

MINUTES
FREEPORT PROJECT FREEPORT BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2020
6:30 p.m.

This meeting was held online/virtually, using Zoom teleconferencing

Attending: Chair Geralyn Campanelli, Guy Blanchard, Gordon Hamlin, Ford Reiche, Suzanne Watson, Tod Yankee and Planner, Caroline Pelletier

Excused: Vice Chair Adam Troidl,

Town Planner Caroline Pelletier explained the process to be followed this evening and there are members of the public listening.

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Campanelli called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. and thanked everyone for attending.

ITEM I: Information Exchange

1) Update on Staff Approvals

Mrs. Pelletier explained that they had a staff approval for the Harraseeket Inn relocating their small landscaped area that had a flag pole closer to the existing house they have on their property. Although it was beautiful, it was causing some hazard and people kept hitting it. They filled in that little circle area with pavement. It is definitely under 100 sq. ft. so she signed off on it. Although the flag pole was visible, the paved area wasn't super visible from Main Street.

2) Updated on Staff Review Board actions

The Staff Review Board met this week and had an after-the-fact approval for a change of use for Little Friends Early Learning Center on Wardtown Road. It is a day care that has been in operation for more than 20 years. They were operating as a Home Occupation but have since exceeded the standard. While they are not changing much on their site, they did have to come for Staff Review Board approval. The changes were small enough in terms of square footage so they were able to go to Staff Review Board. There was another application for a change of use to add an apartment at 541 U.S. Route One which was tabled.

3) Update on Planning Board topics

Mrs. Pelletier advised that the Planning Board had its first virtual meeting this month. They workshopped with the Desert of Maine who was meeting with them to discuss some possible rezoning or zoning amendment options at the Desert. It went well and she suspects the Board will see an application forthcoming for some zone changes out there. The Planning Board has some big projects they have been working on. Due to the virtual meeting setup and abutter notification requirements, there are things on hold. They have been working on regulations for solar panels and updating shoreland zoning. Both require an excess of about a thousand notices be sent to property owners. They are on hold until we move forward and hopefully resume meetings. If we don't resume in-person meetings soon, she feels we will have to re-evaluate how we are going to get some of these bigger things done and still meet our notice requirements. They are also set to hold a public hearing on the public notification. We talked about adding the requirement for ads to be in a second newspaper. That was something this Board wanted to see happen. As soon as we have an agenda with some public hearings, she expects they will take that up. She will make sure this Board knows in the event someone wants to come and comment at that public hearing. Another thing they have coming up is taking a look

at a section of the Ordinance on rural flexible lot development. It is something that allows smaller lots outside of subdivisions. We are facing some enforcement issues so they will be taking another look at that.

ITEM II: Approval of the minutes from the Wednesday, May 20, 2020 Project Review Board meeting.

MOVED AND SECONDED: That the Minutes be approved as presented and read.
(Reiche & Watson) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Ayes) (1 Excused-Troidl) (0 Nays)

ITEM III: Reviews

KLIF LLC – Exterior Alterations

The applicant is seeking approval of a Design Review Certificate for exterior alterations at their property at 13 Bow Street. The removal of a chimney and installation of solar panels are proposed. Design Review District I – Class C. Zoning District: Village Commercial I (VC-1). Tax Assessor Map 11, Lot 102. KLIF Enterprises LLC, applicant and owner; Andrew Wilbur, representative.

Mrs. Pelletier pointed out that this building was before the Board six months ago when Andy Wilbur, the applicant purchased it and planned to be making some exterior modifications. In the recent historic inventory, it was flagged but today before the Board it is listed as a Class C. It has a lot of architectural and historic detail and charm to it so it was flagged by the people doing the inventory as being a building that perhaps was misclassified. Today, it is a C building, and that is how we look at it in terms of Design Review. The applicant has started doing some work and now finds the need to remove the second chimney on this building. It is not visible everywhere. It depends on the view. There were some pictures in the packet but it is considered an alteration to the building. Under the Ordinance, it needs to come before the Board. The second thing is that the applicant wants to install solar panels. We have other places in town that have solar panels. The Design Review Ordinance is silent on solar panels but again they are attached to the building and it is a building modification which is why it is before the Board tonight. The applicant included some information on the solar panels, the chimney and photos showing the visibility of the structure.

Chair Campanelli asked if the chimney on the Walking Company is going to go as well. Mr. Wilbur advised that that chimney needs to stay since it is tied into a furnace in the basement of the Walking Company. It would be cost prohibitive to remove it. The others have been defunct for some time.

Chair Campanelli opened the public portion of the meeting but there were no public comments provided. She noted that as Caroline indicated, there are no design guidelines for solar right now but feels it is great that the applicant is putting solar on. Mr. Blanchard asked if there is a plan to address solar panels in future ordinances that are being worked on potentially. Mrs. Pelletier advised that the Planning Board has been talking about solar panels and is looking at solar regulations in town. It would be more limited in the village. At this point, Design Review changes, sometimes the Council wants input from the Planning Board and sometimes they can do them on their own, so when the solar proposal if it moves forward gets to Council, it is something that will be flagged as something that needs to be looked at and carefully considered but it is not part of the solar discussion at this point. That is a big discussion and there was some other ongoing work hopefully going to happen to the Design Review Ordinance at the same time. It is definitely something that has been flagged.

Mr. Wilbur, as a business owner, noted there is a tendency to have these things go in front of the Board. In terms of supporting solar, it would be nice if things were able to be staff approved based on conditions rather than having to have the time and expense of going through the approval process. Chair Campanelli agreed with him. Part of why Mr. Wilbur is coming to us is for the chimney removal. Mr. Wilbur noted that he was doing one application and he is not sure the solar will happen this year, but he figured if he was going to pay the fee for the chimney removal, he might as well get the solar one included as well and hopes it will happen within the two-year time frame he has. It wasn't a deterrent or a cost to him in this case so he is not objecting to it in anyway. This is food for thought if the goal is to support solar, from a cost perspective if it is straight forward and communicated in a way that people can just get an approval for it rather than having to navigate the expense and time for the process. Chair Campanelli agreed. Ms. Watson asked if there may be some sort of planning process or group formed around this and it might make some sense to do some homework on this. Mrs. Pelletier mentioned she could note this for the Board. The way the solar language is drafted for Freeport, the next step is to have a public hearing. It addresses all aspects of solar from people who want to put it on the roof of their home to large-scale solar projects that want to come in. One of the things the approach is taking is exactly what Andy is saying although Design Review is a different thing, people who want to put it on their house or accessory to their business to support their own business. It will be a streamlined process because we do want to support the property owner at the local level. The Board will see that in the draft language and she will circulate it when the public hearing goes out because they would love to have public feedback to make sure it works for Freeport.

Mr. Blanchard noted there is also federal guidance available for putting solar panels on historic buildings and offered to send it along to Mrs. Pelletier.

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 scale of the building will not be altered. 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 or buildings should be visually compatible with the heights of the buildings in the neighborhood.

The 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 proportion of the building's front 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 rhythm of solids to voids in the front facades 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.

The roof shape will not be altered. 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 proposal includes the removal of the second chimney (rear of building) and to install solar panels on the roof. The area where the chimney will be removed will be repaired with 3-tab asphalt shingles. The solar panels will be installed on three sections of the roof, with varying visibility. 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).

Rhythm of spaces to buildings on the streets are not being 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.

No change to any site features is proposed. 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 KLIF LLC for exterior alterations at 13 Bow Street (Tax Assessor Map 11, Lot 102), to be substantially as proposed, application dated 05/27/20, finding that it meets the standards of 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 construction, the applicant obtain a building permit from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer. (Hamlin & Yankee) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Ayes) (1 Excused-Troidl) (0 Nays)

Girr Residence – Exterior Alterations

The applicant is seeking approval of a Design Review Certificate for exterior alterations at their property at 85 Bow Street. The proposal includes the removal and replacement of an existing porch. Design Review District II – Class A. Zoning District: Village Mixed Use I (VMU-1). Tax Assessor Map 13, Lot 81. Laura Girr, applicant and owner; Cory Warren MW Hoss Construction, representative.

Mrs. Pelletier mentioned that Laura Girr is in attendance and Corey Warren is here representing the applicant. This is a case where the applicant was prepared to go forward with a porch reconstruction. They came in for a building permit and discovered that they were in the Design Review District Class A which is why they are before the Board tonight. She noted that the Board has had discussions about demolition versus reconstruction and the applicants ask that the Board consider this as a reconstruction since they are proposing to take down an existing rotted porch and replace it in the same location, with the same footprint with modernized materials to a degree but retain the trim, columns and architectural features shown in the pictures in the Board's packets. The applicant is hoping to reuse some of those wood details to the greatest extent possible but in some cases, they may need to recreate them if they are rotten. They are proposing some Azek trim and composite boards for the decking. One of the biggest

changes is that you see a railing system on the deck but the preference of the applicant is to not have a railing. However, code requires them to have a railing if the height is 30" above grade. After checking with the Codes Officer, he confirmed that they do have to have a railing so the proposal before the Board includes a railing system on the back portion and along the side. They will not have to have it on the main street side. They are proposing to use the existing granite steps. If the Board is comfortable looking at this as a reconstruction, in the proposed motion there is a finding clarifying why you would look at this as a reconstruction as opposed to a demolition request.

Mr. Blanchard asked if the Board is sure it is not a National Register listed building since it is close to the boundaries of the Harraseeket Historic District. Mr. Warren advised that he has not found any literature that says it is. Chair Campanelli pointed out that it did not say it on the survey form. Mr. Blanchard mentioned that if the applicant does not want a railing, he does not want to force one on them since they are using modern materials. Chair Campanelli agreed and mentioned that it really does ruin the design of the porch. She asked why it is proposed on two sides. Mr. Warren advised that on the Bow Street end it is less than 20" off the ground and half of the whole deck is over 30". On the back, the grade slopes off quite a bit. It is a safety issue for Codes.

Mrs. Pelletier added that it appears the Harraseeket Historic District starts on the other side of Bow Street. She also mentioned that the property owner just commented that it is not as far as they know. Chair Campanelli advised that she is concerned about any work that is damaged that it is replaced in kind, that it replicates exactly what is there because if they go off that, it is really going to change the character of this porch. It is really lovely detailing and she is concerned about that. She wants to make sure that we note that in the language of the motion. Mr. Warren advised that the goal is to tear down and reuse as much of the detail trim between the posts below the roof line and rebuild it nearly identical to what is there but upgrade some of the materials for ease of maintenance and longevity of the deck. In order to meet code, they have to put footings in which are not present right now and build the deck strong enough to comply with today's Code. They will add some framing but most of it will be hidden under the deck with the picket skirting that will be replaced to look nearly identical to what is there. The only change would be the addition of a safety railing which they wish they didn't have to put on.

Mr. Reiche referred to the gable end under that shed roof and asked if the intention is to reuse or duplicate that. Mr. Warren advised that they will duplicate it since most of it doesn't look like it could be reused. The new material will start above those detailed archways. The plan is to duplicate exactly. They will take pictures and drawings of dimensions to recreate what is there but level it up and square it up to the building. From the pictures, one can see that it is falling off the building right now. With a couple more winters, the whole thing could fall down.

Chair Campanelli knows the Board is not supposed to design but asked the Board if they had any suggestions for a railing. Mr. Warren advised that the goal was to pick up some railing that would be the least obtrusive to the view from the street and that is the least visual. It is a more modern material but as far as the visual impact from Bow Street, adding a white baluster railing would change the look of that porch quite a bit. In order to meet safety, they are quite stuck to choose a railing that would accomplish the job. A stainless cable rail is not the cheapest option and they would like to do something cheaper, but feel it would probably compromise the look of the porch more than what is desired. Mr. Hamlin asked if the railing would start right in the front. Mr. Warren advised that it would start in the front and would run the whole side because the grade starts to drop off. When they rebuild the deck and level it off, it will hit the 30" and cause the code to come into play. The anchors will not be visible from the

street. They are required to have a cap to the railing that can bear 150 lbs. and the cable rail will be spaced every 4" horizontally. He explained how it would be attached.

Mr. Blanchard advised that he is sending the National Register nomination for the Harraseeket Historic District to Mrs. Pelletier which has a description of what the District is so if we check it after tonight, we can go back and make sure it is correct saying this property is outside of the District. It probably is. The District was created in 1974 but they do get specific about lots and map numbers which may or may not still be accurate. If the applicant doesn't want a railing, he does not want to force one on them if there is a way out.

Mrs. Pelletier advised that if the Board wants to add a condition saying: If it is determined that the structure is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the building code would allow an exemption for the requirement of a railing, the Board grants that approval. That would allow them to figure it out and figure out how the exemption would work. That way they could move forward with the deck and either have the cable railing as proposed or if new information is learned and they are able to do it differently, that would give them the option. Mr. Yankee asked if the top stand is a strand or is it solid? Mr. Warren advised that it has to be solid. Chair Campanelli asked how the Board felt about adding a 4th condition. There was general agreement to add it and Mrs. Pelletier reread her suggested condition. Mr. Hamlin suggested adding: It would not require the applicant to come back before the Board. Other Board members agreed.

There were no public comments provided.

Proposed Findings of Fact:

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 scale of the building will not be altered as the proposal includes removing and replacing an existing porch, in the same location and same size and scale. A railing system will be required (per code) for portions of the reconstructed porch. 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 building and porch 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 proportions of the front façade will not be altered. The proposal includes removing and replacing an existing porch, in the same location and same size and scale. A railing system will be required per code, for portions of the reconstructed porch. 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 be retained. 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.

Proportions of openings within the facility will remain unchanged. 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 shape of the building will not be altered. The roofline of the reconstructed porch will match the existing roof. Trim details and the porch roof overhang will be retained. 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 rotting wood structure will be removed and the new porch will use four concrete footings. A railing is proposed for the reconstructed porch and will a stainless-steel cable railing system. New roofing will match the existing in terms of style and material. Any new trim is proposed to be Azek PVC. The existing trim detail (between the existing columns) will be removed and reused or rebuilt with wood material as needed. The columns will also be rebuilt with wood and retain the same detail. The wood slats covering the area beneath the deck will be reused/replaced as needed. For the decking surface, Azek composite decking is 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 street will not be altered as the reconstructed porch will be in the same location. 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.

No changes to any site features are proposed. 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 signage is 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 Laura Girr, for the reconstruction of a porch at 85 Bow Street (Tax Assessor Map 13, Lot 81), to be built substantially as proposed, application dated 05/20/2020, finding that it meets the standards of 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) The Board finds that this is an application for reconstruction, as the applicant will be removing and replacing an existing porch, in the same location and with the same dimensions, and any required changes per Code.
- 3) Prior to the start of any construction, the applicant obtain a building permit from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer.
- 4) If it is determined that the building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and may be exempt from certain Building Codes, namely the railing, the applicant may proceed with the exemption without needing to reappear before this Board.

Freeport Housing Trust – Site Alterations

The applicant is seeking approval of a Design Review Certificate and Site Plan Amendment for site alterations at their property at 60 Bow Street. Design Review District II – Class C. Zoning District: Medium Density Residential II (MDR-II). Tax Assessor Map 20, Lot 74C. FHT Quarry Ridge LP, applicant; Maine State Housing Authority, owner; Pat Carroll, Carroll Associates, representative.

Mrs. Pelletier advised that the Freeport Housing Trust has a purchase and sales agreement to buy the Quarry Ridge Apartments on Bow Street. They sit up on a hill and back from the road. It is an interesting parcel because the entrance and a small portion of Building #1 are in Design Review. The rest of the property is outside the district. The only changes that would fall within Design Review would be the placement of the lighting fixtures, repaving at the entrance of the roadway and guide rails towards the beginning. They are also proposing a new roof either asphalt or metal for Building #1. This project has a lot of little changes that didn't clearly fall into the Ordinance. She likes to be overly cautious which is why it is here before the Board tonight. It is really part of a rehabilitation project for the site. It includes parking lot restriping, ADA improvements, cleaning up landscaping. It does not include any new units, any building additions, no change to the footprint of the structure. It does include some rehab to the outside of the buildings but other than the roof, you will not see a lot of it from the road. She heard from the Fire Chief that he wants to make sure that the changes will not obstruct passage for the ladder truck. She talked to the applicant and learned they are not changing the paved parking areas. They are just rehabbing them. They are not adding islands. The applicants agreed to reach out to the Fire Chief that there are no turning issues. If they need to tweak a tree here or there, it might happen but it would happen under the threshold of Staff Approval. They are fixing some of the stormwater improvements on the site. The Town Engineer looked at it and signed off on it because he didn't have any issues.

Pat Carroll is here representing the applicant and Matt Peters is here representing the Freeport Housing Trust. Pat is prepared to share his computer screen with the Board and walk them through the Plan. Mr. Carroll introduced Matt Peters. Mr. Peters explained that they want to preserve the ongoing affordability of the property over the long term. They are putting in new use restrictions so all the apartments will have limits on who can live there, up to a certain income threshold and also limits on rental restrictions. They are also investing a substantial amount of money to make sure the property is up to the Trust's standards, a lot of the curb appeal as well as some work in the apartments. A few of the apartments will be brought up to the full Accessibility standards and the light stormwater work will definitely help with the flow through the site.

Pat Carroll displayed a screen showing an aerial photograph of the site. He pointed out the Upper Village that contains 3 buildings with 12 units and then the Lower Village that contains 3 buildings with 22 units. There is a total of 34 units on this site. They are not proposing to add units, or footprints or change the exterior of buildings in any significant way. In Building #1 and #2 they will convert two of the existing ground floor apartments to fully ADA accessible units. There is a Rental Office and Laundromat in Building #3 that will be upgraded as far as the laundry facilities go. Those are the major floor plan changes for the buildings. They are cosmetic in a way. They are replacing front doors, and all the roofs in the project. Two different options for roofing are being looked at. One would be asphalt which is what is there now. The second would be metal roofing that would be installed on the roof. They would be both gray which is similar to what is there now. Either would work but it is a matter of how the budgets come in and how much money Matt has to spend on the project. Metal would last longer and their goal is to

make this project livable for another 40 or 50 years. The property contains 14 acres of land and development really occurs in the Northeast corner of that site. They are doing some minor site work such as replacing curbing, replacing all the sidewalks, which in some places are over 3' wide. They are replacing them in a wider width to make it comfortable for people and making sure the ADA units and any of the common spaces in the project have accessible sidewalks and removing or reducing a couple of sidewalks in the Lower Village to make things work better. They are really only adding a little over 400 sq. ft. of impervious cover to this site so they think they have done a pretty good job of trying to maintain what is there, improve it where they can and minimize the amount of new impervious on the site. They are doing some new reconfigurations of the parking lots and most of the striping does not meet the Town's standards today. They reviewed Zoning and determined that 54 spaces would be required and they are actually showing 59 spaces on site. Mr. Carroll then displayed a colored plan showing the Upper Village and then the Lower Village. As Caroline indicated, this does fall under Design Review but the only visible portions are as Quarry Ridge comes up, you can begin to see the beginning of Building #1 behind the natural tree buffer so it is well hidden. The Lower Village is totally hidden. He displayed other shots. The only physical change anyone will see from Bow Street is the new roofing.

He explained that the Quarry Ridge Road is in poor shape. There are lots of pot holes, the drainage doesn't work very well and the paving is in poor shape. He pointed to an area of Quarry Ridge Road extending about 25' up from the intersection which should be box cut and actually rebuilt. That is the majority of road work being done. He pointed out a tight corner and there have been cobblestones added there because people tend to cut that corner. It is rutted so they added cobblestones. They are going to widen that curve so people coming and going up to this point will make it happen. The other major thing is they are adding a curve on the north side of Quarry Ridge Road. Currently the road kind of crowns and half of the road runoff runs down towards Building One and a lot of it runs over the banking onto Bow Street. In installing this curve, it not only keeps cars and tires off the shoulder of the road but it actually collects the water and brings it down and minimizes the potential for erosion. This was built back in 1983 and it appears the Town didn't have much of a design standard back then because they were allowed to use railroad ties as curbing. They have totally rotted out in 35 years and the sidewalk behind them is in pretty rough shape and a lot of this is only 3' wide right now. The idea is to come in and install new curbing along the inside face of the parking lot and then adjacent to that they will install a new 5' wide sidewalk allowing two people to walk side by side. In the ADA unit on the left side of Unit #1, and the ADA unit on the right side of Unit #2, there is one entrance to each building. The sidewalk and access points to those entrances would all be raised up and made to comply with ADA requirements. He pointed to where there will be a new walkway that comes back to the Laundry Room and Office for the development. The walkway continues on and they will install curbing all the way down Quarry Ridge Road to the Lower Village site. They will be replacing sidewalks and removing sidewalks where necessary and providing ADA access to the lower unit. That is the major site change. They are really just improvements on what is there and they are following the same alignment. They are not really changing anything. He pointed out where the only change in alignment is being made to make a better connection. The parking will all be restriped. There are a series of pole lights and they will be remounted with LED fixtures. There is some lighting on the buildings primarily at the entrance points to provide safety for pedestrians walking to the units. All those lights will be short cut-off light fixtures and the Board has seen cut sheets on those.

For landscaping, there are a lot of shrubs and trees on this site planted 35 years ago especially up around the building units. They are very overgrown and do not allow the buildings to breathe very well. They are hard to maintain and actually provide a place for someone to hide. They will be cleaning a lot of the overgrown shrubbery on the site. For the most part, the trees are doing great but they will be

taking a few trees out that are not doing well. They are adding a significant number of trees and plantings to bring the scale of the buildings down. Those are the major elements they are proposing and they hope the Board is in agreement with what they are planning to do.

Chair Campanelli asked if the Board had any questions. Ms. Watson asked what access there is directly from Bow Street up into the complex other than driving. Mr. Carroll pointed to an existing sidewalk that comes down and ties into a sidewalk on Bow Street which will be maintained. Ms. Watson applauded the project but was curious if there is any plan as indoor work is being done on these units to do more energy efficiency work. Mr. Peters advised that they provide heat so the owners will pay the heat. There is a central boiler and hot water system. The residents experience only electricity costs so when they replace a refrigerator, they make sure to purchase energy star equipment. There are only a couple of overhead lights in the apartments and as part of this proposal they will be LED lights. Ms. Watson was thinking about insulation and when you have walls open, it is easy to put insulation in. She encouraged the thought process if it is something that is cost effective, one of the big issues has always been that when the tenant pays the electric bill, there is no real incentive to lower the cost of the electric bill. It is something that is critically important these days for folks with moderate incomes. Mr. Peters noted that the heating is paid for by the owner and is provided by central propane boilers. They are replacing the existing boilers with high efficiency boilers. They did consider putting solar panels on the roof but the roofs are too chopped up so may invest in an off-site solar farm to reduce some of the electricity costs, but not all of them.

Mr. Yankee pointed out that the sidewalk is the only access to the road. He asked if it is maintained in the winter and will it meet the same ADA standards? Mr. Carroll was not sure it is maintained in the winter but knows that it does not meet the ADA standards as far as slopes go. There is too much grade change across there. Mr. Yankee noted that Mr. Carroll mentioned that the water is an issue on the driveway as it goes down to Bow Street. He asked if there is a drain at the bottom that will capture the runoff. Mr. Carroll indicated that there is a catch basin on both sides of Quarry Ridge Road and explained how the water would be captured. Mr. Yankee asked if there are any ledge issues for the work being proposed. Mr. Carroll indicated that the answer is no because for the most part the swale is already there and they are just cleaning it out.

Chair Campanelli asked for public input. There were no public comments provided. She thanked Mr. Carroll for the detailed explanation. She called for a motion.

Proposed Findings of Fact:

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 scale of the buildings will not be altered. 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 buildings 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 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.

Proportions of openings within the facility will remain unchanged. 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 shape of the buildings will not be altered. 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 only building located within Design Review District II is building one and it will be only partially visible from the right-of-way. The applicant would like approval for either asphalt shingles or metal roofing; either would be a shade of gray. 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 street 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 only portion of the property in Design Review District II includes the front portion which contains the first section of Quarry Ridge Road and building one. That portion of the road will be repaved and there will be sidewalk alterations, replacement lighting fixtures and a new guard rail. 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 signage is 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.

Proposed 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 currently contains 34 multifamily dwelling units on approximately 14 acres. Most of the property is not visible from the road. Minor site alterations are proposed as part of a rehabilitation of the site. Existing landscaping will be cleaned up and supplemented as shown on the site plan. No new buildings are proposed. 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 site is already developed and no changes to any building footprints are proposed. The project includes mostly minor site changes that are part of a site rehabilitation project. The front portion of the parcel, including a portion of the road and building one, are Class C in Design Review District II. Limited changes to the exterior building facades are proposed. 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

Vehicular access is existing from a driveway entrance on Bow Street. Reconstruction of the entrance (where it connects to Bow Street) is proposed. The location of the entrance will not change; however, they will need to obtain any applicable permits from Freeport Public Works prior to starting any alterations in the right-of-way. New guardrails along sections of the road are proposed. 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.

The existing site has 67 parking spaces. Parking will be realigned resulting in 60 spaces; 54 spaces are required. There will also be an increase in the number of accessible spaces being provided with 5 of the 60 being ADA compliance in accordance with Section 514 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. 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 site is already development and minor stormwater management improvements are proposed including some new and replacement curbing to control water flow, cleaning of drainage swales, replacement of an existing retaining wall and the addition of a catch basin in the upper portion of the property. A stormwater narrative was included in the submission and plans have been reviewed by the Town Engineer. 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.

No changes to utility connections are proposed. 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 changes to any signage are 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.

There are no special features associated with this project. 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.

Pole lighting fixtures will be replaced in the same location with new cut-off LED light fixtures. Existing building mounted lighting fixtures will be replaced, and supplemented as required, also with cut-off LED fixtures. 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.

The site has existing landscaping which was previously approved. New landscaping plans were included in the submission and landscaping will be updated and supplemented as proposed. Some existing plantings, such as Norway Maples and overgrown shrubs will be removed. 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:
- a. The project will not result in water pollution, erosion or sedimentation to surface waters;
 - b. The project will not result in damage to spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird and other wildlife habitat;
 - c. The project will conserve shoreland vegetation;
 - d. The project will conserve points of public access to waters;
 - e. The project will adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater;
 - f. The project will protect archaeological and historic resources;
 - g. 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. No changes to any public utility connections are proposed. No known historic or archaeological resources have been identified on the site. 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: Be it so ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact, Design Review Certificate and Site Plan Amendment for FHT Quarry Ridge LP, for proposed site changes associated with a rehabilitation project at 60 Bow Street (Tax Assessor Map 26, Lot 74C), to be substantially as proposed, application dated 05/27/2020, finding that it meets the standards of 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 work on the rehabilitation of the road entrance, the applicant obtain any applicable permits from the Freeport Department of Public Works.

She suggested to approve as read. (Watson & Hamlin) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Ayes) (1 Excused-Troidl) (0 Nays)

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

Mrs. Pelletier pointed out that the Board has another meeting next Wednesday. We have three items, two subdivisions and a change of use. The packets will be fairly small because the Board already has the conceptual plans for the subdivisions. One the Board got on the site walk and the other is for Pownal Road that has not changed. That leaves the Board looking at July and she is aware of at least three applications of medium size that will be submitted for the July 15th meeting. If we want to decide to put everything that comes in on July 15th and go until we get through it. The Board has in its Rules of Order and Procedure that you won't take up any new items after 9:30 but we have not historically done that. She asked for feedback from the Board if it wants to go forward and get as much done in one night as it can or if you want to have two small agendas.

Chair Campanelli advised that she would prefer to keep it to one meeting if there are three items. Others agreed. Mrs. Pelletier added that there are one or two pending and the Board could have up to five but feels it could be manageable. If she gets a very large application, she will reach back out to the Board. If it is five or less, the Board can plan to go with one meeting. Chair Campanelli asked about August and in the past, there was a break in August. She asked Mrs. Pelletier if she foresees that happening or does she think we will be having a meeting. Mrs. Pelletier mentioned that if the Board wanted to take a break, August 19th you could, or September 16th. As long as we have advance notice so we can tell applicants. The quicker the Board decides that, they can get word out and work with that. Ms. Watson feels it is wise to consider August off and September back in and we might actually have an in-person meeting in September. Mr. Blanchard was fine with that. Chair Campanelli is fine either way but would not want to take time off if we have to double back up again. Mrs. Pelletier does not see the Board slowing down. We have two applicants that have been tabled for quite some time. She expects one of them to come back before the Board in July. If we are not going to have an August meeting, she will reach out to the other applicant so they are aware and if they want to come in July, they can come before the Board. Otherwise they may be looking at waiting until September. If the preference of the Board is to take a break and enjoy the summer, given the fact that this month, you have been meeting

three out of four Wednesdays, she feels we can do that. She has no problem circulating the Board's schedule if no August meeting. If somebody contacts her and for some reason there is a project we will jeopardize, she will reach back out to the Board and see if she can recruit a quorum. It is much easier to cancel in advance so people can plan accordingly.

Chair Campanelli took a straw poll to cancel the August meeting or not:

Campanelli: neutral, either way

Blanchard: yes, cancel it

Hamlin: either way

Reiche: yes cancel

Watson: yes cancel

Yankee: yes cancel

Chair Campanelli feels it is reasonable to take a break. The Board has had quite a time of it. She hopes we can keep one meeting in July and then we will see. Mrs. Pelletier mentioned that if we need to cram a meeting in July to take August off, she will reach out and try to pull people in if she needs to. As we reopen and bring in a new planner, it will be nice to have a little lull in the schedule to get things on track. She will get the word out but will see the Board next week. The meeting will start at 6 p.m. Chair Campanelli thanked Board members for giving so much of their time this month.

Mrs. Pelletier pointed out that she has had people thank her that the Town is not putting them on hold during the pandemic. We are getting thanks that the Board is meeting and applications are able to move forward. That is not the case in every town so your work is greatly appreciated.

ITEM V: Adjourn.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To adjourn at 7:46 p.m. (Hamlin & Blanchard) **ROLL CALL**

VOTE: (6 Ayes) (1 Excused-Troidl) (0 Nays)

Recorded by Sharon Coffin