

City of Hallowell
Planning Board Meeting
September 21, 2016
7:00 pm

1. Call to Order

Ms. Obery called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call / Quorum

Ms. Obery took the roll call and established a quorum.

Present: Danielle Obery (Chair), Richard Bostwick, Darryl Brown, Daniel Davis, Judith Feinstein, Andrew Landry (2nd alt.), Jane Orbeton, Rosemary Presnar

Richard Dolby, Interim Code Enforcement Officer; Nate Rudy, City Manager

Excused: Amy Mills (1st alt.)

Mr. Landry will not be voting.

3. Public Comments (The Board has agreed to limit the time allotted to Public Comment to fifteen minutes.)

Mr. Dolby informed the Board that the City has received the proposed Master Plan for the Stevens School Planned Development. He said he will review the application for provisional completeness by the September 30 deadline set by Ordinance. He suggested a member of the Board assist him.

Mr. Rudy told the Board that he has received three applications for Code Enforcement Officer and will begin interviews soon. He also told the Board that the City has decided to seek a volunteer historic consultant and asked the Board members to suggest possible individuals.

4. Approval of Minutes of the July 20, 2016 Planning Board Meeting

Motion to approve the minutes of the July 20, 2016 meeting as presented.

Moved: Orbeton

Seconded: Presnar

Unanimously approved,
Davis abstaining

5. Historic District Certificate of Appropriateness Application for David Anderson & Jean Kirkpatrick, 18 Warren Street, Map 9 Lot 31

David Anderson presented an application for installation of replacement windows. He explained that the existing windows are in poor shape and require repeated repair. They want to replace them with Paradigm or Harvey replacement windows. The replacements would be double-hung – two-over-two. There are 29 windows in all, and they would like to replace them in two or three phases due to cost and financing.

Ms. Orbeton asked about the windows with awnings; Mr. Anderson said those would not be replaced, only the windows that are numbered on the photographs. Ms. Orbeton asked if there would be any changes in the size of the glass or the width of the frames; Mr. Anderson said he did not know if the windows would be manufactured with wider framing, only that they will fit the same size openings. He added that the bedroom windows must comply with the standards for secondary means of egress, so they might have to be casement windows that look like double-hung windows when closed. Ms. Orbeton observed that it is important to retain the trim and that the proportions and general dimensions stay the same. She expressed concern about casements and asked for photos of the replacement windows. She said she had no problems with phasing the installation. Mr. Anderson pointed out that there are currently triple-track aluminum storm windows which will be removed.

Mr. Bostwick asked if the current windows meet the standards for secondary means of egress. Mr. Anderson said he thought they were too small. Only one third floor window leading to an outside stairway is clearly compliant. Mr. Bostwick said that he was also concerned about the width of the frames; Mr. Anderson said he was not certain of the manufacturer's ability to produce narrower frames.

There was a discussion of how the project might be phased. There was a discussion of the requirements for secondary means of egress. Ms. Orbeton asked the Code Enforcement Officer to work with Mr. Anderson to create a plan.

Mr. Brown pointed out that the application is not complete without examples of what the replacement windows will look like. Mr. Landry pointed out that Life Safety issues override historic appearance.

Motion to continue the application to the next meeting and ask the applicants to provide specific information about the windows and how they wanted to phase the installation.

Moved: Orbeton

Seconded: Brown

Unanimously approved

Mr. Anderson pointed out that the third floor windows are already replacement windows. He also told the Board that he will be abroad during the last two weeks of October but will see if his contractor can represent him.

6. Historic District Certificate of Appropriateness Application for Michelle AuCoin-Giroux, 3 Middle Street, Map 5 Lot 75

Ms. Obery told the Board the applicant had requested to have this application postponed to the October meeting.

7. Historic District Certificate of Appropriateness Application for Andrea Lapointe, 132 second Street, Map 9 Lot 142

Andrea Lapointe and Michael Barden presented an application to amend a previously approved application by adding approval for construction of a storage room and deck on a concrete slab, construction of a portico for the front door, and installation of a fence on the deck.

Ms. Lapointe explained that the house is a much-modified Greek-Revival and originally had porches on both the north and south sides. In preparing for construction of the deck, they uncovered the foundation for the north side porch which required them to alter their plans. They want to construct a storage shed below street level and build the deck over it. They have installed the slab, which has to be slightly wider than the storage shed; the walls and support for the deck will be five feet from the side lot line. In order to provide some sort of barrier for privacy, they want to install some recycled fencing along the side of the deck. They also want to add a Greek-Revival portico around the front door. They will rebuild the existing retaining wall as the true lot boundary.

Ms. Feinstein asked if the portico would be added around the existing door; Ms. Lapointe said it would.

Ms. Orbeton asked if the shed would be below the deck; Ms. Lapointe said it would. It will be the length of the building and about ten feet high. There will be a custom-built door seven feet wide and the height of the shed. Ms. Orbeton asked if the Board had previously approved replacement of the front door; Ms. Lapointe said that was so.

Ms. Feinstein asked if the shed would be accessed only from outside; Ms. Lapointe said there would not be any interior entrance, only the exterior door which faces east.

Mr. Brown asked what materials would be used for construction of the shed; Mr. Barden said it would be built with pressure-treated wood for the deck and the wall below the deck would be sided with vinyl siding. The shed will have a separate roof below the deck floor.

Mr. Bostwick observed that there was no good graphic of the project. He asked what material would be used for the portico. Ms. Lapointe said they would use a kit with either wood or plastic. Mr. Bostwick said he had no clear idea of what the project would look like. Mr. Barden explained the lattice approved for the deck would be replaced with a fence. Ms. Orbeton asked what style of fence they were proposing. Mr. Barden said they wanted to use a six-foot fence instead of a four-foot fence to improve privacy. The deck would be open on the Second Street side with the fence on the remaining two sides.

Ms. Orbeton asked Mr. Dolby to comment on the project. Mr. Dolby said that it was a positive move to replace the posts with a solid wall. The proposed six-foot fence with a scalloped top to provide privacy is also desirable. He pointed out that the narrower shed door prevents use as a garage. He added that portico kits are rarely wood now; usually they are plastic foam or solid plastic that lasts longer than wood.

Ms. Orbeton asked to see the plan from the previous application; Mr. Barden provided it and showed it to the Board.

Mr. Landry asked about drainage from the shed roof; Ms. Lapointe said the five-foot setback will be gravel to provide drainage and the shed will have gutters.

Ms. Presnar asked for clarification of the application which says there will be an electric custom garage door with windows on the north side. Ms. Lapointe said that was an error and it should say the east wall, not the north wall.

Ms. Orbeton observed that the applicants have been doing a nice job on the house and she felt the portico was a good idea, but she felt the scalloped-top fence was not a good fit with the Greek-Revival style. Ms. Lapointe said they proposed the scalloped-top fence only as a means of recycling a fence they already had and would use the lattice fence that was previously approved.

Motion to find the application complete as amended to show the shed door on the east side instead of the north side as stated in the application, to clarify that the shed is to be a first story built on a slab, and to specify that the lattice fence previously approved will be used.

Moved: Orbeton

Seconded: Bostwick

Unanimously approved

Motion to find the application in harmony with Historic District standards and approve the application as amended.

Moved: Orbeton

Seconded: Brown

Unanimously approved

8. Conditional Use Permit Application for Vaughan Homestead Foundation, 2 Litchfield Road, Map 10 Lot 31

Ellen Gibson represented Vaughan Homestead Foundation in presenting an application for construction of a gazebo/pavilion. She explained that they want to construct a 20'x40' open-sided shed for use as a covered space that is not part of the historic homestead to host events. Currently they are holding events on the homestead's porch and it is taking a toll on the porch. The proposed location is where there used to be a swimming pool.

Ms. Orbeton asked if there are historic standard requirements. Ms. Gibson said that the homestead itself is on the National Register, but the grounds are not.

Mr. Dolby told the Board that he did some measurements to verify that there is sufficient distance from the nearest neighbors. He said there is clearly no visual impact from the street.

Ms. Feinstein asked if it would be considered a permanent structure; Mr. Dolby said it would. It will be timber-framed and solidly anchored.

Mr. Brown asked why this was considered a conditional use; Mr. Dolby explained that in the Open Space Zoning District Accessory Buildings and Structures is a Conditional Use. He pointed out that there will be no electricity or water in the structure.

Ms. Orbeton observed that the structure would be visible from the homestead and asked about compatibility of the roof material. Ms. Gibson said that most of the buildings have black asphalt roofing and one has green metal roofing; the roof would be of one or the other. She added that the timbers will be oiled and not painted.

Motion to find the application complete.

Moved: Bostwick

Seconded: Brown

Unanimously approved

