

Old Orchard Beach Design Review Committee Meeting Agenda Wednesday, January 27, 2010 at 6:00pm in Town Council Chambers

Call to Meeting to Order at 6:00pm

Roll Call: Don Comoletti, Shirley Holt, Ray Deleo. **Absent:** Kim Schwickrath & Lee Koenigs. **Staff:** Gary Lamb & Jessica Wagner.

Pledge to the Flag

ITEM 1: Review application and determine Design Review Certificate recommendation for 8 East Grand Avenue Façade Improvement (MBL 306-5-3)

Mr. Lamb: Thank you for making a quorum this evening to review this application. I'd like to make a few points before we begin: Ms. Sharri MacDonald was at the meeting last week by chance. She had a meeting in the next room and when it was complete she attended the DRC meeting. I have listened to Jan 21 meeting tapes and took 11 pages of notes, so I am well caught up on status of this application. Ms. Wagner has been working with applicant and towns consulting architect for months now on this and numerous other CDBG façade applications. Staff and architect went over our somewhat subjective DRC standards, looking for "shall vs. may" language. Shall obviously mandates inclusion, but most of our standards language is on the "may" or suggestive and non-mandatory side. It is logical to assume that review standards do not specifically exclude other architectural detailing. Hence Ms. Wagner's staff comments and new comments from towns consulting architect. Any subjective interpretations now need DRC clarification with your denial or approval of this application, including written findings in each relevant category.

Mr. Comoletti: Would the applicant care to make a presentation?

Mr. George Kerr (applicant): Thank you for tabling this application last meeting. I relied too much on the architect and did not provide enough detail for you to understand the building. I hope this time there is the detail you were looking for. I will take full responsibility of last meeting. We have been working on this for quite a while and we are trying our best to improve facades and streetscapes in town. I took your suggestions and recommendations and went back and worked with the architect. I am going to try to present for the architect, since the architect could not be here tonight. Chris Steel is also here. He is the owner of the Oasis.

The Oasis is a one-story building. We are speaking about 450sf of improvements. The windows are between 25% and 66%. The existing roofline is a shallow gabled roof. In the colored detail drawing, the orange layer is the wall surface, composed to hardieboard. The blue layer is made of wood and will be fastened to the wall surface. This detailing is intended to give the facade some depth. The red areas are trim made of wood. This will add accent to the curved sign and the parapet. These details show a change in the plane and provide detailing in the shadows. The architectural detailing on this building is both is both functional and ornamental. The details add both visual interest and provide water management systems. I think the pictures themselves show you the depth that I'm trying

to explain. With the drawings I have today, I think it clearly shows what the building will look like. I have taken your suggestions to heart and I have tried to implement them.

Mr. Comoletti: What are the materials on the building?

Mr. Kerr: The façade will be composed of hardieboard and wood will be used for accent panels and trim. The storefront systems will be metal and glass windows. The railings will be metal and the posts will be made of wood.

Mr. Comoletti: Would the Committee like to review each Design Review Standard individually and then vote at the end of the application?

Mr. Deleo and Ms. Holt agreed that would be best.

78-686(1) MASS & SCALE:

Ms. Holt: This is an existing one story building and will remain unchanging with this façade renovation.

Mr. Comoletti: I don't feel the existing building is compatible with the buildings that are around it. This is not being improved with this renovation. However, due to the fact that this is not new construction, we can not require it become a two-story building.

Mr. Deleo: I am fine with the mass and scale. Is the Mr. Goodbar awning the same height as the front parapet on the roof overhang?

Mr. Kerr: The awning at 6 East Grand is slightly taller than the roof overhang at 8 East Grand, but we are trying to create the impression that they are similar.

The committee voted 3-0 to approve this proposal in relation to the Mass and Scale standards.

78-686(2) BUILDING HEIGHTS:

Mr. Comoletti: As I stated prior, because this is not new construction, we can not require this building become a two-story building.

The committee voted 3-0 that this section is not applicable to the Building Heights standard because the height is unchanging.

78-686(3) ROOFLINES:

Ms. Holt: confirmed that the roofline was an existing gable roofline.

Mr. Kerr: yes, the existing façade has been built up to hide the gable roof.

Mr. Deleo: I want to know what one would see on the roof overhang while walking towards Old Orchard Street. What happens where curved signage panel is located?

Mr. Kerr: the roof overhang will be shingled and will be curved to fit the form of the fascia.

Ms. Holt: confirmed the roof shingles would be curved.

Mr. Comoletti: there is substantially more detail than we believed existed in the first submittal.

The committee voted 3-0 to approve this proposal in relation to the roofline standards.

78-686(4) FENESTRATION:

Mr. Comoletti: I measured the façade area from the overhang to the ground, and I calculated approximately 53%.

Ms. Wagner indicated that she measured from the parapet to the ground to get 40%.

Mr. Comoletti: either way, this application appears to be within the 25% to 60% range.

Ms. Holt: Because the windows are set back beneath a roof overhang, there is visual interest beyond the fenestration pattern. I don't know much about the historical period of this building, but it does not seem to conflict with the existing architectural style of this structure.

The Committee agreed that D, E, and F are not applicable.

Mr. Comoletti: the areas above the windows and doors are windows.

The committee voted 3-0 to approve this proposal in relation to the fenestration standards.

78-686(5) FACADE MATERIALS:

Ms. Holt indicated that the details added in this submission provide material and detail at an appropriate scale.

Mr. Comoletti indicated that he does not have an objection on materials. He agrees with Ms. Holt in regards to scale. Although the materials are not exactly in line with the Ordinance, we have allowed other work in the past to not fit this particular requirement.

Ms. Holt: the proposal meets the intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Deleo: agreed.

The Committee voted 3-0 that the proposed façade materials meet the intent of this 78-686(5)

The Committee read through 78-686(5)(a)-(g).

Mr. Deleo: I would like there to be a frame within the metal panels below the windows.

Mr. Kerr: I agree. I believe that would provide depth to the structure. We will ensure that happens.

The Committee voted 3-0 that a-g is in compliance with this façade renovation.

78-686(6) ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS:

Ms. Holt: this comes a lot closer to the buildings around it. If I read this section literally, it fulfills the intent of the section.

Mr. Deleo: the awning posts also add architectural detail.

Mr. Comoletti: we are creating visual character, but we are not following the appropriate methods as shown. I agree with Ms. Holt. This meets the intent of this Ordinance section.

Mr. Lamb: I agree with Shirley, the architectural detailing that can be seen tonight is far greater than what was originally presented. It is up to the committee to decide if this proposal fits.

Ms. Holt: if you tried to do more detail, I feel it would be too busy.

Mr. Comoletti: the architectural details meet the intent of the ordinance.

The Committee voted 3-0 to approve this proposal in relation to the Architectural Detail standards.

78-686(7) FENCES, RAILINGS and STEPS:

Mr. Kerr: there will be wood posts and metal railings.

Mr. Comoletti: I would prefer you wrap the wood in azek painted black or some kind of metal material to be maintenance free.

Ms. Holt: pointed out that too many horizontal railings will make the building look shorter, and this is already a short building. However, I think this railing system is fairly consistent with the style of this building.

Mr. Deleo: this looks like a cruise ship railing.

Mr. Kerr: that is good because that is the look we are going for.

Mr. Comoletti: there are three subsections here. Which does this agree with? Would you say it meets the intent of this ordinance section?

The Committee voted 3-0 in agreement that this fits the intent of the Fences, Railings and Steps design standard.

Mr. Deleo: motion to recommend a Design Review Certificate for 8 East Grand Avenue Façade Improvement (MBL 306-5-3), as presented with the following two changes: there be raised panels on the storefront panels below the windows and the wood posts be wrapped in a plastic or metal material other than pressure treated wood.

Ms. Holt: seconded the motion.

Committee approved the motion with a 3-0 vote.

Mr. Kerr: I want to thank the committee and the grant program. I know at times, it seems it was confrontational, but that is based in the subjectivity of the ordinance. I think in the end, something good came out of it. We are excited to start construction. Thank you.

GOOD & WELFARE

No Comments.

Meeting adjourned 7:10pm.

I, Jessica M. Wagner, Secretary to the Planning Board of the Town of Old Orchard Beach, do hereby certify that the foregoing document consisting of four (4) pages is a true copy of the original minutes of the Design Review Committee meeting of January 27, 2010.