

MINUTES
FREEPORT PROJECT REVIEW BOARD
FREEPORT TOWN HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 2019
6 p.m.

This meeting was rescheduled from 07/17/19

PRESENT: GERALYN Campanelli (Chair), Guy Blanchard, Ford Reiche, Adam Troidl, Suzanne Watson, Drew Wing and Caroline Pelletier, Interim Planner

EXCUSED: Gordon Hamlin

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Campanelli called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

ITEM I: Informational Exchange

a) Update on Staff Approvals

Ms. Pelletier explained that she did a staff approval for Stars & Stripes Brewery at 8 Varney Road. The Staff Review Board met regarding Cindy's Fish & Chips that has new owners. They will replace the mobile and one of the two sheds with one small shed-like structure with a canopy and spruced up signage. The Board has an e-mail from Adam Bliss regarding traffic concerns for the L.L. Bean application. The Board has a summary of the completed historical inventory for the Town and it can be on a future agenda.

Ms. Pelletier noted that the next meeting is scheduled on August 21 and wanted to be sure there would be a quorum. Board members agreed that the date would work for them.

Ms. Pelletier advised that the Planning Board will host a workshop with the Project Review Board and the Council on September 4 at 6 o'clock. She hopes this will become a regular thing to better link the two boards together. She will send out an agenda. She knows it is asking the Board to attend two meetings in September and hopes representatives from FEDC will also attend. Chair Campanelli asked members to think about Ordinance items.

Ms. Pelletier mentioned that Donna Larson started circulating the vision for the Freeport Comprehensive Plan and the Planning Board was just starting to talk about that. We touched upon it once and tabled it so she would like to put it on the Board's August agenda to revisit unless it is a massive agenda. They want input from other boards and committees knowing there will be a larger Comprehensive Plan project down the road in the future.

ITEM II: Approval of the minutes from the Wednesday, May 22, 2019 and Wednesday, June 19, 2019 Project Review Board meetings.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To approve the Minutes from May 22, 2019 as submitted. (Troidl & Watson) **VOTE:** (6 Ayes) (1 Excused-Hamlin)

Ms. Watson advised that she was excused from the meeting of June 19, 2019.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To approve the Minutes from June 19, 2019 as amended. (Troidl & Wing) **VOTE:** (6 Ayes) (1 Excused-Hamlin)

ITEM III: Reviews

Landmark Freeport LLC – Design Review Certificate

The applicant is seeking approval of a Design Review Certificate to replace existing stairs, a walkway and a railing system on the front of the property at 115 Main Street. The location of these items will remain unchanged. Design Review District I – Class A. Zoning District: Village Commercial I (VC-I). Tax Assessor Map 11, Lot 83. Landmark Freeport, LLC., applicant and owner; Dominic Petrillo, representative.

Ms. Pelletier introduced the item noting there is a set of brick steps and then there is a brick walkway and another set of brick steps. Mr. Petrillo is proposing to replace the whole thing with a set of granite steps and walkway. It does go into the public right-of-way and what is typically done in these cases, at the recommendation of Public Works, they enter into an encroachment certificate with the Town of Freeport. The condition of approval and what it says, “we will allow you to keep the stairs there but if they are damaged, or if we need to move them, you agree to do so.” Otherwise it is pretty straight forward and it is a Class “A” in Design Review District One.

Mr. Petrillo advised that the replacement stairs will be in the same location as the existing stairs. They may have to remove some of the landscaping as they install the sonotubes. They will lose one foot on either side of the stairs as they approach the top closer to the building.

Chair Campanelli asked if he plans to paint the rails black. Mr. Petrillo noted his plan is to leave the rails stainless because he feels it is cleaner and easier to maintain. Mr. Reiche referred to the Ordinance and since this is a Class “A” building, any changes which include railings have to preserve the architectural, historical or neighborhood significance of the building. He was hoping they wouldn’t be shiny stainless because it is at odds with the building. Chair Campanelli agreed and noted that in driving through town today, she noticed there are a lot of these. She finds the one most attractive are black or white. Mr. Petrillo noted that the black that exists there now is not of historical significance. The flight of stairs was put together in the late 90s and the handrail wouldn’t bear any significance to anything historical. With stainless there is no paint to chip. He explained how the handrails would be added to the granite stairs.

Mr. Petrillo mentioned that if the Board looks at the building that holds Azure Café and the British Goods Store, it will find more granite with stainless handrails. Mr. Wing asked if the new railing will have balusters as well or will it be an open rail. Mr. Petrillo indicated that it would not have balusters. Mr. Wing asked if it would be the same for the railing on the concrete that is elevated at the building. Mr. Petrillo replied that if it were to code, he would carry the look all the way from street to building. He feels that having a continuous run all the way from the street without any breaks would not be the most attractive look. It will probably have some breaks maybe with one after the first flight of stairs onto the first landing and then a separate handrail that started again on the longer run of flat section that now exists, maybe even two different sections of handrails, that way it wouldn’t be one straight shot of stainless steel all the way from the sidewalk all the way up to the building.

Chair Campanelli didn’t feel it is up to code. Ms. Pelletier noted she spoke to Mr. Adams and learned that he could not have that same railing today, it wouldn’t be up to code. The way the grade is there, he probably doesn’t need it. It is built up on both sides. Mr. Troidl explained that he did not realize the Board would be talking about the building. He thought it was just the stairs and the street. Chair Campanelli pointed out that the railing up next to the building takes away from the historic structure. Mr. Petrillo did not believe that 115 Main Street was nominated as a historical building. Chair Campanelli advised that it is a contributing historic structure in the neighborhood, but is not a designated structure.

Mr. Petrillo asked if the Board would prefer to see a black handrail for the flight of stairs that connects the walkway to the building and not take issue with stainless at the bottom flight of stairs or would it prefer to see more of an authentic replacement of the existing black wrought iron from sidewalk to building. Mr. Troidl advised that he is fine with stainless at the street edge. He feels it fits in with what’s in Freeport at the building but due to the historic nature, it would be better to be black or something else. Mr. Troidl mentioned the 30” above grade rule at the building itself, he would wonder about customers with kids at the top of the stairs and it might be a safety risk although it might not be a code. Chair Campanelli would prefer to see black or white used. It would look better.

Mr. Reiche asked if Mr. Petrillo could live with that. Mr. Petrillo advised that he would be fine with black up to the building if that is what the Board prefers. Mr. Reiche advised that it matters to him and explained his interpretation of the Ordinance. If black is okay with Mr. Petrillo, he would support it. Mr. Petrillo advised that he is okay with black. It wouldn't make sense to have the contrast of the shiny stainless transition into black. The handrail will be 1.25" diameter to meet code.

Design Review Ordinance: Chapter 22 Section VII.C.

1. **Scale of the Building.** The scale of a building depends on its overall size, the mass of it in relationship to the open space around it, and the sizes of its doors, windows, porches and balconies. The scale gives a building "presence"; that is, it makes it seem big or small, awkward or graceful, overpowering or unimportant. The scale of a building should be visually compatible with its site and with its neighborhood.

No changes to the scale of the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

2. **Height.** A sudden dramatic change in building height can have a jarring effect on the streetscape, i.e., the way the whole street looks. A tall building can shade its neighbors and/or the street. The height of buildings should be visually compatible with the heights of the buildings in the neighborhood.

The height of the overall structure will not be altered. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

3. **Proportion of Building's Front Facade.** The "first impression" a building gives is that of its front facade, the side of the building, which faces the most frequently used public way. The relationship of the width to the height of the front facade should be visually compatible with that of its neighbors.

No changes to the proportion of the building's front façade are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades.** When you look at any facade of a building, you see openings such as doors or windows (voids) in the wall surface (solid). Usually the voids appear as dark areas, almost holes, in the solid and they are quite noticeable, setting up a pattern or rhythm. The pattern of solids and voids in the front facade of a new or altered building should be visually compatible with that of its neighbors.

The rhythm of solids to voids in the front façade will not be altered. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

5. **Proportions of Opening within the Facility.** Windows and doors come in a variety of shapes and sizes; even rectangular window and door openings can appear quite different depending on their dimensions. The relationship of the height of windows and doors to their width should be visually compatible with the architectural style of the building and with that of its neighbors.

The proportions of openings within the facility will not be altered. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

6. **Roof Shapes.** A roof can have a dramatic impact on the appearance of a building. The shape and proportion of the roof should be visually compatible with the architectural style of the building and with those of neighboring buildings.

No changes to the roof shape are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

7. Relationship of Facade Materials. The facades of a building are what give it character, and the character varies depending on the materials of which the facades are made and their texture. In Freeport, many different materials are used on facades - clapboards, shingles, patterned shingles, brick - depending on the architectural style of the building. The facades of a building, particularly the front facade, should be visually compatible with those of other buildings around it.

No changes to the building façade are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

8. Rhythm of Spaces to Building on Streets. The building itself is not the only thing you see when you look at it; you are also aware of the space where the building is not, i.e., the open space which is around the building. Looking along a street, the buildings and open spaces set up a rhythm. The rhythm of spaces to buildings should be considered when determining visual compatibility, whether it is between buildings or between buildings and the street (setback).

The rhythm of spaces to building on the streets will not be altered. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

9. Site Features. The size, placement and materials of walks, walls, fences, signs, driveways and parking areas may have a visual impact on a building. These features should be visually compatible with the building and neighboring buildings.

The applicant is seeking approval to replace existing stairs, a walkway and a railing system on the front of the property at 115 Main Street. The location of these items will remain unchanged. The new handrail (1.25 inch, graspable, stainless) will be located on both sides of the stairs. The existing stairs (from Main Street) are currently eight feet in width at the bottom and narrow to six feet in width at the top step; the replacement steps will all be 8 feet in width. The stairs will be supported by concrete sonotubes which will not be visible. The replacement stairs and walkway will be "Woodbury" granite. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

10. In addition to the requirements of the Freeport Sign Ordinance, signs in the Freeport Design Review District shall be reviewed for the following: materials, illumination, colors, lettering style, location on site or building, size and scale. Minor changes that do not alter the dimensions or lettering style of an existing sign need not be reviewed, i.e. personal name changes for professional offices, or changes in hours of operation. See Special Publication: "Sign Application Requirements".

No new signs are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of the Design Review Ordinance.

MOVED AND SECONDED: Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact and Design Review Certificate for Landmark Freeport LLC (Tax Assessor Map 11, Lot 83), for replacement stairs, railing and walkway in front of the existing structure, to be substantially as proposed, however black in color, consistent with the application dated 06/26/19, finding that it meets the standards of the Freeport Design Review Ordinance, with the following Conditions of Approval:

- 1) This approval incorporates by reference all supporting plans that amend the previously approved plans submitted by the applicant and his/her representatives at Project Review Board meetings and hearings on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated conditions.

- 2) Prior to any work on the building, the applicant obtain any applicable permits from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer.
- 3) The applicant comply with the conditions outlined in a memo dated 07/09/19 from Earl Gibson, Superintendent of Public Works, with proposed conditions for the project since a portion of the proposed improvements are within the public right of way. (Troidl & Reiche) **VOTE:** (6 Ayes) (1 Excused-Hamlin)

L.L. Bean – Corporate Campus Renovations

The applicant is seeking approval for a Design Review Certificate and Site Plan Amendment for site alterations and exterior building alterations at their property on One Casco Street. Design Review District I – Class C. Zoning Districts: Commercial III (C-III) & Industrial I (I-I). Tax Assessor Map 20, Lots 98-ETC & 101. LL Bean, Inc, applicant and owner; Kylie Mason, Sebago Technics, representative.

Chair Campanelli advised that Mr. Reiche and Mr. Wing are recusing themselves from this application and asked them to explain their reasons. Mr. Reiche advised that he is in a business relationship with them and Mr. Wing advised that he is professionally involved in the project. They stepped down from the Board.

Dave Lockman noted he works in L.L. Bean's real estate and construction and has been involved in this project from its inception. He thanked the Board since he learned some calendars were moved around to support this meeting. They certainly wanted to get in front of the Board sooner rather than later. They have been working on this project in concept and design for five or six years. It has been a lengthy process for them and they are excited about it.

Kylie Mason of Sebago Technics displayed the plan and explained that not much has changed since the last time they were here. They received an e-mail today regarding traffic. She spoke to their Traffic Engineer who has been having ongoing discussions with MDOT and explained how the calculations work. Based on the historical trip generation calculation and development, development would have been permitted for 401 a.m. trips and 425 p.m. trips. The projected build volumes after the proposed expansion are 395 a.m. trips and 427 p.m. trips. Since this is only an increase of 2 trips over the permitted conditions, this would not require DEP. This is not going to increase traffic and she feels they are perhaps dealing with a perception issue as opposed to an unfounded calculation. Ms. Mason noted they were in receipt of the Police Chief's comments and have responded back. L.L. Bean is happy to put the "No Left Hand Turn Sign" up again.

Scott Laflamme displayed plans and walked the Board through the façade of the building. He pointed out the blue stone along the base. There will be a tree house meeting space for staff. The outside will be redone with glass and metal panels. They are trying to get natural light into the building. They are proposing a flat roof with skylights. Ms. Watson asked if any consideration was given to putting solar on this building. There was discussion about solar early on but it was taken out for the time being. Mr. Lockman noted that L.L. Bean is considering other solar options on other properties they own. The amount of power they could generate from this site would be low and they are working with consultants to investigate what their other opportunities are but it is out for this particular site.

Mr. Troidl noted he is not as worried about the traffic as others but asked if cars ever flowed behind this building. Ms. Mason explained that there is a truck route but it is prohibited for vehicles, although cars did take it occasionally. There have always been a number of trucks coming and going and because this is converting warehouse and distribution to office building, those truck trips are not going to exist anymore except in a small amount. That truck traffic is a big change as well which they didn't account for in any of the calculations.

Chair Campanelli asked if there is a good pedestrian way to walk from the L L Building to the headquarters building. Is this something people would be doing. Ms. Mason explained that they could walk through the parking lot but there is no island-based pathway. A lot of the Information Technology employees currently in the LL Building will be housed in this new building. Mr. Lockman explained they have some ideas on how to repurpose that building once the new building is complete. They are considering turning it into a photo studio and are looking at the opportunity to bring the photo studio they are leasing in Westbrook with its three employees to Freeport.

Chair Campanelli mentioned their plans for the Taylor Building. Ms. Mason noted their intention is to remove the Taylor Building but they don't have a plan to show what they will do when they take it down. They will come back later but they are still working on what will be located there. Everyone from the Taylor Building will be moving into the renovated building. They know they are going to do something better than a big green lawn.

Mr. Troidl mentioned the construction truck traffic that is going on and asked if the tree roots are being protected. Ms. Mason explained that in that area they generally feel comfortable with the truck traffic but it doesn't mean that those roots are not getting impacted. The trees closest to the building will most likely be impacted when they bring the building down so they are going to go anyway. Mr. Troidl asked if the Board should add a condition about hearing back from DOT. Ms. Pelletier explained that the Board could leave it open ended. It does not need to be there before they do site work. It is an existing site and everyone is aware so we will make sure it is addressed. If they need to get permitting, then they can go out and do that.

Ms. Pelletier noted that there is a proposed condition prior to certificate of occupancy for the final phase and noted this is obviously a very large project and it will take a while. When they figure out what they are going to do with the Taylor Building and either come back and readjust their parking calculation and take another look and apply for the permit or demolish Taylor if that is their plan. Ms. Mason asked if it was okay, could they possibly write it so that it happens within three months after occupancy so they can begin to start planning what they are doing while they are moving people in. Mr. Lockman explained that the phase plan has two phases of occupancy. One is approximately 24ish months out and another will be about 20 months after that. They would want to have in their plan of what happens in Phase 3 which is what happens to the Taylor Building. They would hope to have that fleshed out in and around the same time they would occupy Phase 1 which would be about two years from now. Ms. Pelletier mentioned the problem is that if they get the certificate of occupancy, they need to do it. We don't have anything to tie it to the fact that they are going to do it. Mr. Troidl mentioned that the plan says there will be 1,194 spaces but only 1,107 are required. He asked if this factors in the Taylor Building. Ms. Pelletier advised that it does not. She asked the applicant to say their timing needs again and why before the certificate of occupancy for Phase 3, they couldn't make application. Mr. Lockman said that they need time for design. They haven't spent a lot of energy thinking about different concepts for that space. Things at L.L. Bean move slowly and it would give them time with the right people to plan through what that space would look like and the time to come back to the Board. They could certainly do that before they occupy in the first phase. He suspects it will be phase occupancy permits and they will work with the Codes Officer. Phase 3 is when they will take Taylor down and do something with the LL Building and then transform the space underneath Taylor into something else, probably some parking. They probably will take some parking out of other portions of the site but they haven't gone through the design yet. He feels he can come to the Board well before prior scheduling of certificate of occupancy for the final phase of building renovations.

Ms. Pelletier clarified that if MDOT says they have to get a permit, they have to get a permit. If they build a building and can't use it, that is their problem with MDOT and we are not going to get involved. She feels it is good to make it a condition so it is flagged because to meet the traffic, we want to know they are doing what they need to do. She knows there has been communication with the Town and DOT and the applicant and DOT but if the Board leaves it as a generic condition in that the applicant has something in writing from DOT confirming whether or not they need any additional permitting, and if so, they obtain the applicable permits and leave it at that. Before we do final sign-off and release performance guarantees which insures they do what they say they are going to do, we make sure they do all these conditions so it definitely will get flagged. In talking with Mr. Bliss today, she learned that he doesn't feel we need to put the whole project on hold but he wants to make sure that any traffic concerns will be addressed going forward for the Town and the applicant. It could be tacked onto No. 6 of the conditions.

Design Review Ordinance: Chapter 22 Section VII.C.

1. Scale of the Building. The scale of a building depends on its overall size, the mass of it in relationship to the open space around it, and the sizes of its doors, windows, porches and balconies. The scale gives a building "presence";

that is, it makes it seem big or small, awkward or graceful, overpowering or unimportant. The scale of a building should be visually compatible with its site and with its neighborhood.

The building is existing and the overall dimensions will not be altered. The façade facing Main Street consists of mostly brick and metal with some windows and an open area outdoor on the second level. The existing façade will be removed and the materials of the new façade will consist of a glass curtain wall accented with a wood-look vertical metal slat system and a stacked bluestone base. The combination of the materials and the 100' long tree house (which will project out 12 feet) will help minimize the expanse of the building façade. The tree house will be supported by angled wood columns. The wood look aluminum slats, will add visual interest to the façade and almost create a sense of rolling hills. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

2. **Height.** A sudden dramatic change in building height can have a jarring effect on the streetscape, i.e., the way the whole street looks. A tall building can shade its neighbors and/or the street. The height of buildings should be visually compatible with the heights of the buildings in the neighborhood.

The overall height of the building will not be altered. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

3. **Proportion of Building's Front Facade.** The "first impression" a building gives is that of its front facade, the side of the building, which faces the most frequently used public way. The relationship of the width to the height of the front facade should be visually compatible with that of its neighbors.

The façade facing Main Street consists of mostly brick and metal with some windows and an open area outdoor on the second level. The existing façade will be removed and the materials of the new façade will consist of a glass curtain wall accented with a wood-look vertical metal slat system and a stacked bluestone base. The overall relationship of the width to the height of the façade will not be altered. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

4. **Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades.** When you look at any facade of a building, you see openings such as doors or windows (voids) in the wall surface (solid). Usually the voids appear as dark areas, almost holes, in the solid and they are quite noticeable, setting up a pattern or rhythm. The pattern of solids and voids in the front facade of a new or altered building should be visually compatible with that of its neighbors.

The existing façade will be removed and the materials of the new façade will consist of a glass curtain wall accented with a wood-look vertical metal slat system and a stacked bluestone base. The wood look aluminum slats, will overlay the glass curtain wall and will add visual interest to the façade and almost create a sense of rolling hills. There will be an 100' long tree house (which will project out 12 feet) on the Main Street façade. The tree house will be supported by angled wood columns. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

5. **Proportions of Opening within the Facility.** Windows and doors come in a variety of shapes and sizes; even rectangular window and door openings can appear quite different depending on their dimensions. The relationship of the height of windows and doors to their width should be visually compatible with the architectural style of the building and with that of its neighbors.

The existing façade will be removed and the materials of the new façade will consist of a glass curtain wall accented with a wood-look vertical metal slat system and a stacked bluestone base. The wood look aluminum slats, will overlay the glass curtain wall and help minimize the appearance of a mostly glass building. The proportions of openings are sized in relation to the large size of both the overall building and the long façade. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 6. Roof Shapes.** A roof can have a dramatic impact on the appearance of a building. The shape and proportion of the roof should be visually compatible with the architectural style of the building and with those of neighboring buildings.

The roof is currently flat and will remain unchanged. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 7. Relationship of Facade Materials.** The facades of a building are what give it character, and the character varies depending on the materials of which the facades are made and their texture. In Freeport, many different materials are used on facades - clapboards, shingles, patterned shingles, brick - depending on the architectural style of the building. The facades of a building, particularly the front facade, should be visually compatible with those of other buildings around it.

The façade facing Main Street consists of mostly brick and metal with some windows and an open area outdoor on the second level. The existing façade will be removed and the materials of the new façade will consist of a glass curtain wall accented with a wood-look vertical metal slat system and a stacked bluestone base. The wood look aluminum slats, will overlay the glass curtain wall. The combination of the materials and the 100' long tree house (which will project out 12 feet) will help minimize the expanse of the building façade. The tree house will be supported by angled wood columns. A portion of the building is within the Color Overlay District, however the visible façade facing Main Street will not actually be painted. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 8. Rhythm of Spaces to Building on Streets.** The building itself is not the only thing you see when you look at it; you are also aware of the space where the building is not, i.e., the open space which is around the building. Looking along a street, the buildings and open spaces set up a rhythm. The rhythm of spaces to buildings should be considered when determining visual compatibility, whether it is between buildings or between buildings and the street (setback).

The location of the building is existing. The footprint of the façade along Main Street will remain relatively unchanged, with the exception of the 100 foot long tree house which will project 12 feet off of the building. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- 9. Site Features.** The size, placement and materials of walks, walls, fences, signs, driveways and parking areas may have a visual impact on a building. These features should be visually compatible with the building and neighboring buildings.

The project involves significant site work throughout the campus. Existing vegetation will be retained where possible. The existing ball field on the Main Street side of the building will be removed. The area in front of the building will have a berm, and a new walkway and landscaping is proposed. The project complies with buffering requirements of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

10. In addition to the requirements of the Freeport Sign Ordinance, signs in the Freeport Design Review District shall be reviewed for the following: materials, illumination, colors, lettering style, location on site or building, size and scale. Minor changes that do not alter the dimensions or lettering style of an existing sign need not be reviewed, i.e. personal name changes for professional offices, or changes in hours of operation. See Special Publication: "Sign Application Requirements".

No new signs are proposed at this time. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of the Design Review Ordinance.

Findings of Fact: (Section 602.F. of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance)

a. Preservation of Landscape: The landscape shall be developed in such a manner as to be in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighborhoods and in accordance with good development practice by minimizing tree and soil removal, retaining existing vegetation where desirable, and keeping any grade changes in character with the general appearance of neighboring areas. If a site includes a ridge or ridges above the surrounding areas and provides scenic vistas for surrounding areas, special attempts shall be made to preserve the natural environment of the skyline of the ridge. Existing vegetation and buffering landscaping are potential methods of preserving the scenic vista.

The site is already developed with buildings and site features used as the corporate headquarters for LL Bean. The project involves significant site work throughout the campus. Existing vegetation will be retained where possible. The existing ball field on the Main Street side of the building will be removed. The area in front of the building will have a berm, and a new walkway and landscaping is proposed. The project complies with buffering requirements of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. The project is in the Industrial I and Commercial III Zoning Districts and complies with the space and bulk standards of Sections 411 & 421 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. Most of the site alterations are within the Industrial I District portion of the property and therefore the Performance Standards for Commercial District (Section 527 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance) are not applicable. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

b. Relation of Proposed Buildings to the Environment: The design and layout of the buildings and/or other development areas shall encourage safety, including fire protection. Proposed structures shall be related harmoniously to the terrain and to existing buildings and land uses in the vicinity which have a visual relationship to the proposed buildings. Visual compatibility, not uniformity with the surrounding area, shall be emphasized. Special attention shall be paid to the scale (mass), height and bulk, proportions of the proposed buildings, the nature of the open spaces (setbacks, landscaping) around the buildings, the design of the buildings (including roof style, facade openings, architectural style and details), building materials and signs.

If the structure is in the Design Review District, the Project Review Board shall incorporate the findings of the standards or the Design Review Ordinance in its Site Plan Review findings.

The building is partially within Freeport Design Review District I (the district boundary extends 600 feet from the centerline of Lower Main Street) and partially within the Color Overlay District. The building is Class C. Review and approval of a Design Review Certificate is required and the Board has determined that the standards of the Freeport Design Review Ordinance have been met.

The project includes removing and replacing the existing facade and installing a “treehouse” on the Route One façade. The materials of the new façade will consist of a glass curtain wall accented with a wood-look vertical metal slat system and a stacked bluestone base. The wood look aluminum slats, will overlay the glass curtain wall and will add visual interest to the façade and almost create a sense of rolling hills. The combination of the materials and the 100’ long tree house will help minimize the expanse of the building façade. The tree house will be supported by angled wood columns. The applicant did have a pre-application meeting with Town staff, including the Fire Chief and the Codes Enforcement Officer to ensure that the layout of the site will provide for public safety and address any applicable building and fire codes related to the new use of the building. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- c. Vehicular Access:** The proposed layout of access points shall be designed so as to avoid unnecessary adverse impacts on existing vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns. Special consideration shall be given to the location, number, and control of access points, adequacy of adjacent streets, traffic flow, sight distances, turning lanes, and existing or proposed traffic signalization and pedestrian-vehicular contacts. The entrance to the site shall meet the minimum sight distance according to MDOT standards to the greatest extent possible

There are currently two vehicular accesses to the site: Casco Street, which is a signaled intersection, and Double L Street. No changes to the existing site entrances from Route One are proposed. No changes to existing road striping are proposed as the most recent road striping in the area was completed in 2018 as a result of a project between the Town of Freeport and the MDOT.

A traffic study was included with the original submission, with traffic counts conducted in October 2018. The traffic study notes that the overall number of employees will be lower than what the site and original permitting were designed. At the time of the original development, traffic was reviewed as part of the DEP Site Location Process and not separately by the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT). The applicant has stated that the proposal before the Board would not trigger the need for a Traffic Movement Permit.

The Town Engineer did raise some questions/concerns prior to the last meeting (see email to Caroline Pelletier, dated 06/19/19 from Adam Bliss). These comments were addressed at the last meeting and further in the current submission. One of his concerns was for traffic and requiring a peer review of the traffic study, however at the last meeting, the Board decided at the June meeting that this is something that they would not require.

In an email dated 07/09/2019, Police Chief Susan Nourse noted concerns for potential traffic and circulation congestion issues from the project. She suggests if the applicant still wants to consider a crosswalk across Main Street (at Double L Street) the request should be brought back to the Traffic and Parking Committee to see if it is still appropriate. In response to concerns about traffic at Double L Street, the applicant noted agrees to replace the “No left Turn” sign at the Double L Street and Main Street Intersection.

Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- d. Parking and Circulation:** The layout and design of all means of vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives, and parking areas shall be safe and convenient and, insofar as practical, shall not detract from the proposed buildings and neighboring properties. General interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, service traffic, drive-up facilities, loading areas, and the arrangement and use of parking areas shall be considered.

This proposal will increase capacity of 300 employees working at the site, for a total of 1,200. The proposed site changes include adding an additional 41 parking spaces. The new parking spaces will comply with the dimensional parking stall requirements of Section 514 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. In total on the Casco Street Campus, there will be 1,194 spaces; 1,107 are required. The parking calculation submitted by the applicant does not include the square footage of the Taylor Building as the intent is that all of the employees from the Taylor Building will be

moved into the renovated building once this project is complete (the Taylor Building may be removed but that is not part of this application). A proposed condition of approval has been added that prior to the scheduling of a Certificate of Occupancy for the final phase of building renovations associated with this project, the applicant either apply to the Town for any required permits for the removal of the Taylor Building, or make application to return to the Board to address the parking requirements due to the building no longer being removed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- e. **Surface Water Drainage:** Adequate provisions shall be made for surface drainage so that removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties, down-stream conditions, or the public storm drainage system. The increase in rate of runoff in the post development condition shall be held to a zero or less percent of the predevelopment condition unless an engineering study has been performed as described in Section 529.2 above. On-site absorption shall be utilized to minimize discharges whenever possible. All drainage calculations shall be based on a two-year, ten year and twenty-five year storm frequency. Emphasis shall be placed on the protection of floodplains; reservation of stream corridors; establishment of drainage rights-of-way and the adequacy of the existing system; and the need for improvements, both on-site and off-site, to adequately control the rate, volume and velocity of storm drainage and the quality of the stormwater leaving the site. Maintenance responsibilities shall be reviewed to determine their adequacy.

The property is within a watershed of an Urban Impaired Stream and an amendment to the existing Site Location of Development Permit from the Maine Department of Environmental Protection will be required. The submission was reviewed by the Town Engineer for its compliance with Section 529 Stormwater Management (of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance). His review comments are included in a memo dated 07/10/19. His conclusion is that the proposal meets the standards of municipal ordinances however he does note some future considerations for the applicant due to the property location within the watershed of an urban impaired stream. It is recommended that the applicant enters into a Maintenance Agreement for a Stormwater Management System with the Town of Freeport and to be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds. This has been added as conditions of approval. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- f. **Utilities:** All utilities included in the site plan shall be reviewed as to their adequacy, safety, and impact on the property under review and surrounding properties. The site plan shall show what provisions are being proposed for water supply, wastewater, solid waste disposal and storm drainage. Whenever feasible, as determined by the Project Review Board, all electric, telephone and other utility lines shall be installed underground. Any utility installations above ground shall be located so as to have a harmonious relationship with neighboring properties and the site.

The building will remain connected to public utilities. The submission did include a capacity letter from the Freeport Sewer District (dated May 7, 2019) and a letter from MaineWater (dated April 15, 2019). Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- g. **Advertising Features:** The size, location, texture and lighting of all exterior signs and outdoor advertising structures or features shall not detract from the layout of the property and the design of proposed buildings and structures and the surrounding properties, and shall not constitute hazards to vehicles and pedestrians.

No new signage is proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- h. **Special Features:** Exposed storage areas, exposed machinery installations, service areas, truck loading areas, utility buildings and structures, similar accessory areas and structures, shall be subject to such setbacks, screen plantings or other screening methods as shall reasonably be required to prevent their being incongruous with the existing or contemplated environment and the surrounding properties.

Due to the layout of the site, the grade changes in relation to the overall campus and in relation to Main Street and the amount of screening (existing and proposed), service and truck areas will not be that visible from the right-of-way. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- i. **Exterior Lighting:** All exterior lighting shall be designed to encourage energy efficiency, to ensure safe movement of people and vehicles, and to minimize adverse impact on neighboring properties and public ways. Adverse impact is to be judged in terms of hazards to people and vehicular traffic and potential damage to the value of adjacent properties. Lighting shall be arranged to minimize glare and reflection on adjacent properties and the traveling public. For all proposed lighting, the source of the light shall be shielded and the light should be directed to the ground, except in the case of ground sign lighting. In the Village Commercial 1 and 2 Districts, lighting for pedestrian walkways and adjacent public sidewalks shall also be provided.

The location of lighting fixtures is shown on the plan and a photometrics plan has been submitted. All fixtures will be LED and full cut-off. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- j. **Emergency Vehicle Access:** Provisions shall be made for providing and maintaining convenient and safe emergency vehicle access to all buildings and structures at all times.

All public safety department heads have reviewed the plans. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- k. **Landscaping:** Landscaping shall be designed and installed to define, soften, or screen the appearance of off-street parking areas from the public right(s)-of-way and abutting properties, to enhance the physical design of the building(s) and site, and to minimize the encroachment of the proposed use on neighboring land uses. Particular attention should be paid to the use of planting to break up parking areas. The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practical, by minimizing tree and soil removal, retaining existing vegetation where desirable, and keeping any grade changes in character with the general appearance of neighboring areas. Landscaping shall be provided as part of the overall site plan design and integrated into building arrangements, topography, parking and buffering requirements. Landscaping may include trees, bushes, shrubs, ground cover, perennials, annuals, plants, grading and the use of building and paving materials in an imaginative manner.

Existing vegetation will be retained where possible and many of the large trees between the front building façade and road will remain. The existing ball field on the Main Street side of the building will be removed. The area in front of the building will have a berm, and a new walkway and landscaping is proposed. The project complies with buffering requirements of the applicable Sections of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- l. **Environmental Considerations:** A site plan shall not be approved unless it meets the following criteria:
- (1) The project will not result in water pollution, erosion or sedimentation to surface waters;
 - (2) The project will not result in damage to spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird and other wildlife habitat;
 - (3) The project will conserve shoreland vegetation;
 - (4) The project will conserve points of public access to waters;
 - (5) The project will adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater;
 - (6) The project will protect archaeological and historic resources;
 - (7) The project will not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or maritime activities in the Marine Waterfront District.

This parcel is not within the Marine Waterfront District or the Shoreland Zone. The building will remain connected to the public water and sewer systems and capacity letters from both Districts have been included in the submission. The property is within a watershed of an Urban Impaired Stream and an amendment to the

existing Site Location of Development Permit from the Maine Department of Environmental Protection will be required. In a letter dated April 5, 2019, Kirk Mohny from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission states that there will be no historic properties affected by the project. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance.

MOVED AND SECONDED: That we accept the proposed motion and printed Finding of Facts as read and written in the Staff Report with the addition of Item 6. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of any Occupancy, the applicant will abide by the decision of the Maine DOT for any additional permitting. (Troidl & Watson) **VOTE:** (4 Ayes) (2 Recused-Reiche & Wing) (1 Excused- Hamlin)

Proposed Motion: Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact, Design Review Certificate, and Site Plan Amendment for the LL Bean Corporate Headquarter Renovations on Casco Street (Tax Assessor Map 20, Lots 98-ETC & 101), for a building and site alterations, to be substantially as proposed, plan set dated 06-26-19, finding that it meets the standards of the Freeport Design Review Ordinance and the Freeport Zoning Ordinance, with the following Conditions of Approval:

- 1) This approval incorporates by reference all supporting plans that amend the previously approved plans submitted by the applicant and his/her representatives at Project Review Board meetings and hearings on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated conditions.
- 2) Prior to any work on the building, the applicant obtain a building permit from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer.
- 3) Prior to any site work, or a building permit being applied for, the applicant do the following:
 - A. Enter into a Maintenance Agreement for a Stormwater Management System with the Town of Freeport, to be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, with yearly stormwater reporting to the Town of Freeport being required.
 - B. Establish a performance guarantee in the amount to cover the cost of all site work associated with the project, to be reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer and in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney. The performance guarantee shall cover the cost of all site work, including the road, landscaping, erosion control, and stormwater management etc. Along with the performance guarantee, a non-refundable administrative fee of 2% of the performance guarantee, in the amount to be determined by the Town Engineer, be paid.
 - D. Establish an inspection account, in the amount of \$TBD, for inspection of the site improvements by the Town Engineer.
 - E. The developer have a pre-construction meeting with the Town Engineer.
- 4) Prior to starting work on the proposed site changes, the applicant obtain approval from the Maine Department of Environmental Protection for an amendment to the existing Site Location of Development Permit. The applicant may proceed with the building improvements while they are awaiting the amended permit from the DEP, however this will be doing so at their own risk.
- 5) Prior to the scheduling of a Certificate of Occupancy for the final phase of building renovations associated with this project, the applicant either apply to the Town for any required permits for the removal of the Taylor Building, or make application to return to the Board to address the parking requirements due to the building no longer being removed.
6. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of any Occupancy, the applicant will abide by the decision of the Maine DOT for any additional permitting.

Cigri Subdivision – Subdivision Amendment – PUBLIC HEARING THIS ITEM HAS BEEN TABLED AT THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANT

The applicant is seeking approval to move a lot line between lots two and three in the previously approved Cigri Subdivision on Independence Drive/ Cigri Drive. No additional building lots are being created. An access easement over

lot one to lot two has also been added to the plan. Design Review District I – Class B & C. Tax Assessor Map 9, Lots 2, 2-1 and 2-2.

ITEM IV: Persons wishing to address the Board on non-agenda items.

Chair Campanelli mentioned advertising meetings. Ms. Pelletier explained that she e-mailed other communities to see what they do. She plans to reach out to *The Forecaster* because it really is about subdivisions. The Board doesn't have to do a public hearing for Site Plan. While you have the option, you don't do it very often. The *Press Herald* duplicates the *Times Record* if we are going to put in a legal ad. She will send them a sample and get a cost estimate. Once the Board sees what it looks like and what it costs, it can go from there. If it is something the Board wants to proceed with, we can look at what Ordinance amendments are needed for the fee structure before going to the Council.

Chair Campanelli noted that she does pick up *The Forecaster* and feels we would probably reach more people in *The Forecaster*. Ms. Pelletier explained that her only concern is if they take two weeks off at Christmas, it could delay a whole project. Ms. Watson feels people are saying that *The Forecaster* would be a supplement to the *Times Record* and it doesn't require a subscription which the *Times Record* does. Chair Campanelli would like to know how the Town of Yarmouth does their advertising.

Ms. Pelletier explained that if you are going to have a public hearing, you pay a flat fee of \$110. Legally we have to run it in a printed material which is first class mail and our options would be *The Record* or the *Press Herald* because it can be mailed. The *Forecaster* can't be mailed. If the Board is going to make one person pay a fee for the supplemental ad, we need to be fair and that if one public hearing has to do it, they all have to do it. Chair Campanelli suggested that Ms. Pelletier find out the cost for running the ads 7 and 3 days before for a subdivision. Depending on a holiday, we might run it a little sooner. Mr. Troidl feels once would be fine. Ms. Pelletier noted she would check on fees and when they don't print.

Chair Campanelli pointed out that the next meeting will be pretty full. Ms. Pelletier explained what she thought would be coming to the Board. Chair Campanelli mentioned bringing things written up they can be given to the Planning Board before the workshop or at that meeting. She knows Mr. Troidl has written up some things. He mentioned it could be parking lot review and Design Review. Ms. Pelletier pointed out that it is their meeting and she envisions that it could be the projects the Planning Board is working on right now, see what they have in backlog and then hear from this Board on what is important and some of the things you have been struggling with such as Design Review, Section 527, the pedestrian path requirement and summary of the overlays. It is to share ideas, see what people are working on and if they are working on the right projects and we are pooling our resources.

Ms. Watson mentioned that she is concerned we are knee jerk reacting to retail going away and that we are going to be making decisions that could be detrimental long term. In-fill development could be spurred in a way that is detrimental to the Town as a whole. Chair Campanelli added that a lot of people share that concern. Ms. Watson does not want to call it parking. She wants to call it in-fill development. Mr. Blanchard advised that our Design Review Ordinance covers this already. Mr. Troidl noted that it says that every building must have a store front. He feels we can have a people friendly building in town that doesn't have a store front. Ms. Watson explained what is happening in Portsmouth. She feels if we are smart, we should build residential and professional offices in. Ms. Pelletier would like to see it as an opportunity to cover the surface of what the two boards are looking at and flag some things that we want them to look at. The Planning Board does the planning and this board does project review. She hopes the boards can share some of their struggles pertaining to the things they work on every day and some of the Ordinance sections. How they go forward and what they work on might be a Council decision. If we touch upon some of these, we could have a meeting if they want this Board's input on a specific project later. It feels like a step in the right direction to get the two planning functions connecting with each other and working more efficiently. Ms. Watson brought up the Comprehensive Plan and feels we are not addressing the issues in front of us. Ms. Pelletier explained that it is not something we have money in the budget for now but it is something that could be flagged.

Chair Campanelli asked if the Planning Board is aware of all the layers that exist. Ms. Pelletier feels it was eye opening and good for them. They want to do the workshop and pause and look at some different things. We have to focus on what our immediate needs and struggles are. Ms. Watson mentioned that this is a new board and the Planning Board is new. Chair Campanelli sees this as a benefit because we are coming in with fresh eyes and everybody wants to work together proactively. We might not be able to do the Comp Plan first but it is great to have a conversation.

Ms. Watson noted that she is concerned that we are going to look at retail and say it is going away. It is going away. That is the reality but what are we going to replace it with. That is what we have the opportunity to influence. Chair Campanelli listed all the new venues we have in town and in looking at all of them, she feels we have an opportunity to create a really cool place. It is not just for tourists. It is for the village and residents.

Ms. Pelletier pointed out that we have to do something with Design Review. Everyone is struggling with it. Even if it is just to take what we have and improve it for the time being. Hearing some of the applications that come before the Board could be eye opening for some people. She is not sure everyone is aware of the scope of things the Board sees. She is not sure people are aware of the scope of things the Board sees. It is because there is a standard or in some cases, there is a standard that is not clear enough to people.

Mr. Troidl advised that if all we are going to do is have a new plan, he asked what would incentivize anyone to come here and actually build a project. Those are business goals of the Town but would help us understand where things are coming from top down or bottom up or both. Ms. Watson advised that the fact of the matter is that they will come because it is all about the fact that Portland and Yarmouth are saturated and Freeport is the next horizon. We are going to change what we do or not.

Ms. Pelletier pointed out that the Planning Board needs to hear from this Board what issues you identified based upon the way you use these ordinances. The Council has forwarded 4 or 5 things to them recently and they look at their to do list and then they look at this Board's list, they can then regroup and prioritize knowing that going forward, the Comp Plan is on the horizon but looking at the picture and figuring out how to tackle the in-fill development ordinance. It would be a great conversation. We can help them shape what their goals are because they have a new chairperson, a new Board and they lost their long-time staff person.

Mr. Troidl mentioned that he is happy to rewrite what he wrote and put in a couple of scenarios. If it is the biggest picture and volume of work, the Town Council, Planning Board and us need to be involved in, there will need to be a consultant. You cannot do that volume of work with a bunch of volunteers. Ms. Pelletier feels they will have to pick and choose what is most important to them. Mr. Troidl feels it would be good to have Keith McBride from FEDC at the workshop because of his expertise.

Ms. Pelletier advised that we just spent a large sum of money on the historical inventory so we really need to update them on this stuff because they don't know how this board uses Design Review. Ms. Watson feels the historical review is valuable. More discussion followed on railings and the need for urban design standards.

Chair Campanelli hopes that in the future we can have quarterly workshops. She is all for working groups.

ITEM V: Adjourn.

Chair Campanelli adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Recorded by Sharon Coffin