

**MINUTES
FREEPORT PROJECT REVIEW BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2021
6 p.m.**

This meeting was held online/virtually using Zoom teleconferencing

PRESENT: Guy Blanchard, Chair, GERALYN Campanelli, Ford Reiche, Adam Troidl, Suzanne Watson, Tod Yankee and Caroline Pelletier, Town Planner

EXCUSED: Gordon Hamlin

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Blanchard called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

ITEM I: Information Exchange

Ms. Pelletier advised that we will have some upcoming vacancies on the Board and if anyone is watching and is interested in submitting an application, now is the time. We are trying to update what the other Boards are discussing. The Planning Board has been meeting and last month talked about public notice and recommending those amendments to the Town Council. They also talked about some Shoreland Zoning changes. Coming up in February they will be talking about the new Solar uses. There will be a public hearing and she did extensive notices and most Board members will be receiving a piece of mail from the Town in the upcoming days. They will also talk about building heights and densities in the Village Commercial Zone.

ITEM II: Review of the minutes from the December 9, 2020 and the December 16, 2020 Project Review Board meetings.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To accept the Minutes of December 9, 2020 as printed and read. (Troidl & Watson) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Yes) (1 Excused-Hamlin) (0 No)

Chair Blanchard advised that a correction is necessary in the Minutes of December 16. Whoever reads it needs to change the heading to *MINUTES* instead of *Revised Agenda*. Mr. Troidl pointed out that there is a *Mr.* Lizotte at the top of Page 7 that should have been a *Ms.* Lizotte.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To accept the Minutes of December 16, 2020 with the changes stated. (Reiche & Troidl) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (5 Yes) (2 Excused-Campanelli & Hamlin) (0 No)

ITEM III: Reviews

304 Pownal Road Subdivision – Conceptual Subdivision

The applicant is presenting conceptual plans for a 6-lot residential Open Space Subdivision on Pownal Road. Individual lots would be accessed by private driveways from Pownal Road. Approximately 33 acres of open space are proposed. Zoning District: Rural Residential I (RR-1). Tax Assessor Map 21, Lot 89. Pownal Road, LLC, applicant and owner. Craig Sweet, PE., Terradyn Consultants, LLC, representative.

Ms. Pelletier explained that a couple of months back the Board looked at a subdivision on Pownal Road directly across from this. It was on the opposite side of the road. They are proposing six lots on the parcel but with the acreage, they could have up to 14. They are proposing individual driveways. It is a State road so they would have to get entrance permits from DOT in addition to meeting any requirements in the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance. They are proposing 33 acres of open space, 27 acres are required. One of the interesting things about this parcel is that there is an old closed landfill on the parcel which has some DEP restrictions that will

come into play. The applicant has reached out to DEP but that will require some additional research and due diligence. They are proposing to have wells and septic systems. On the applicant's team, Craig Sweet is here to provide a full introduction to the project.

Mr. Sweet explained that he is here representing the applicant. He screen shared a map showing the property with an existing landfill that was closed in 2000. It is about 5.2 acres. He noted that there are two existing single-family homes that are vacant at this time. The property is wooded with pockets of wetlands. He pointed out the steep slopes which are included in the net residential calculations. The existing landfill is currently accessed by a gravel road and it is proposed to remain as the primary access to the site. They reached out to DEP and learned that they regulate anything on top of the landfill cap with a 100-foot buffer of the solid waste boundary which he has shown on the plans. He pointed out the six lots they are hoping to get on the site and the long driveway will be the right-of-way easement for the Town for access to the landfill for any monitoring that needs to be done. They did the calculations and learned that the property could support 14 lots but they are proposing 6. They worked with the DOT and he pointed to the two driveways that will share one entrance as well as Lot 5 and 6. He pointed to the ones that will remain separate. They updated the net residential calculations from what they had originally submitted after receiving comments from the Town Engineer and now it is roughly 28 ½ acres of open space which will be provided. Each lot will have a well and septic system as well as underground utilities. They are hoping to do stormwater on each lot with some vegetated buffers and filters if necessary.

Mr. Reiche asked Mr. Sweet to tell the Board more about the landfill, when it was operated and a little more about the regulatory issues you have ahead of you on this? Mr. Sweet advised that he believes it was closed around 2000. The Town still has to do some annual monitoring of wells for leachate at the site but DEP will only regulate the boundary for solid waste and a 100-foot buffer outside of it. He learned that anything beyond that, DEP won't regulate through the solid waste aspect. Mr. Reiche asked what geologic studies does Mr. Sweet have to do? Mr. Sweet answered that he will be testing for wells to make sure that everything is safe for drinking water. There are no other requirements from DEP for that. Ms. Pelletier mentioned that as far as the Town, she will have the Town Engineer doing some additional research on the Town's behalf. They found some documents that had been recorded that pertained to making people aware that there is a closed landfill on the property. They were sent to the applicant and will be included in the Board's next packet. If it would be helpful to the Board, to have Mr. Bliss available to answer questions. Mr. Reiche feels this is obviously something the Board should be very conscious of as it goes through the approval process. He would like as much information as possible. Mr. Troidl mentioned Brunswick's old landfill. There was a five-acre lot that someone bought and built a single-family home on that and is right next to a similar gravel-access road. He did not know if reaching out to Brunswick made any sense but they may have information on that. Ms. Pelletier noted that Mr. Bliss is doing a little bit of digging to see what additional records can be found.

Mr. Sweet added that he knows there is an existing well where the mobile home used to be on the site that is up by the road. That is where they have been doing their testing. Mr. Troidl mentioned that Mr. Bliss pointed out in his e-mail that Lots 3 and 4 have driveways that might be on steep slopes. He asked Mr. Sweet to talk about the strategy for how he will deal with that. Mr. Sweet advised that that is part of the reason they are combining them as well as to get them out of the steep slope area. Mr. Yankee asked if these are subdivided, assuming that they will be sold at some point, is there a responsibility for the seller to disclose that there is a closed landfill nearby? Perhaps this goes back to what Mr. Reiche was suggesting regulatory-wise and all that. Ms. Pelletier advised that there is a document that got recorded on the parcel at the Registry. She offered to reach out and see what legally needs to be included in these notes on the recorded plan to flag buyers about the history of the subject parcel. Any of those questions the Board has that tie into the standard, we need to make a list and figure out the best way to address them legally going forward.

Ms. Campanelli asked if the open space will be useable? Has Mr. Sweet looked at how it could connect to other

open spaces that are accessible to residents in that area? Mr. Sweet noted he has not yet looked at this but offered to provide some additional information at the next submission. Ms. Campanelli advised that she feels he really should look into that and connect with the Town, the Conservation Commission and the Freeport Conservation Trust. In that discussion, the landfill will again come into play. She questioned if there was any litigation to make that landfill more useable and if any research was done on that. It is a pretty intense situation with people walking around and using that space. She would be interested in hearing the history around that and how it ended up in private ownership. On that same note, Mr. Troidl mentioned that typically open space has restrictions of what you can and cannot do on it. He doesn't know if a landfill would be a typical restriction like you would see in any subdivision or if there are warning signs that people can't be on it. Mr. Sweet advised that he learned from DEP that they can't construct anything that would disturb the ground on top of it. He will confirm with them but they don't have any other regulations on what can be done on top. He assumes people could walk around out there but that is something he will follow up on and will get more information.

Ms. Watson added that she discovered in the past that these older landfills had to have a plastic liner. She asked Mr. Sweet if he knew whether or not this particular landfill has a plastic liner to prevent leaching into the subsoil. Mr. Sweet did not know if there is a plastic liner but did know that it went through the DEP's closure process or if they did any remediation efforts when it was closed. Ms. Watson mentioned knowing if it has a plastic liner at this stage to prevent leaching would be an important piece of information to have because it would make a big difference on what wells would be subject to.

Chair Blanchard pointed out that some towns have used their closed landfills for locations for solar arrays and he is not sure this is something the Town or the developer would pursue as part of this project. He just threw it out. He has a concern with Lots 2 and 4 because of their proximity to the landfill. Any conveyance out he feels will be a difficult sell for some people being that close. He questioned if the lot placement is appropriate but he knows Mr. Sweet has looked at this a lot and he feels the lot itself presents a lot of challenges. It is something to maybe look at again. Lot 2 is really close and Lot 4 is a little bit more of a space from that 100-foot buffer but he feels a buyer going out there would see the landfill and see a lot of questions. He feels a site walk is really worth doing for this. He is not sure how the rest of the Board feels about this. Because of the challenges of this particular parcel, it would really benefit the Board. Other Board members agreed. Mr. Yankee returned to the open land and asked if the landfill area is included in the open space? Mr. Sweet advised that it was originally included in the documents submitted but after reviewing the Town Engineer's letter, he removed it. Without it, they still meet the open space requirements. He mentioned that he could either deed it out or include it if certain regulations will allow.

Mr. Reiche asked that in terms of getting peer review or independent professional advice on this landfill, which he feels would be at the applicant's expense if we did it, is that something we have to decide on early in the process or wait until we know more about the landfill problem? Ms. Pelletier advised that she did not know what the Board would need right now. She knew there would be a lot of questions about the landfill and they have come up already. Yes, the Board can require peer review but feels we will need more information on what else the applicant can provide regarding the landfill because the Board has already asked a lot of questions and they need to come up with more information. Once the Board has that, it will be able to decide what other information you might be able to require under the Ordinance and what you might need. Mr. Reiche feels that having that type of professional advice would help the Board from over reacting to this and it might ultimately benefit the applicant for the Board to have more insight into what questions to ask and what to not be concerned about would be really helpful. Chair Blanchard noted that this application poses some challenges for the Board since it has some members rolling off in the next couple of months before this goes through all the steps to be approved. He supposes there are four of us staying on but wanted the applicant to know that there will be some Board turnover as this application makes its way through. Mr. Yankee believes the history of when the landfill was created, what went into it and pretty thorough history would be helpful for him to ask more

questions. Mr. Sweet indicated that he has not yet gone through the files at the DEP but has spoken with the landfill unit and will be doing that.

Chair Blanchard pointed out that the Board has indicated it would be interested in going on a site walk. Ms. Pelletier suggested tentatively scheduling the site walk on a weekday before the February or March meeting. Notices will have to be sent out to abutters. Mr. Sweet advised that he will look for more information and will reach out to Ms. Pelletier.

Daniel Einstein advised that he is an abutter on the north side. He appreciates the Board's concerns about the landfill. It is his worry as well. He had two questions: what happens if all the digging for wells and all of that causes a problem with the landfill, who will clean it up? With the open space, what are the legalities with that? Is it something that can't be developed with a deed restriction? Ms. Pelletier pointed out that there are restrictions on the property but she hasn't come across anything saying it cannot be developed. There is an understanding from the Town Engineer from his conversations with DEP that there is that buffer around the closed landfill area. How they established that area is another question she believes the Town Engineer did raise in his memo. If the construction disrupts the landfill at all, even if it is out of those buffers, who is liable is a question that will have to be resolved. Mr. Yankee feels that what the question might have been there is who owns the open land, how is it maintained, who has control over it? Ms. Pelletier feels that right now that will be t/b/d. Whether or not the landfill and the rest of the open space if handled differently will be t/b/d. At this point the applicant has not stated their intentions and it sounds like they are thinking of some changes based on the Town Engineer's comments.

Warren Gerow asked about water testing at the well which is basically out at the road. He asked if there are any requirements for hydrogeological work back closer to some of the back lots like Lot 2 and Lot 4? What would go on there to check out the water at these lots that are further back? Mr. Sweet mentioned that for those lots, they will test and possibly put the wells towards the front of the lots and away from the landfill as much as possible.

Ms. Pelletier added that the role of the Board is to determine what are the appropriate areas for development and for open space. Once the Board sees where the actual house lots are going to be, that is guidance the applicant will be looking for from the Board to give them, what kind of hydrogeologic study they would want to come forward and what they would need to include to demonstrate in this unique situation whether or not they meet the standards of the Ordinance. Until we see the site and the Board knows where the lots will be, the Board cannot give them concrete guidance on that.

Mr. Reiche asked if there are any waivers being requested. Ms. Pelletier advised that there are not. Mr. Reiche asked who is the applicant? Mr. Sweet indicated that the applicant is Pownal Road LLC. Mr. Reiche mentioned the Board has to make the finding that the applicant has financial and technical capacities. Mr. Sweet noted he will provide financial information in the next submission but the owners have done other subdivisions.

Mr. Troidl mentioned Chair Blanchard pointed out Board turnovers coming up and if we do the site walk in February, that would be fine but if it was before the March meeting, we would have an extra hour of daylight and he thinks we would have new Board members. It may be more advantageous in April. Chair Blanchard likes the daylight savings idea.

MOVED AND SECONDED: Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board table the review of the Site Inventory, Analysis and Conceptual Sketch Plan for 304 Pownal Road LLC, for a 6 lot, residential open space subdivision (Tax Assessor Map 21, Lot 89) until after such time that the Board is able to conduct a site walk. (Troidl & Watson) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Yes) (1 Excused-Hamlin) (0 No)

Arts and Cultural Alliance of Freeport – Design Review Certificate

The applicant is seeking approval of a Design Review Certificate for exterior building alterations at the existing First Parish Church at 40 Main Street. Zoning District: Village Commercial I (VC-I). Design Review District I – Class A. Tax Assessor Map 11, Lot 122. Arts & Cultural Alliance of Freeport, applicant; First Parish of Freeport, owner; James Cram, representative.

Ms. Pelletier explained that a few months ago the Arts and Cultural Alliance was before the Board for a change of use. Construction is now underway and they have found new things that need to be done in the building. They have found some improvements that need to be made and because they are in the Design Review District and the improvements will be visible, they are before the Board. One of the improvements they need to make is to get some circulation in that building which Mr. Cram can explain. They are proposing to put some ventilation resulting in a few new changes to the exterior façade.

They are also proposing to replace a window on the second floor on the rear façade which would be a simulated divided light window. If you are standing on Depot Street and looking at the back side of the church, on the upper level they have these cool windows that are actually stained-glass windows behind the storm window. However, they are not in good shape and are rotting. They want to take them out, keep the frame, keep the storm and take out the interior stain glass panels out and kind of fill in the windows on the second story. It is high up and far back from Depot Street but you can see it. That is why it is here before the Board. Mr. Cram can go into the details on the appearance and why it is needed.

Jim Cram, Freeport Historical Society Director advised that they are underway finally where they are starting the new walkway and new ramps going in. They originally planned to just put in a heat pump in the gallery space to provide air conditioning in that area but discovered there is very little natural ventilation. There aren't a lot of operable windows so they started talking with Russ Martin a professional engineer about calculating how they could get more air into the building. There are four heating units to provide the extra heat you need when you put more fresh air in. There is a lot of ductwork required to all four of those units. They have to bring the fresh air in and exhaust the other air out. The details Mr. Cram provided show how they used existing basement windows for most of the vents, in and out. There is one very high gray exhaust louver on the north gable in that alley between there and Anne Taylor's loft and there is an intake hood, the largest piece is actually hidden behind the fire escape on the south side of the building. The air handling system is almost a \$50,000 bump in the project so it is not something they wanted to do but in this era of COVID, having enough fresh air is certainly something they have to be sure their prospective clientele will feel comfortable in there using the space.

The window in the kitchenette, if you go behind the building you will see that almost every window in the back of the building has been replaced previously with a vinyl replacement window and this would be a better quality window than any of those are. It is a simple double hung simulated divided light sash to go in that former kitchen window on the main level but it is two stories above the parking lot. It is straight forward. The four windows high on the gable that Ms. Pelletier talked about, to make this project work, that side of the space is being converted into an art gallery and it turns out that artists like to have walls to put their paintings on. There are currently 12 windows in there. Two of them are being replaced by the new front entry, four of them are being covered with temporary panels on the inside which will be able to be removed so people can see the stained glass for different types of events. These four were always planned to be covered over but the church recently had a stained-glass specialist who rotates through the State every several years and does free assessments of churches' stained-glass windows. These are all sagging and the lead is falling out.

The ones where the door is coming out, are so bad, they are being discarded and they are taking some of the best other ones to replace those with. The best way to preserve these four sagging ones is to take them out and pack and store them and use the glass for replacement glass when others are in need of it. Some of them have already

been replaced with glass that does not match. The most efficient way for them to do that now would be to use an insulated panel with insulation associated with it and a dark panel cover on the outside that would be protected by the storm window. When you look at the rear elevation of this church, you realize that to really spruce up this exterior, it is a major job to look at the whole building. They would like to put these insulated panels behind those storms at this time. He noted that Eric Smith is here from the church if the Board has questions directly for him.

Mr. Troidl asked if there would be two louvers on the north gable? Mr. Cram indicated there would be two louvers and he sent cut sheets on them and all the components are good quality. They planned on a 2-hour fire rated ceiling below the main level between the two floors which is another challenge they were presented with but it is all inside. Mr. Troidl noted that everything seems to be as sensitive as it can be because obviously fresh air is important for air quality. It is a shame to lose the stained-glass windows but so many in the Northeast are covered by storm windows so unless you are inside the building they don't do much for you right now. He is not sure how much of a loss that is back there.

Chair Blanchard recommended seeing if there are any grants for window restoration and didn't know if the Historical Society has had any experience with that but perhaps one exists for stained glass as well so they go back in their original place and not be relegated to the basement in storage. It is a shame to lose the original fabric of the building. Mr. Cram pointed out to Mr. Smith that the church is trying to do something with their primary stained glass on Main Street. Mr. Smith advised that some of this proposal comes with the efforts between ACAF and the church to work out this agreement and come up with good compromises between the artists' needs and the congregation and the preservation of the building. They had a glass inspector come through a couple of months ago and they are looking at replacing the external covers of the windows, not with just storm windows but the large plexiglass coverings that face Main Street both to the south and to the west. Along with the repair to the very intricate windows in the sanctuary space, that is close to a \$100,000 project. The windows they are discussing are two sets on each of the three walls of the adjacent space to the sanctuary. Two are on the Main Street side, two on the alleyway side and two on the east side facing Depot Street. Those are the ones that have taken the most beating through wear and tear over the last 125 years. That was the primary ventilation for the meeting space. They were often repaired often using glass that doesn't match. The glass inspector said if anything had to go, these matching windows should be removed and they were moved to another opening on the alleyway. The ones on the east side facing Depot Street are among the ones that will need the most work. The idea would be to take the glass out and save it for future use as they repair the ones that can be seen from Main Street. Because there will be an interior wall built covering that glass, if they want to protect it, this is the time to take it out. Otherwise, there will not be a way to get to it once the interior wall covers it up. There is a significant project facing them in terms of repairing the more valuable glass that will be visible from the Main Street side of the church.

Chair Blanchard understood the cost concern for these types of projects. His concern is more with what is called for federal regulations, the cumulative effect or death by a thousand cuts that you start making these incremental changes over time to a historic building and then what's left? It is a matter of pulling back and taking a look at what you have and preserving it the best you can. He is glad these windows are not just going in the trash but losing those windows on the façade elevation facing Main Street and replacing it with an entry was a substantial change for the building. Making more changes to the church gives him a little pause.

Ms. Campanelli agreed with everything Chair Blanchard said. It is easy to justify the changes but there are ways of going about it to accommodate new uses and maintain the integrity of the structure. Mr. Smith noted that they have all realized that the eastern side of the building facing Depot Street has not been a great concern to the Town or the church over the last several decades and that is why it is the one side of the church that doesn't have shingles on it and has aluminum siding, very visible vinyl replacement windows, storm windows, giant halogen lights that were a requirement of the Town to light the parking lot. Both from the church and ACAF's perspective,

particularly as lots around that area may be developed and become more of a neighborhood, they would like in the future to revisit that side and bring it more like its original siding, shingles and outdoor fixtures.

Mr. Yankee advised that the two halogen lights have been inoperable for many years and since they will be throwing ladders up there, it might be a good time to take care of them. Mr. Smith noted that they are the responsibility of the lease holder of the parking lot. Their maintenance, care and electric bill for those are the responsibility of the lease holder but Mr. Yankee is correct, it has been several years.

David Webster noted he is on the Board of ACAF and works closely with church members to deconstruct the things that needed to change in order to move them forward as Meeting House Arts. Everything they have done in cooperation with any changes and things taken out, they have preserved and stored all those items they had to remove. At any point in the future, for greater historic preservation they will have the original materials. This has been a major concern for the church's congregation and it is one for him and ACAF. They are just trying to be practical and at some point, who knows they will be able to work together to restore the back side of the church and at that time they will have some of the same materials.

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 overall scale of the main structure 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 overall height of the 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 alterations are proposed to the front façade of the building which faces the most frequently used public way. 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 proposal includes incorporating the use of existing openings with the exceptions of two new louvers which will be in new openings, however painted to match the façade on which they will be located. 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.

No new openings for windows and doors are being created. The replacement window will be the same size and in the same location. Although the applicant is proposing to remove the stained glass from four upper level windows, the frame and storm glass will remain to retain the appearance of the openings in the 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 overall 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 louvers and intake hood will be aluminum, and all painted to match the color of the materials in the area for which they will be located. The new window will be SDL (simulated divided light) with vinyl exterior and wood interior. 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 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.

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.

BE IT ORDERED: that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact and Design Review Certificate for the Arts and Cultural Alliance of Freeport at 40 Main Street (Tax Assessor Map 11, Lot 122), for exterior building alterations, to be built substantially as proposed, application dated 12/30/2020, 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 construction, the applicant obtain any applicable permits from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer. (Reiche & Campanelli) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Yes) (1 Excused-Hamlin) (0 No)

ITEM IV: Persons wishing to address the Board on non-agenda items. There were none provided.

ITEM V: Adjourn.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To adjourn at 6:58 p.m. (Reiche & Troidl) **ROLL CALL VOTE:**

(6 Yes) (1 Excused-Hamlin) (0 No)

Recorded by Sharon Coffin