



Design Review Minutes

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Monday, May 1st, 2023 @ 6:00pm
Council Chambers - 1 Portland Avenue

www.oobmaine.com/design-review-board

Call to order 6:02 PM

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Present:	Absent:
Gary Luca	Frank Manduca
Richard Pelletier	
Kim Schwickrath	
Don Comoletti	

REGULAR BUSINESS

Item 1 – Election of Design Review Committee officers for chair and vice chair

Associate Planner Foster explained that elections are needed for committee officers.

Chair Don Comoletti asked if we remembered when they last voted.

Associate Planner Foster responded it had been awhile but we would need to go back and look at the date.

Chair Comoletti stated he would still be chair unless someone else was interested.

Richard Pelletier made a motion to elect Don Comoletti as chair.

Seconded by Kim Schwickrath.

All in favor 3-0. Unanimous.

Don nominated Gary Luca for Vice Chair.

Seconded by Kim.

1 All in favor 3-0. Unanimous.

2

3 **Item 2** – Discussion on Sec. 78-686. - Design standards for new
4 construction and building rehabilitation

5 Associate Planner Foster opened item with application classification for what falls
6 under admin or committee, and then under replacement, additions, modifications,
7 and specifics like expanding decks and porches. This refers to design standards.

8

9 Richard asked if the requirements for application are clear, because what is
10 submitted for review seems to be a weakness? They aren't bringing samples.
11 Associate Planner Foster responded that part is clear, it is just getting them to
12 submit it.

13

14 Chair Comoletti asked when staff gets to meet with applicants prior to review?
15 Associate Planner Foster responded that it depends, that is part of the challenge.
16 We don't like to treat after the fact applications differently but sometimes we kind
17 of have to. If it comes to us when work is in process, sometimes review gets rushed
18 a little more than it should be. That is an internal issue.

19

20 Richard went over the application requirements, highlighting importance of cut
21 sheets.

22 Associate Planner Foster added that having accurate drawings is important
23 especially when looking back at what was approved.

24 Kim asked what level of drawings they should require?

25 Richard added a reasonable rendering would be adequate. With planning board
26 review of new structure, they will need more anyway.

27 Associate Planner Foster responded that depending on requirements for admin
28 review it is different based on level of construction.

29

30 Chair Comoletti stated for smaller improvements they shouldn't require applicants
31 to spend more on architecture design than they are on the project itself.

32 The board agreed they would send someone away if they don't have what they
33 need in the application to review the project.

34 Associate Planner Foster responded that they application has been reviewed. It
35 depends what they are looking at. They application covers a lot that isn't always
36 applicable to some of these proposals. For application materials the ordinance is
37 straight forward and similar for admin and design review, site plan to scale showing
38 site features, buildings, drives, sidewalks, utility lines, lighting, and building
39 elevations drawn to scale.

40

41 Chair Comoletti referenced the previous application to raise the cottage. It wasn't
42 to scale. We work with people with a time crunch, but maybe we should stop doing
43 that.

1 Associate Planner Foster added it is up to the committee.
2 Richard referenced previous approval where they didn't have a rendering and made
3 improvements to materials based on the committee's feedback. When they left
4 with approval we didn't actually have a rendering for the work approved. What we
5 have on file is important.
6
7 Kim mentioned that they shouldn't give in to people and everyone who is required
8 to based on rules should have proposals reviewed.
9 Associate Planner Foster asked about reviews of the pier?
10 Chair Comoletti referenced the Grand Vic kiosks.
11 Kim referenced review of the electronic sign on the pier.
12
13 Associate Planner Foster stated that under the qualification the only one that
14 references within view of a public street or sidewalk is, construction or alteration of
15 new or existing decks, porches, stairs, patios, fences, walls, and any other structure
16 within view of a public street or sidewalk.
17 The board agreed it should be any structure and simplified to say such.
18
19 Associate Planner Foster pointed out that the guidance for regulation goes to the
20 design standards so what we have any say in is these 7 items; mass & scale,
21 building height, rooflines, fenestration, façade materials, architectural details, and
22 fences, railings, and steps.
23 One of these should be mechanical. We have talked about utilities but what is that
24 regulation. In draft it falls under fencing for shielding requirements.
25 Kim mentioned a miscellaneous category.
26
27 Associate Planner Foster referenced mass & scale as being self-explanatory.
28 Building heights are straightforward. Rooflines is wordy and I don't know myself
29 what these pitches are.
30 Chair Comoletti mentioned that they are significant pitches, what you would want
31 to build if you have a lot of snow. Don't know why they are in here, we have flat
32 roofs in some areas.
33
34 Richard added mechanicals are important and come up for where they are going.
35 Chair Comoletti added satellites and others.
36 Associate Planner Foster would want to go back to the list. Façade materials,
37 number 5, preferred material is wood clapboards or cedar shingles.
38 Kim mentioned this goes back 30 years.
39 Associate Planner Foster was surprised to see wood replacement shingles used on
40 the church.
41 Richard pointed out it says preferred and preferred is wood. You can add other
42 materials must be approved by design review.
43 Associate Planner Foster doesn't know if they need red brick, stucco, concrete,

1 vinyl listed out like it is.
2 Chair Comoletti mentioned they had aluminum siding but not vinyl. I don't think we
3 would want to see a metal fab building in these zones. This could be taken out.
4
5 Associate Planner Foster mentioned some standards are lie they were pulled from a
6 city historic district. Last updates were 2001 but we would need to see what was
7 changed.
8
9 Richard is thinking of wording about mechanicals and anything ancillary to the
10 building like dishes.
11 Kim added everything should be shown on the rendering.
12 The committee discussed rubbish containers.
13 Associate Planner Foster pointed out that there is an enclosure requirement, but if
14 you look around in summer it doesn't seem to be enforced.
15 The committee discussed enforcement falling on the building inspector, but they
16 have other things going on.
17
18 Associate Planner Foster asked are we capturing everything, and are there other
19 things we care about?
20 Chair Comoletti mentioned exposed or visible auxiliary equipment. Harold's is an
21 example with the heat pumps on the side. They would do what we wanted, and
22 when we looked back the application wasn't as clear as they thought.
23
24 Richard wants to eliminate the chance of someone arguing a satellite dish isn't
25 mechanical.
26 Associate Planner Foster would need to review draft language. I have a better
27 understanding now as to ordinance drafting requirements.
28
29 Gary Luca asked about interns.
30 Associate Planner Foster we do usually get interns but they are working on other
31 projects for planning.
32
33 Chair Comoletti mentioned the Waves motel statue and including statues not just
34 buildings for review requirements.
35
36 Associate Planner Foster referenced that we got into murals a little and if it is a sign
37 or art.
38 Chair Comoletti mentioned the candy shop at the top of the square with banners,
39 signs, pictures, and ribbons.
40 Associate Planner Foster has approved sign permits there and another item was
41 after the fact when they were replacing. Murals could be art. I personally like them.
42 There is one at Beach Bagel, St. Tropez, and Café 64. I have even seen people
43 taking pictures in front of them, hopefully for a good reason.

1 Chair Comoletti said a mural is a sign as far as he is concerned because it is
2 advertising. It even says the business name for Café 64.
3
4 Associate Planner Foster referenced colors and making specifications.
5 Chair Comoletti would like to see them not be specific but elude to color scheme
6 that is appropriate for location.
7 Kim thinks they need to be more specific. Is it seaside/Victorian village?
8 Associate Planner Foster mentioned people have let them specify colors.
9 Chair Comoletti asked about what they are trying to maintain. Someone could say I
10 am going to paint this red because this was Victorian.
11 Richard said murals could be added in under architectural details.
12
13 Chair Comoletti said they discussed specific features, but haven't put them under a
14 specific name.
15 Associate Planner Foster stated people ask about the character, you could have
16 three buildings in a row, all with a different look and built different years.
17 Richard asked isn't that the purpose of the design review committee?
18 Chair Comoletti asked what is the feeling we are trying to create here? Muted
19 colors, careful created signs, but that might not be practical here.
20
21 Richard pointed out Old Orchard Beach isn't York or Ogunquit, it is different. We
22 need to come up with that theme. It could take 20 years. Don't forget York had all
23 the historic buildings, it is different than here.
24
25 Chair Comoletti added they need to work towards visual image description and get
26 it into words. This would be helpful to the person submitting the application. They
27 need consistency to get things cleaned up.
28
29 Richard added that they need to be cautious because what about the next person
30 using vinyl siding. He wouldn't want to see the inn with vinyl siding. Economically
31 the town is in good shape they should be able to ask for what they want, it's the
32 matter of what do they want.
33
34 Chair Comoletti responded they buckle sometimes under the time issue, where
35 people are looking for approval for that season.
36 Associate Planner Foster added if it requires site plan that is at least two meetings
37 with planning board. Timelines for planning board were discussed.
38
39 **ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES**
40 Accept the meeting minutes of the 4/3/2023 meeting
41 Associate Planner Foster mentioned they don't have anything else and the minutes
42 were not completed.
43
44

1 **GOOD & WELFARE**

2 Chair Comoletti referenced the demo at Waves and windows that have been
3 moved on the side of the building facing the street that he doesn't recall them
4 approving.

5 Associate Planner Foster mentioned they did administratively approve a ground
6 floor porch and entrance to Ocean House, shown in rendering. For committee
7 approval they approved building demo on corner of West Grand and Pierce Street,
8 off street parking area construction, modification of signage, and installation of
9 accessible ramp access to main building.

10
11 Kim asked if codes goes back and said it wasn't done to plan?

12 Associate Planner Foster responded they would need to see the approval and
13 building permit for what was permitted.

14 Chair Comoletti asked who reviews the building permit against what was approved.

15 Associate Planner Foster said he does but there isn't a specific step and it doesn't
16 always happen. Ideally, we would get before and after photos to compare.

17 Chair Comoletti discussed the previous gelato building approval on West Grand
18 where it went from housing to a mixed use that they didn't approve.

19
20 Kim mentioned the entrance gateway should be cleaned up with a nice entry, not a
21 hay bale with a pumpkin and piece of fencing.

22 The committee discussed gateway treatments and examples in other states and
23 towns.

24 Associate Planner Foster added they are still studying the gateway in regards to
25 traffic and there may be recommendations for this area. There have been proposals
26 in that area that required traffic movement permits from DOT but nothing has
27 come for review or permitting. When he started the draft gateway ordinance was
28 being presented. It seemed the planning board took issue with including single
29 family, but not the other aspects.

30 Chair Comoletti referenced the storage building and general look in the gateway.

31
32 Associate Planner Foster added that because the existing design isn't clear, this
33 needs to get cleaned up before going into the overlay ordinance.

34 Richard added it depends on what is the zoning, it is mixed. Look at the functionally
35 obsolete buildings, these would require review under an overlay. One is Norman's
36 motel. We could look at them and get an inventory.

37
38 **ADJOURNMENT**

39 Chair Comoletti asked for motion to adjourn. Richard made motion to adjourn,
40 seconded by Kim. Adjourned 7:07 pm

41
42 *I, Michael Foster, Town of Old Orchard Beach Associate Town Planner, do hereby certify that the foregoing*
43 *document consisting of Six (6) pages is a true copy of the original minutes of the Design Review Committee*
44 *Meeting of May 1, 2023.*

45
x 

Michael Foster