

Minutes
Design Review Board
Thursday, August 25, 2016
Council Chambers – Municipal Building
93 Cottage Street
4:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 P.M. Members present: Barbara Sassaman, Chair; Steve Demers, Vice Chair; Erin Early Ward, Secretary and Pancho Cole, Member. Also in attendance was Bob Osborne, Planning Director.

II. EXCUSED ABSENCES *Emily Dwyer*

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Cole moved to adopt the agenda. Mr. Demers seconded the motion which passed four in favor and none against.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (August 11, 2016)

Mr. Cole moved to approve the August 11, 2016 minutes as presented. Ms. Early-Ward seconded the motion which passed four in favor and none against.

V. BUILDING PERMIT REMINDERS

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

VI. REGULAR BUSINESS

a. Certificate of Appropriateness (Previously Tabled)

Application: DRB-2016-43

Applicant: Mount Desert Street, LLC (Cathy and Stephen Coston)

Project Location: 68 Mount Desert Street, Tax Map & Lot 104-414-000

Proposed Project: Construction of New Building.

Greg Johnston, Todd Hardy and Steve Coston spoke to the Board about the application and the changes that are contained in the revised submission.

Mr. Coston stated that significant changes to the project have been made to address concerns stated by the Board and the community. He described the changes including the front porch, lowered roofline and other features. They want to be a good neighbor as a lifelong resident.

Mr. Hardy stated that the intent of the design changes is to make the building look like a large house or mansion. The plan eliminates five units. The roofline is dropped about 2 feet and the added dormers give the appearance of a lower eave line. The dormers are typical in this neighborhood. They have worked on sizing and proportions. There is a large variety of window sizing and created elements to the side and rear to make the building look like it has grown out over the years. It is a more interesting variety of architectural elements. The lot coverage of the building is out by 10%. They are looking for feedback.

Mr. Cole asked about the roofline and stairs.

Greg Johnston stated that the staircases were brought under the roof. The porch has been brought around the rear of the building. He also indicated that the reduced parking footprint (reduction for the six units) was absorbed by the expanded footprint of the building.

Mr. Cole asked about the trees on the Spring Street side of the site.

Ms. Early-Ward questioned the window size in the dormers. She also asked if the roofline could come down more?

Mr. Hardy indicated that the roofline was down two feet and that the gable ends were also adjusted to reduce the visual mass of the roof. He also discussed the color of the siding as dark gray in a vinyl clapboard.

Mr. Demers suggested he would like to see the roofline dropped more but not the pitch. He would also like to see the eaves dropped as well. He asked if the details of the building would be traditional or modern?

Mr. Hardy stated that question is not totally known and must be worked out.

Mr. Cole suggested that the stair tower on the western side would be nice if it were more detailed.

Chair Sassaman thanked the group for making many improvements to the drawings as was suggested by the Board and neighbors. She noted that the neighboring buildings have great horizontal lines. The horizontal lines on this building are broken with vertical lines that tend to make the building appear taller. She cited examples of elements of neighboring buildings that lower the appearance of those buildings.

Mr. Johnston noted that the retained old trees on the front of the site will tend to mitigate the height of the building by visually lowering the height.

Chair Sassaman stated that the Spring Street façade of the building has great height and that is troubling because the dramatic size may not be appropriate.

Ms. Early-Ward moved to table the item to the next meeting. Mr. Cole seconded the motion which was approved 4 votes in favor and none against.

Mr. Coston thanked the Board and indicated that they have noted the comments

b. Certificate of Appropriateness

Application: DRB-2016-45

Applicant: Eden Builders (Todd Hardy)

Project Location: 134 Main Street, Tax Map & Lot 104-504-000

Proposed Project: Demolition of Historic Building, Construction of New Building and Installation of Signs.

Todd Hardy spoke representing the application. He indicated that there are two considerations here to demolish the existing building at 134 Main Street and to construct a new building. Both elements would require Certificate of Appropriateness.

Todd Hardy explained that they have explored the options and verified the historical elements of the building. They propose to preserve the front façade. They propose to integrate the historic front façade with a compatible but different building.

There was a clarification that the Pine and Palm façade would in fact be preserved.

Ms. Early-Ward indicated that there are tax credits available for preservation of the façade.

The Board had Mr. Hardy discuss the color pallet of the project.

Mr. Hardy noted that the element at the front of the building was wood carving not plaster.

Mr. Demers indicated that the proposed dark colors help the historic gable stand out.

Mr. Hardy noted that signs and lighting would be taken up at a later time.

Chair Sassaman asked if they wanted to pursue the demolition approval now and continue working toward the new building subject to final approval.

Mr. Cole moved that the Board approve the demolition subject to saving the façade to be integrated into the new building as shown on the plan. Mr. Demers seconded the motion. The Board voted four in favor and none against the motion.

c. Certificate of Appropriateness

Application: DRB-2016-46

Applicant: Robert Rechholtz (RDR Realty, BH, LLC)

Project Location: 59 Cottage Street, Tax Map & Lot 104-085-000

Proposed Project: Installation of Sandwich Sign (and Multi-tenant sign plan over 100 sq. ft.).

Robert Rechholtz spoke to the Board about his application. He indicated that they have provided the updated multi-tenant sign plan and they are seeking 120 sq. ft. of total signage.

Chair Sassaman indicated that the request is for 120 square feet of signage combined on the freestanding signs, wall signs and sandwich board signs. She noted that the applicant is moving toward individual sign panels of 14 inches in height and 78 inches in width.

Ms. Early-Ward moved to approve the multi-tenant sign plan as submitted. Mr. Cole seconded the motion. The Board voted four in favor and none against the motion.

Ms. Early-Ward moved to approve the two sandwich board signs. Mr. Cole seconded the motion. The Board voted four in favor and none against the motion.

d. Certificate of Appropriateness

Application: DRB-2016-47

Applicant: Garret FitzGerald

Project Location: 297 Main Street, Tax Map & Lot 107-190-000

Proposed Project: Installation of Sign, Fencing and Awning

Garret FitzGerald spoke representing the application. He indicated that the signs were re-faced in vinyl and that the awning color had been changed and the fence was replaced. They had not intended to work outside the process.

After some discussion Mr. Cole moved to approve the application as submitted adding the canvas panels for the deck fencing be painted red and installed. Ms. Early-Ward seconded the motion which was approved four in favor and none against.

e. Certificate of Appropriateness

Application: DRB-2016-48

Applicant: Olomana, LLC)

Project Location: 1334 State Highway 102, Tax Map & Lot 227-015-000

Proposed Project: Installation of Sign

Dan Granholm spoke representing the application. He indicated that they propose a temporary sign which will be needed for no more than a year and a half.

The Board discussed that the sign base was granite blocks and the posts are aluminum. They noted that these element could be incorporated into a permanent sign if the applicant so wished.

Mr. Cole moved to approve the application with the understanding that the temporary sign would be removed in 18 months from installation but the frame and posts are a permanent installation. Mr. Demers seconded the motion which was approved four in favor and none against.

f. Discussion Item

Applicant: Sinclair Builders, Inc. (Randy Sinclair)

Project Location: 27 Cottage Street, Tax Map & Lot 104-138-000

Proposed Project: Construction of New Building.

Randy Sinclair spoke about the proposed building. We propose a 1-story, 40 ft. by 100 ft building for retail use. They propose a second level at some point in the future. The height of the front façade is about 18 feet in total. This includes the actual building height of 12 feet plus the 6 foot tall cornice of the building. All vegetation in front will go away.

Mr. Demers indicated that the design appears formulaic and needs more character. Quirky would be better. Asymmetry might be better. The parapet would be improved with more details and trim details.

It was discussed that the building would have a full basement. The store would be about 3,300 sq. ft.

Chair Sassaman stated that the fenestration is residential in character as proposed. She inquired why not propose glass wall to wall? She suggested that the doorway could be opened up to both ramp up from the sidewalk and to open up the windows for more visible stock in trade. She noted that the rear of the building is visible from neighboring properties and that the design should consider how it is fenestrated as well. She noted that the alcove of the entrance to the building should be lighted because it invites people in.

The Board discussed the colors that are proposed for the building. They noted that the submission should make those colors and materials available for review.

The Board thanked Mr. Sinclair for the preview of their project.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

The Board discussed moving the meeting time to 6:00 pm to accommodate both Emily Dwyer and potential other members who have indicated that the midday time of 4:00 pm does not work with their schedule.

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

Member Cole moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:40 pm. Ms. Early-Ward seconded the motion which was approved four in favor and none against.

Signed as approved:



Erin Early Ward, Secretary
Design Review Board, Town of Bar Harbor

9/8/2016
Date