

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
MEETING OF AUGUST 22, 2019**

---

---

**PACKET MATERIALS**

---

Cover Page with Date

---

Agenda

---

Minutes for Approval

---

Applications

---

Supporting Documents

---

---

---

---

**Agenda  
Design Review Board (DRB)  
August 22, 2019 at 6:00 P.M.  
Council Chambers – Municipal Building  
93 Cottage Street**

---

**SITE VISIT**

The DRB will conduct a site visit before the DRB regular meeting for an application known as DRB-19-36 Destination Health (see below) on August 22, 2019 at 5:00 PM at 124 Cottage Street/Tax Map 104 Lot 159. The purpose of the site visit is to orient the DRB to the physical characteristics and the anticipated changes to the site and to the area resulting from the proposed project. Members of the public are welcome to attend to listen. The DRB Chairperson may or may not elect to allow the public to make comments.

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. EXCUSED ABSENCES**

**III. ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (August 8, 2019)**

**V. PUBLIC COMMENT**

**VI. BUILDING PERMIT REMINDERS**

**VII. REGULAR BUSINESS**

**a. Certificate of Appropriateness**

**Application:** DRB-19-37 (Brrrr! Harbor)  
**Applicant:** Brian Schafer  
**Project Location:** 37 ½ Cottage Street/104-140  
**Proposed Project:** Installation or Changes in sign or awning

**b. Certificate of Appropriateness**

**Application:** DRB-19-38 (Adventure Advertising)  
**Applicant:** Swan Hospitality Group/Kim Swan  
**Project Location:** 43 Cottage Street/104-107  
**Proposed Project:** Installation or Changes in sign or awning

**c. Certificate of Appropriateness**

**Application:** DRB-19-36 (Destination Health)  
**Applicant:** Destination Health Properties, LLC  
**Project Location:** 124 Cottage Street/104-159-000  
**Proposed Project:** Construction of New Building and Installation of Sign

**Agenda**  
**Design Review Board (DRB)**  
**August 22, 2019 at 6:00 P.M.**  
**Council Chambers – Municipal Building**  
**93 Cottage Street**

**VIII. OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. DR Handbook**
- b. Vacancies (2)**

**IX. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA**

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

**Minutes**  
**Design Review Board**  
**August 8, 2019 at 6:00 PM**  
**Council Chambers – Municipal Building**  
**93 Cottage Street**

Chairperson Barbara Sassaman, Vice-chair Steve Demers, Secretary Peter Bono and board members Francis “Pancho” Cole and Andrew Geel were present. The sixth and seven seats on the board are currently vacant.

Town staff present: Planning Director Michele Gagnon.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson Sassaman called the meeting of the Design Review Board to order at 6:00 PM.

**II. EXCUSED ABSENCES**

None

**III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

Cole moved to adopt the agenda. Demers seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

**IV. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Cole nominated and moved the same slate officers (Chairperson Barbara Sassaman, Vice-chair Steve Demers, and Secretary Peter Bono) with Geel as second. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

**V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (June 13, 2019)**

Demers moved to adopt the minutes of June 13, 2019. Cole seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**VII. BUILDING PERMIT REMINDERS**

Sassaman reminded the applicant that they would need to apply for and receive a building permit prior to commencing any of the activities approved at the meeting.

**VIII. REGULAR BUSINESS**

**a. Certificate of Appropriateness**

**Application:** DRB-19-22 (Hulls Cove Gas Station)  
**Applicant:** Sign Services Inc.  
**Project Location:** 3 Breakneck Road/223-003-000  
**Proposed Project:** Installation or Changes in sign or awning

**Minutes  
Design Review Board  
August 8, 2019 at 6:00 PM  
Council Chambers – Municipal Building  
93 Cottage Street**

No one was representing the applicant.

**Demers moved that:**

- 1) There will be no lighting on the face of the canopy or pectin panel or vertical surfaces. The lighting under the canopy will be 3,000 KV.**
- 2) The standing ID sign's digital prices will be illuminated from within but nothing else on the ID sign will be lit. Two gooseneck lights will illuminate the ID sign and will be 3,000 KV.**
- 3) All signage for the gas station and the store totals 180 SF, which is approved, even though it exceeds the allowance.**
- 4) No other lighting or signage is approved**
- 5) Store signs included in the 180 SF are: General Store 32 SF, Coca Cola Sold Here 6 SF, Green Mountain Coffee 6 SF, Hot Breakfast banner 18 SF, Pizza banner 22 SF, and the ATM neon sign 1 SF.**
- 6) Size of gas station signs are approved as submitted.**

**Cole seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (5-0).**

**b. Certificate of Appropriateness**

**Application: DRB-19-36 (Destination Health)**

**Applicant: Destination Health Properties, LLC**

**Project Location: 124 Cottage Street/104-159-000**

**Proposed Project: Construction of New Building and Installation of Sign**

Representing the applicant were Stewart Brecher from Stewart Brecher Architect and Geoff Fraser from Fraser Associates Architects. The owner, Andrea Lepcio, was also present.

The project was presented to the board including the material that would be used.

A long discussion ensued about how the modern architectural style of the proposed building fits into the area. Bono read a statement explaining why he could not support the proposed design.

It was agreed that the applicant needs to demonstrate to the board how the project meets the standards.

**Chairperson Sassaman moved to table the application and to schedule a site visit at 5:15 PM (later changed to 5:00 PM) on August 22, 2019. Cole seconded the motion and it carried unanimously (5-0).**

**Minutes  
Design Review Board  
August 8, 2019 at 6:00 PM  
Council Chambers – Municipal Building  
93 Cottage Street**

**IX. OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. Color chart – Chairperson Sassaman moved that the old, list minus CW-300 Tucker Orange and CW-540 Dunmore Green, is Trim Colors only and that the new list is for everything. Demers seconded the motion and it carried unanimously (5-0).**
- b. DR Handbook – Tasks to be accomplished by August 22, 2019 – Chairperson Sassaman would like the members to provide pictures of exemplary signs.**
- c. Discuss vacancies (3) - Board members will try to come up with names.**

**X. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA**

None

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Cole moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 PM. Demers seconded the motion and carried unanimously (5-0).**

**SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL  
FOR  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

**DESTINATION HEALTH**

**17 AUGUST 2019**





## DESIGN REVIEW NARRATIVE

Subsequent to our first meeting I decided to revisit the issue of roofs and patterns in the Downtown Village districts. Much of Downtown Village I has buildings in close proximity and in many cases with common or adjacent walls with 100% lot coverage and zero setbacks in most situations. Downtown Village II has similar conditions but with limits. There is a front setback that is at least 10 feet depending upon the building height. There is also zero side setback in most situations. However the constructed tell a different story. Most, if not all of the buildings in Downtown Village II do not extend to the side property lines and the front setbacks vary as a significant number of the buildings are pre LUO and currently grandfathered/mothered non-conforming structures.

What I have come to realize is that our internal image of what downtown Bar Harbor looks like is not very different than the images we carried as children when drawing a house – vertical walls and a triangular roof. The actual variety of building forms and materials is far richer than our early efforts.

So how then do we relate new construction to existing buildings? I would suggest that, in the denser portions of the districts, the relationship is both easier to accomplish and more important to do so. Looking at the photo collage of the streets one sees that common floor, window and roof heights are prevalent but rarely consistent. There is an even greater variety of building materials, decoration and trim. Much of Downtown Village I has been constructed as commercial buildings. While Downtown Village II seems to have started life as residential. However, what they seem to have in common is a presentation of the roof edge or cornice.

The pre-LUO buildings in Village II have a plethora of front setbacks and almost no buildings with a zero side setback. This makes finding commonalities difficult. Every site is unique and varied and patterns are never quite established. There are two gas stations, a wonderful granite post office, restaurants complete with dining under canopies and behind, at times what appears to be shower curtains, hotels, a supermarket, the fine former high school now municipal building and many others.

The site at 124 Cottage Street might actually be at the extreme end of finding commonalities generated by its two neighbors. To the East there are a pair of structures, not in prime condition, that have been modified and improved over the years and having both commercial and residential occupancy. They are both built hard against the sidewalk and extend fully to the side property lines. To the West there remains a single family dwelling set back from the sidewalk and behind a front porch.

Which brings me to the design we presented at you last meeting. Our building facing Cottage Street, is setback from the street the required 10 feet based upon its height. We also set the building back from the side property lines for a couple of reason that include fire safety, preserving, at least for now, the neighbor's lot line windows, and most important, the general pattern of building in the neighborhood. It is our belief that the neighborhood is best served by a neutral, and subtle building that doesn't attempt to mimic either of the adjoining buildings as referencing both would be near impossible. We have elected to take you advice about the building top. We have added a projecting cornice at the top of the walls. This device has been used, in many buildings in the Districts to indicate the top when there is a flat roof and hide a variety of pitched roofs that are often not attractive.

We have chosen not to utilize a Western False Façade, a technique developed when there was only enough money to decorate one wall of the building. This technique was used extensively in post-Colonial construction. The historic district in Providence RI has numerous houses that are built with brick walls except for the front where more expensive wood was used. The other problem that I find with the False Façade suggesting a pitched roof is that only works when looking straight at the front wall but looks rather silly when seen from the side.

It is not our intention to create inappropriate infill but rather to create a building that meets our client's needs and truly enhances the neighborhood. The Downtown Districts are replete with a variety of building styles and vintages. It is this very variety that gives Bar Harbor its charm. We are sure that making all of the buildings look the same is not the intention of Design Review board nor is the intention of the LUO. We hope that you will see fit to check the N/A option on your check list in reference to the visible roof pitch.

**Town of Bar Harbor  
Design Review Board  
Findings for Deliberations Checklist**

---

**Section 125-114 – Design Review Standards:**

In reviewing an application for a certificate of appropriateness, the DRB shall approve the issuance of a certificate if it finds the application and proposed activities are consistent with the following standards, or that they will be consistent as a result of conditions of approval imposed on the application.

In reviewing applications the Board shall consider the appropriate sections of each of the following categories and shall find the project in conformance with all relevant provisions before approving the issuance of a certificate of appropriateness.

<b>The Board finds that the proposal meets:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
a. Standards relating to visual compatibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Standards for materials and design details for structural projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Standards for materials and design details for accessory projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Standards for signs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Standards for historic buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Standards of Visual Compatibility:**

The proposal must meet each of the following requirements, as applicable, in order to meet the Visual Compatibility standards of Section 125-114(B):

	Yes	No	N/A
<p>1. The height of a new building, addition, or a modification to an existing building would be visually compatible with adjacent buildings as seen from public streets. <i>The adjoining lots have significantly different heights. The new building is of a neutral height between the immediate neighbors</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>2. Where there is an established pattern of building height, the height, or apparent height, of a new, expanded, or modified building as seen from the public street would maintain a complementary pattern. <i>The height of the building is well within the range of heights in the district. There isn't an obvious established height pattern as most of the buildings in the district have been design as individuals within each lot</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3. The size and mass of a building in relationship to the site and surrounding features would visually complement the buildings, squares, and places to which it is visually related. <i>The size and the mass have been designed to provide a neutral backdrop to the adjoining mass.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4. Where there is an established pattern of building size or scale as viewed from a public street, the addition of a new building, or modification to an existing building, would be designed to maintain the existing pattern. <i>There is no clearly established pattern. The District has a myriad of conforming and non-conforming setbacks heights and colors.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5. The design of the building would visually complement the district.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. The façade facing the street would incorporate pedestrian-scale design features such as doors and windows to create a character that complements the district. <i>The street façade does incorporate pedestrian –scale elements. The windows are discontinuous and the entry is recessed to provide an individual scale at the front door.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>b. Windows, or architectural treatments designed to simulate Windows, would comprise no less than 20% of the exterior wall surface. <i>There are actual windows and they are greater than 20% of the exterior surface</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- c. The façade would avoid large areas of blank wall space.     
*The street avoid large areas of blank façade.*
6. A ground floor façade facing a public street would incorporate arcades, display windows, awnings, or other features that add visual interest to the building.     
*The ground floor façade windows allow views of the activity within the room behind. The entry is recess and a portion of the second floor project beyond the first floor.*
7. A building used for retail or other public uses would be designed to have clearly defined entrances that are visually compatible with the visual character of the district.     
*The entry is clearly defined and is of similar character to the "storefront" entry on many buildings.*
8. The roof would be designed to complement the overall visual character of the district.
- a. If there is an established pattern of rooflines, a new buildings roofline would be similar to adjacent buildings.     
*There isn't a clearly established pattern of rooflines as most building vary in setback and height. What is apparent in the Districts is that most building have overhanging trim at the top of the wall. This building has a projecting cornice that reflects that pattern.*
- b. If there is not an established roofline pattern, the new building would have a pitched or gabled roof, or false front, or other design element which would create the appearance of a pitched roof.     
*See prior comment*
- c. Accessory buildings, canopies, and other structures would have a visually compatible roofline with the principal building.     
*The apartment building at the rear of the lot has a similar design and roofline.*
9. Treatment to the accessory building and structures would be compatible with the principal building and would use similar materials, details, and level trim.     
*The materials and colors of the secondary structure are similar to those of the street building*
10. A new building with more than 5,000 square feet of area on the first floor would be designed so that the scale is visually compatible with the character of the district.     
*The first floor is less than 5,000 square feet.*

- |  |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>a. The overall mass of the building would be visually broken into smaller elements through the physical layout of the building and/or design of the façade.<br/><i>Even though this building is less than 5,000 square feet we have broken up the mass.</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>11. The ratio and width of the front or street façade to the building height would complement the visual character of the district.<br/><i>The width to height ratio complements the character of the district.</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>12. If an established pattern of façade proportions exists, a new or modified building would maintain the established pattern.<br/><i>There are many different patterns pf façade proportions in the district and this building compares favorably with many of them. Being subtle and understated it doesn't establish a new pattern</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>13. The ratio of the width of windows to the height of the windows would complement the visual character of the district.<br/><i>Windows of similar sized can be found throughout the Downtown districts.</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>14. A modification to an existing building would maintain the existing proportionality.<br/><i>This is not applicable.</i></p>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>15. A modification to an existing façade which would change or eliminate windows would be done in a manner that maintains the established relationship of windows to wall.<br/><i>This is not applicable</i></p>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>16. A new or modified building would maintain an established pattern of window proportions among a group of buildings<br/><i>There isn't a obvious group of buildings but the proportions can be found throughout the district.</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>17. If an established pattern exists with respect to the placement of buildings on the lot vis-à-vis the side lot lines, a new or modified building would reflect the established pattern to the extent allowed by the setback provisions of the district in which they are located.<br/><i>The most common side lot lines pattern is not to build to the lot line even though it is permitted.</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

18. A new or modified building or structure would visually complement neighboring buildings, the overall character of the district, and any other buildings to which it is visually related to the extent permitted by the setback requirements of the district in which it is located.
- Many of the buildings in the district are non-conforming with respect to front setback as is the neighbor. We are not permitted to build to the front lot line.*
19. If there is an established front setback pattern, a new building would be located to maintain the established pattern. If no there is no pattern, a new building would be located in a manner that is compatible with the overall character of the district.
- See above.*
20. A new building would be located on a lot so that the setback from the street is no more than the average of the setbacks for buildings in similar locations in the district.
- This is governed by the Building code and our structure is not set back as far as many of the buildings in the district.*
21. If located on a corner lot, the setback relationship on both streets would be maintained.
- This is not applicable*
22. If a sidewalk exists in front of the parcel, the site would be designed to provide for pedestrian access to the front entrance of the building without the need to cross parking areas or access drives.
- The site is designed to provide pedestrian access by both ramp and stairs without crossing parking areas.*
23. The walkway to the front entrance of the building would be constructed with materials that would contrast with the paving of areas intended for vehicular travel. The walkway would also provide safe and inviting access to the building that is visually compatible with other pedestrian facilities in the neighborhood.
- Yes. The path will be concrete and the steps granite.*
24. If a sidewalk along the street is interrupted or crossed by a proposed driveway, access road, or other vehicular facility, the sidewalk material would be maintained across the driveway, or another visually compatible method used to clearly delineate the sidewalk from the drive.
- There is no driveway.*

25. The location and design of facilities for motor vehicles, including parking lots, driveways, access road, drive-through facilities, and service/fueling areas would visually complement the overall character of the district.
- a. The vehicular facility would not be located between the front of the building and the street.     
*This is not applicable.*
- b. The access drive, driveway, entrance/exit to drive-through services would not pass between the building and the sidewalk where a sidewalk exists.     
*This is not applicable*
- c. A parking lot would be located to the side or rear of a building.     
*There isn't parking for this building*
- d. Overhead doors and service areas would be located on the side or rear of the building and would be screened from view from a public street.     
*This is not applicable.*
- e. Drive-through services would be designed to keep vehicular activity to the side and/or rear of the building and would prevent the queuing of vehicles between the front of the building and the street or in other areas where it is visually incompatible.     
*This is not applicable*

**Standards for Materials and Design Details for Structural Projects:**

The proposal must meet each of the following requirements, as applicable, in order to meet the Standards for Materials and Design Details for Structural Projects in Section 125-114(C):

	Yes	No	N/A
1. Siding materials that enhance the visual and architectural quality of the structure would be applied. The selected siding would also be visually compatible with other exterior finishes on the building and with those buildings to which it is visually related. <i>The siding is natural wood and in horizontal and vertical pattern That can be found on other buildings in the districts.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The siding would be of a material that is commonly used in the overlay district. <i>Yes, it is wood</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



- |   |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>3. The color of the exterior finish would complement the architectural style of the structure as well as the period it was built. The colors would also reflect hue and shades which were available in the era and style depicted, and the colors would blend with the immediately adjacent structures in the area.<br/><i>The color complements the style and the vintage of the building and is no different that the differences between many of the buildings in the district.</i></p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>4. The style and size of the windows would be proportional and visually compatible to the buildings in the overlay district and would maintain the architectural continuity of the building.<br/><i>The style and size of the windows are part of the architectural continuity of the building and similar units are found throughout the district.</i></p>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>5. The window would be constructed of wood, vinyl or lead, or would be of synthetic material that simulates such traditional materials.<br/><i>The window frames are similar to their wood equivalent.</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>6. The door would be visually compatible with the structure.<br/><i>The door is typical of retail storefront buildings and compliments the style of the building.</i></p>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>7. The primary entry door to a store would be recessed from the property line so as that it does not interfere with pedestrian traffic.<br/><i>The entry door is setback from the façade which is setback 10 feet from the pedestrian way.</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>8. If consistent with the established pattern of other entrance doors, the door would have a transom above the full height of the store windows.<br/><br/><i>Most of the neighboring door do not have transoms.</i></p>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>9. If visible from the public street, the roof would be visually compatible with the style of the building and the other exterior finishes and colors.<br/><i>The roof is not visible.</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>10. If visible from the street, the roof would not be brightly colored metal, plastic, or fiberglass.<br/><i>See above</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>11. The trim would be visually compatible with the style of the building and other exterior finishes.<br/><i>There is minimum trim which is consistent with the style of the building.</i></p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>12. The trim would be made from materials such as wood, stone, brick, vinyl, and metal, or other synthetic materials that appear as such and are compatible with the overall building.<br/><i>See above</i></p>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- |  |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 13. The entrance to the building would be visually compatible with the overall building treatment and would be the focal point of the façade.<br><i>The entry is compatible with the building and is the focal point of the façade by material and recess.</i>         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. An awning or canopy would be attached to the structure and would function as an extension of the building and shall be compatible with the visual character of the district.<br><i>No awning or canopy is planned for the street façade.</i>                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. The entrance materials would be made of wood, vinyl, tile, stucco, stone, brick, concrete, canvas, fiberglass, and metal (or other materials that are visually compatible with the overall building).<br><i>The entrance materials are selected from the list.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Standards for Seasonal Closures:** *This section is not applicable.*

- |  |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Measures for seasonal closure would be compatible with the building and architecturally similar to the building materials, design, and color. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The measures would also fit appropriately in the space being enclosed and would be safely attached and secured.                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The measures for seasonal closure would be neat and clean in appearance.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The closure provisions would not include materials such as bed sheet, paper, tarps, cardboard, bubble wrap, or painted glass.                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Signs left in place would not be covered.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Standards for Materials and Design Details for Accessory Projects:**

The proposal must meet each of the following requirements, as applicable, in order to meet the Standards for Materials and Design Details for Accessory Projects in Section 125-114(D):

	Yes	No	N/A
<b>Awnings, Sunscreens, and Canopies</b>			
<i>There is a small flat canopy at the rear of the building with trim similar to that of the roof cornice. This section is not applicable.</i>			
1. The awning, sunscreen, or canopy would be visually compatible with the building and its surrounding area with respect to topography.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The awning, sunscreen, or canopy would be necessary given the unique circumstances of the property, and would be compatible with similar elements of adjacent properties and is	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |   |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. The awning, sunscreen or canopy would be designed so that it will not cover unique or architecturally significant building features.                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Letter or graphics on the awning or canopy would be placed on a valance of no more than 12 inches attached to the awning bar.                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. The graphics on an awning or canopy or valance would comply with signage requirements of Section 125-66(BB)  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. The awning would extend the full width of the existing window and door frames on the first floor.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Awnings proposed on the upper-floor would be installed over individual windows and would complement the window design, building architecture, and color. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Canopies or awnings would be attached to the building and would not extend more than 12 feet from the wall to which they are attached.                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. A street level awning would be at least 18 inches behind the curb.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. The color of an awning would be compatible with the overall design of the building.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Landscaping**

- |   |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Landscaping materials and vegetation would be visually compatible with the building. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

*It is planned that the front setback landscape be compatible with the building, and will consist of low shrubs and ground cover.*

- |  |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. Landscaping would not block unique architectural features of the building or appear disproportional to the lot and building size. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

*See above.*

**Standards for Historic Buildings: *This section is not applicable.***

The proposal must meet each of the following requirements, as applicable, in order to meet the Standards for Historic Buildings in Section 125-114(E):

	Yes	No	N/A
1. If a building or structure classified as historic would be moved, reconstructed, or altered it would be maintained in a manner which would preserve the architectural character of the building, structure or appurtenance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |  |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. Demolition would be necessary as the owner has produced evidence that the preservation of the building is not consistent with the purposes of Section 125-114(E), or that the building cannot be preserved because of the structural condition of the building, or the cost of renovations would make its retention infeasible. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The structure would be relocated to another site if the existing site is not consistent with the purposes of Section 125-114(E), and the building cannot be preserved because of the structural condition of the building or the cost of renovations would make retention of the building infeasible.                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Any modification to a historic building would retain all of its original features to the maximum extent feasible. Any modifications would also maintain the architectural style and treatment of the original building.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. When renovating or expanding a historic building the materials would match the original materials in texture, dimension, color, location and design.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Existing features such as porches, steps, handrails, balusters, cornices, columns, lintels, windows, fixtures, hardware, doors, and roofs would be retained.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. The design or any modification or addition to the existing building would maintain the architectural style of the existing building and would conform to the existing treatment with respect to trim and exterior finishes.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Handicapped access would be located and constructed so as not to obscure the character defining features of the entranceway or porch.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Porches or steps would not be enclosed in a manner that destroys their intended purpose.  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. The selected paint colors would be consistent with Subsection C(1)(b).   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |





MAIN STREET



MAIN STREET



COTTAGE STREET



COTTAGE STREET