

REVISED AGENDA
FREEPORT PROJECT REVIEW BOARD
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2020

6 p.m.

This meeting was held online/virtually using Zoom teleconferencing

PRESENT: Guy Blanchard, (Chair), Gordon Hamlin, Ford Reiche, Adam Troidl, Suzanne Watson, Tod Yankee and Caroline Pelletier, Town Planner

Excused: Geralyn Campanelli

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Blanchard called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

ITEM I: Information Exchange

1) Update on Staff Approvals

Ms. Pelletier advised that she did have a staff approval that she screen shared with the Board. Years ago, there was a property at the end of Noble Drive that was formerly named Sailing Partners. They put up a metal building and due to its visibility, there was a lot of talk about its landscaping and the building façade. A decade or so later, what sounded like a good idea to have a change in the direction of the siding turned out not to be. There is rot and water issues under the roof overhang and a small section of vinyl siding that they had. They wanted to make some changes to the building. She pointed to an entry and a door and they wanted to rip the whole thing off and just have metal siding. She informed them that it would not work since at the time the Board really wanted to maintain the appearance of an entry. It helped to minimize the building so they are shifting their door due to their business operation and are extending the canopy. After looking at the landscaping, they need to relocate one plant. They did get rid of the siding change. It is going to be all metal but a different color. They ran into some issues with building codes that made the metal siding more practical. The bottom section will be metal siding that is painted green. The only actual physical change to the site is the relocation of one plant and they extended that little brick walkway out front.

2) Update on action by the Staff Review Board

Ms. Pelletier advised that the Staff Review Board has been busy. They reviewed two or three applications for a fill permit, a couple of them after the fact and a couple have been in advance of the project where people own property and are putting driveways but nothing else. Because of the amount of material, it triggers the need for a fill permit. They also approved a change of use at the former Friendly's Building at 147 Main Street. It will now be an antiques store and auction house. There was a change of use from office to retail.

ITEM II: Review of the minutes from the October 21, 2020 and the November 18, 2020 Project Review Board meetings.

Ms. Pelletier noted that the October set of minutes was where there was a question on the wording in one of the motions. She and Sharon went back and checked the tape and found it was word for word. There was another typo that she corrected.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To approve the October 21, 2020 Minutes as printed and read. (Troidl& Reiche) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Yes) (1 Excused-Campanelli) (0 No)

MOVED AND SECONDED: To approve the November 18, 2020 Minutes as stated and read. (Hamlin & Reiche) (6 Yes) (1 Excused-Campanelli) (0 No)

ITEM III: Reviews

Amended Redding Creek Subdivision – Proposed Amendment – PUBLIC HEARING - THIS ITEM HAS BEEN TABLED

The applicant is seeking approval of an amendment to the previously approved Amended Subdivision Plan - Lot 2A Redding Creek Subdivision (0 Redding Lane). A septic system relocation is proposed. A waiver to allow a first-time system variance has been requested. No additional lots are proposed. Zoning Districts: Rural Residential I (RR-I) and Shoreland Area (SA). Tax Assessor Map 25, Lot 45-F-1. Peter and Kim Murray, applicant and owners; Matt Cartmell, Cartmell & Associates Keller Williams Realty, representative.

Freeport Conservation Trust – Parking Area for Open Space

The applicant is seeking Site Plan Approval for a new parking area for open space at 0 US Route One North. The area will be constructed of gravel and have space for two cars. Zoning District: Medium Density A (MD-A). Tax Assessor Map 18, Lot 16A. Freeport Conservation Trust, applicant and owner. Ben Niles, Trustee Freeport Conservation Trust, representative.

Ms. Pelletier advised that there was a use added to the Zoning Ordinance about six years ago for a parking area for open space. A few have come before the Board. The Freeport Conservation Trust is here tonight. They just acquired a piece of land on U.S. Route One North and they want a parking area there. It is minimal. There is parking for two cars and a new driveway off U.S. Route One. It is a State Road and they got approval for a new driveway from the State of Maine. That information was included in the Board's packet. They do have a bigger driveway than they would like but it is not something the Board can waive. They have a 22-foot driveway. There is a little flexibility in the design of the parking lot. Our Town Engineer reviewed the parking lot and does not have any objections. He did give a memo with a few things for the applicant to consider such as being aware of wetlands and streams that are located further in on the property. We do not have any outstanding items with the application. One thing to note is that in the MD-A and MD-B there is a buffer requirement. In this case there is no building and it did not make sense to bring a landscaping plan in just to bring on in so the applicant did propose a natural buffer and they will retain whatever they can that is there today with the exception of what they need to cut down to get the driveway in. Ben Niles is here representing the application tonight.

Mr. Niles did not have anything to add. He feels Ms. Pelletier summarized it very well and he appreciates the assistance they received from her and Mr. Bliss to understand the requirements. They were not initially aware of the 22-foot width requirement and their initial MDOT permit was for 12 feet but it has been revised and is now 22 feet. Perhaps sometime in the future, they hope they can do these with less width but that is not for tonight.

Mr. Reiche mentioned in looking through the materials, it looks like there is a trail on the property that refers to an adjacent property. He asked if there is much connectivity or a network? Mr. Niles advised there is a single loop trail that begins on the property that FCT acquired from the Simpson Estate last February. The land on which Elizabeth Simpson's house was located, which is next to this, FCT received an easement, a draft of which was attached to her will. That easement provided for a trail on that roughly 16 acres next to the parcel they acquired. There is a trail that continues throughout the easement property and comes back in a loop. It is a longer trail than what could be put on 5 acres. It is essentially a trail on 20.

Chair Blanchard opened the meeting up to public comment. There were no public comments provided.

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.

No structures are proposed. Tree removal will be minimized to the area needed for the installation of the new driveway. 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 parcel is not within the Design Review District. No new structures 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.

Access to the parking area will be from a 22-foot-wide driveway; meeting the dimensional requirements of Section 512.D.10 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance (for a non-residential, two way driveway). Since this parcel is located on a portion of Route One under State jurisdiction, a driveway/entrance permit (for the new driveway) from the State of Maine is required and has been included in the submission (dated 06/30/2020). 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.

A gravel parking area for two vehicles is proposed. The parking area provides for the standard-length parking stalls (18.5 feet), however the aisle width behind is slightly shorter than the standard requirement of 24 feet. Section 514.B.9.b does have the following standard: "b. Parking areas for open spaces are exempt from the parking space dimensional standards of this section. Instead, the design of all parking areas must be reviewed and approved by the Freeport Town Engineer...". In this case, the Town Engineer has reviewed and approved the dimensional design of the parking area and does not have any objections; his comments are included in an email dated 12/11/20. 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.

Based upon the size and nature of the development, and the natural drainage patterns on the site, detailed information on surface water drainage was not included in the submission. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard.

- 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 new utilities 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 new signs 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.**

No lighting is proposed. 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.**

Section 406.G.2. of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance has requirements for buffering. The applicant is proposing to retain the existing wooded vegetation on-site and will only remove what is required for the parking area. No new landscaping is proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

- l. Environmental Considerations: A site plan shall not be approved unless it meets the following criteria:**

- (1) The project will not result in water pollution, erosion or sedimentation to surfacewaters;**

- (2) The project will not result in damage to spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird and other wildlife habitat;
- (3) The project will conserve shoreland vegetation;
- (4) The project will conserve points of public access to waters;
- (5) The project will adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater;
- (6) The project will protect archaeological and historic resources;
- (7) The project will not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or maritime activities in the Marine Waterfront District.

This parcel is not within the Marine Waterfront District or the Shoreland Zone. No structures 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 Freeport Zoning Ordinance.

MOVED AND SECONDED: Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact and a Site Plan for the Freeport Conservation Trust for a new gravel parking area for open space, at their property on 0 US Route One (Tax Assessor Map 18, Lot 16A), to be built substantially as proposed, site plan dated November 30, 2020, finding that it meets the standards of 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) The applicant establish an inspection account in the amount of \$300 for inspection of the proposed site improvements by the Town Engineer. (Reiche & Watson) **ROLL CALL**
VOTE: (6 Yes) (1 Excused-Campanelli) (0 No)

Mr. Niles thanked the Board for its time and the Staff for their assistance.

Casco Bay Carwash LLC – New Ground Sign

The applicant is seeking approval of a Site Plan Amendment to add a new ground sign at their property at 392 US Route One. No other changes are proposed. Zoning District: Commercial I (C-I). Tax Assessor Map 26, Lot 41. Rebecca Lizotte, applicant and representative; 392 Doten, LLC., owner.

Mr. Pelletier explained that Rebecca Lizotte is here tonight representing the application. Doten’s came before the Board for an office building and a car wash pre-pandemic. They had one multi-tenant ground sign approved for the rear building. Because they want another ground sign that was not included in their first submission, the Ordinance requires that they come back to the Board. The design of the sign was included in the submission. It is going to be internally illuminated. They included a plot plan that showed the location. One comment to note is that the Codes Officer did flag that State Law has certain requirements as far as the setbacks from the white lines and the yellow lines on the road. That is something she will send to the applicant to look at so there is a possibility that depending on how they scale that off, they might have to tweak the location a little bit but we will let them figure it out in the field. They are here tonight for a new ground sign as shown and that is the only change they have.

Mr. Lizotte did not have anything to add except they did place the sign along the 4' pedestrian easement that was granted in their approval so it is past the 15-foot setback and beside the pedestrian path but not in that pedestrian path easement so they are in compliance with that. She mentioned going with sign design and she thought they had checked the DOT setbacks. If they haven't, she will make sure it is done. On the design of the actual sign, they would like to get rid of the curvature and go with a straight triangle top. If it is a big deal, they can leave it as proposed. It was an after thought at the conference table where they are a straight-line kind of company. If it is too late to change it tonight, she will understand but would really like to straighten the curve at the top to make it a straight triangle.

Mr. Troidl noted that the overall sign height gets to be 13 feet high and there is 8 feet of post between the post and the base of the sign. It seems a bit out of proportion. He asked if they are trying to clear landscaping or if there is thought behind that of sign lines? Ms. Lizotte replied no, she thinks it was scaled off the other signs along that road and went with this scale of the signs of their neighbors.

Mr. Reiche mentioned that Section 527 encourages signage that is harmonious and does not give the appearance of strip development. He asked Ms. Pelletier if she knows of other signs that are internally illuminated and sized and placed like this on that part of Route One. Ms. Pelletier noted that going down there, there are others that are similar in height. She knows a couple of the hotels had internally illuminated signs as well as Maine Optometry that is across the road. Ms. Lizotte advised that they took that into consideration so they went between Maine Optometry with a single pole with a bigger center sign post and the dual post look at Royal River and Maine Beer. The hotels have a single solid post with a large rectangular sign on top. They took a little of each.

Mr. Reiche referred to the Ordinance that suggests that signs should have as little white in them as possible to reduce the overall commercial appearance and also reduce sky glow. It doesn't appear that this is showing up in this sign. There is a lot of white and he asked Ms. Lizotte if there is any way she could change that. She advised that it was one of the reasons they wanted to get rid of the curve. It would chalk some of that white down to mimic the triangle of the lighthouse and gets rid of some of that blank space.

Mr. Yankee asked about the edges and if they are blue or white, lit or unlit? Ms. Lizotte advised that the edges are navy blue and they are lit. There is one internal light that will light the entire vinyl sign. Chair Blanchard drew an example and asked if that is what Ms. Lizotte is envisioning. She agreed that it was exactly what they would be doing. They would be getting rid of some of the white space at the top. Chair Blanchard feels visuals help.

Mr. Yankee asked Ms. Pelletier about the issue of creating more ambient light and is there anything the Board should be concerned about lighting up the outsides rather than just the front and back to create that additional sky light? Ms. Pelletier advised that this is nothing we have ever considered before. She believes that the Maine Optometry sign across the road is white but does not recall if the signs are colored or illuminated. She believes that having the sides blue will help. It is nothing we have ever addressed before or gotten into. Mr. Troidl does not think too much light will penetrate through the blue on this sign.

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.

One ground sign was previously approved with the original submission. That ground sign was about 32 square feet and was approved to be located towards the side of the property and closer to the rear building. The applicant is now proposing a second ground sign which will be located towards the front of the site and between the front property line and the car wash building. 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 parcel is not within the Design Review District. No new structures 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.

No changes to vehicular access 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.

No changes to parking and circulation are proposed. 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.

No changes to surface water drainage are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard.

- 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 utilities 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.

One ground sign was previously approved with the original submission. That ground sign was about 32 square feet and was approved to be located towards the side of the property and closer to the rear building. The applicant is now proposing a second ground sign which will be located towards the front of the site and between the front property line and the car wash building. The new sign will be about 160 inches in height. The sign will be made out of metal and vinyl, internally illuminated and be two-sided. The sign face will be about 84"x64" (approximately 37 sf); the colors and design are included in the submission. There will be a 28-inch-high stone wall installed surrounding the base of the sign. The sign meets the standards of Section 527 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. 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.

No lighting is proposed. 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.

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

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

This parcel is not within the Marine Waterfront District or the Shoreland Zone. No buildings 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 Freeport Zoning Ordinance.

MOVED AND SECONDED: Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact and a Site Plan Amendment for Rebecca Lizotte, for a new ground sign for the Casco Bay Car Wash at 392 US Route One (Tax Assessor Map 26, Lot 41), to be built substantially as proposed, application dated 12/03/20, finding that it meets the standards of 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 installation the applicant obtain a sign permit from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer. (Troidl & Reiche) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Yes) (1 Excused-Campanelli) (0 No)

Kendall Tavern – Design Review Certificate

The applicant is seeking approval of a Design Review Certificate for exterior alterations at their Bed and Breakfast Inn at 213 Main Street. Alterations include replacement windows, new windows on the side façade of the barn, a new garage door, and new building mounted lighting. Zoning Districts: Village I (V-I), Freeport Village Overlay District, Design Review District I – Class B, & Design Review Color Overlay District. Tax Assessor Map 15, Lot 10. Nancy Kieran, applicant; NRK MAP, LLC, owners.

Ms. Pelletier advised that the owners are here tonight. They are proposing to make some changes to the barn. They want to convert the first level of the garage into living space. It is not changing the use of a B & B with a single family. It doesn't have to come to the Board for a single use but they are in Design Review so they do need to come before the Board for that. In looking at the pictures, the Board will see there is a door in the garage opening and some areas that are patched. Unfortunately, the door fell off due to rot. They are here before the Board to replace that. They are proposing to in-fill the opening and install a residential-style 36" wide barn sliding door. They are looking for the exact hardware. They are looking to replace all the windows over the next couple of years on the barn structure. They want to go to a 6 over 6. The panes would be between the glass which is what matches the existing portion of the house now. The existing house has vinyl on the inside and the outside. They are proposing having windows with vinyl on the outside and wood on the inside. The other change is the addition of five windows on the northerly side of the barn. The applicants are here if the Board has questions.

Mr. Kieran thanked Ms. Pelletier for explaining pretty much what they want to do. Mr. Reiche thanked the applicants for improving their property. The windows with the mullions in the glass with no outside relief prevents you from seeing a shadow line or anything. Under some lighting conditions, it looks like it is just a piece of glass without any divisions at all. He has a strong preference for windows with a true divided light or at least have the mullions on the outside. He believes Matthews Bros. makes a product like that. That would be a significant improvement in the windows. It is a lovely building. Where the applicants' garage door used to be, he is sure there was a barn-style door that got infilled with an overhead door the same size. To shrink that square which is such a prominent part of the façade and put

a small door in there, it will forever look like there used to be big door there and now there is a little door there.

Mr. Kieran mentioned he may not have been clear with Ms. Pelletier but they are not shrinking that door opening. When completed, the door opening will look like a tongue and groove door that they suspect filled that space back in the 1890s when the barn was built. The exterior door will be a sliding door that will also match the tongue and groove door so when it is closed, hopefully, the effect is that it will camouflage and just look like part of the big door. The 36" x 80" door will be a sliding door but it will be sliding over something that looks like a full barn door. Mr. Reiche pointed out that it sounds like Mr. Kieran is being much more sensitive to what he was talking about than he realized from the application and thanked him.

Mr. Kieran added that the door has been an eye sore to them for seven years. Putting an overhead door in that barn was a disgrace. Mr. Kieran feels Mr. Reiche brought up a good point on the mullions but he is going to be cleaning the windows. Mrs. Kieran pointed out that those windows will match what is in the inn. They did that in the '91-'92 renovation. Mr. Reiche understood that they had this style window in the residential part of the building and asked what is in this elevation of the barn now. Is it true divided light in some of the windows? Mr. Kieran advised that no, it isn't. Not only did they put an overhead door in the barn, they put double hung single-pane windows in the barn and different windows in the inn. The original windows in 1894 or 1895 were definitely separated but he is trying to use newer technology to make it easier to maintain.

Chair Blanchard mentioned that in looking at the photo from the 1992 renovation, he can see the replacement garage door is recessed from the façade so it gives it a little bit of depth. He asked if that would still be maintained? Mr. Kieran replied that yes, and even the trim will not change. He will work around that. The faux barn door he is putting in with the slider will still be recessed in that opening. Chair Blanchard mentioned one of the sad things while reading the survey forms that were included with the Board's materials are the number of renovations and changes that has occurred to the buildings over time. It is unfortunate to lose the original integrity in the buildings. He feels the improvements the Kierans are making are good and the additional windows being proposed for the side elevation are consistent with what is there. That is a nice addition.

Mr. Kieran advised that what he is using on the faux door and the slider door is actually wood that has been in the barn since they got here. That wood dates back to the 1885/1895 construction. It will be brought out of the darkness and used in the door.

Mr. Troidl mentioned all the different mixed-use scenarios the Board has had. He asked Ms. Pelletier if it is adding an apartment. It is mentioned as living space. Ms. Pelletier advised that they are adding living space but to add an apartment, they would need cooking facilities, a bathroom and a kitchen. Since they have a B&B, they can't convert to a two-family but they want some additional space. They will not have cooking facilities and they are not changing the use. It is a land use technicality. B&Bs are in single-family homes so it is not a change. It is its own little mixed-use.

Mr. Kieran advised that the barn, while connected to the inn, does not house any inn rooms.

There were no public comments provided.

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 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 structures 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 former garage door rotted and fell off. To provide access to the living space on the first floor, the applicant is proposing to add a 38" wide door in the existing opening. The area around the door will be filled in reusing wood from the inside of the barn. The wood will be installed vertically. The new door will be sliding (barn door style) and will be mounting on a metal slider rail. The overall width to height of the façade will not be altered. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

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

To provide access to the living space on the first floor, the applicant is proposing to add a 38" wide door in the existing opening. The area around the door will be filled in reusing wood from the inside of the barn. The wood will be installed vertically. The new door will be sliding (barn door style) and will be mounting on a metal slider rail. The rhythm of solids to voids on the second story will not be altered and windows on the first level of the front façade will be replaced but retained in the same location. The applicant is proposing to add five windows on the first floor, north façade of the barn building. The windows will match the replacement windows and will be the same size as the windows on the second level. 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.

All new openings are rectangular and will be standard residential sizes. 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 of the existing structures 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 new barn-style sliding door and the area if infill we be made of wood. All new and replacement windows will be vinyl exterior and wood interior. The mullion style will be 6/6 and the mullions will be in between the sheets of glass. 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 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.

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 & Design Review Certificate for Nancy Kieran, for exterior building alterations at 213 Main Street (Tax Assessor Map 15, Lot 10), to be substantially as proposed, 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) The applicant obtain any applicable permits from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer. (Troidl & Yankee) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Yes) 1 Excused-Campanelli) (0 No)

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

Ms. Pelletier advised that the Board's next meeting will be held on January 20. Chair Blanchard wished the Board a happy and safe holiday season.

Mr. Reiche added that he finds Ms. Pelletier's Staff Reports are always so helpful and Ms. Watson agreed that they are amazing.

ITEM V: Adjourn.

MOVED AND SECONDED: To adjourn at 6:37 p.m. (Reiche & Hamlin) **ROLL CALL VOTE:** (6 Yes) (1 Excused-Campanelli) (0 No)

Recorded by Sharon Coffin