.</p> <p>Don Comoletti: There's barely any room in between buildings.</p> <p>Jeffrey Halverty: Because of the zoning in this district there is a 0 property line as long as there is fire wall protection.</p> <p>Jeffrey Hinderliter recommends: Since we do have time to consider this project we don't have to complete this application right away. We can delay to at least the next meeting.</p> <p>Mark Lindquist asks: What about lighting? We have a lot of goosenecks. (The rest of the board agrees the goosenecks are commonly used.)</p> <p>Jeffrey Halverty: There is lighting in the plan but we have no plans for expressed architectural elements to signage or lighting. We wanted to eliminate them to meet any signage and lighting standard but we could incorporate them. We could share some options as well.</p> <p>Kim Schwickrath asks: Is there an entry here?</p> <p>Jeffrey Halverty explains: Yes, because of those zero property lines we wanted to provide an entry space but still be compliant. This is traditional with small</p>	
---	--

<p>towns.</p> <p>Jeffrey Hinderliter: If you would like a site meeting when would you like that to happen? I can poll everyone. I would prefer 5-7 days in advance by late next week.</p> <p>The board agrees to Thursday October 16th, 2014 or the Friday after Columbus Day.</p>	<p>No Motion until Site Walk</p> <p>No Vote</p>
<p>Other Business:</p> <p>Ordinances:</p> <p>Jeffrey Hinderliter: The Comprehensive Plan Committee is asking for input and a more formal discussion would be appreciated as we think about future ordinances. I would like to put this on the November meeting. First Monday of the Month, the 3rd of November.</p> <p>Mark Lindquist: I won't be present for that meeting.</p> <p>Jeffrey Hinderliter: Since I would like to have the full committee for this discussion we can wait for December. Because the DRC portion isn't huge, in the greater plan we can wait for December.</p> <p>Kim Schwickrath suggests maybe an alternate meeting time be presented since the board is willing to be flexible.</p> <p>Don Comoletti brings up a concern about the building across from Soho before a building with yellow awning. A building that previously came to the board and built a dog house on the roof to accommodate the stairs without approval. The windows are blown out and the garage hardware is on the ground.</p> <p>Jeffrey Hinderliter: The DRC ordinances say that under 500sf the project goes under Administrative Review. They are replacing the windows and building a matching dog house. If I am thinking of the same property?</p> <p>Don Comoletti: I am concerned they are going to use the garage or living space.</p> <p>Jeffrey Hinderliter: I think this is 62 W. Grand Ave. I will check that out. As an aside, I've done the Annual Report from June 30th, 2013 to July 1st, 2014 and we've done twice the amount of permits from the year previous. I think there were 20-21 total and 7 were administrative which I think total we only did 11 the previous fiscal year.</p> <p>The Board compliments Jeffrey on the great job he is doing as Town Planner. Jeffrey Hinderliter receives comment about a museum and adds:</p>	

<p>Planning Board is reviewing a plan on Wild Dunes Way by Milliken Mills Pond MBL: 105A-1-200, the design needs some help. Jeffrey's recommendation is to preserve the brick building and convert it to a museum. Asking for leverage or support to make sure that structure is preserved.</p>	
<p>Motion to Adjourn by Kim Schwickrath seconded by Mark Lindquist</p>	<p>Motion</p> <p>Vote 3 Yes 0 No</p>
<p>Adjournment at 7:11pm</p>	<p>Adjournment</p>

I, Molly Phillips, Design Review Committee Clerk of the Town of Old Orchard Beach, do hereby certify that the foregoing document consisting of eight (8) pages is a true copy of the original minutes of the Design Review Committee Meeting of October 6, 2014.

Molly Phillips