

Minutes — Design Review Board
Thursday, April 22, 2021 at 4:00 P.M.
Council Chambers – Municipal Building — 93 Cottage Street

The meeting was conducted remotely, via video (Zoom), due to COVID-19 (as authorized under MRSA §403-A, approved by the Legislature via LD 2167)

Present were Design Review Board members Barbara Sassaman, chairman; Andrew Geel, vice-chairman; Pete Bono, Secretary, and Pancho Cole, member. The other three seats on the seven-member board are currently vacant.

Town staff was Steve Fuller, Mike Gurtler, Angie Chamberlain, and Michele Gagnon.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Sassaman called the meeting to order a bit before 4:07 PM.

II. EXCUSED ABSENCES

The four appointed members of the board were all present (see above about vacancies), and so there were no absences to excuse.

III. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Cole moved to adopt the agenda. Mr. Geel seconded. The motion then carried unanimously (4-0).

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Sassaman remarked that the board did not receive the March 11, 2021, March 25, 2021, and April 8, 2021 minutes.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

No comment was submitted by email, and no one attending the meeting spoke.

VI. BUILDING PERMIT REMINDERS

Chairman Sassaman gave a reminder that anyone obtaining a Certificate of Appropriateness from the board will also need to obtain a building permit from the Code Enforcement Office before proceeding with their project.

VII. REGULAR BUSINESS

Per the motion made earlier, the agenda items were reversed and considered in the order presented below.

a. Certificate of Appropriateness

Application: DRB-2021-16 (78 West St. signs/multitenant signage plan)

Applicant: Fuego Hospitality LLC (David Higgins)

Owner: Sherry Rasmussen

Project Location: 78 West Street (Tax Parcel 104-098-000)

Proposed Project: Installation of signage and approval of new multitenant signage plan (adding decals in front windows and reallocation of signage square footage by units of building)

Mr. Bono moved to approve the multitenant signage plan for 78 West Street as submitted dated April 8, 2021. Mr. Cole seconded. The motion then carried unanimously (4-0).

Mr. Geel moved to approve the revise signage plan for application DRB-2021-16. Chairman Sassaman seconded. The motion then carried unanimously (4-0).

Steve Fuller's sketch showing the window area pre- and post signage conditions was entered into the record.

b. Certificate of Appropriateness

Application: DRB-2021-14 (77 Cottage Street B&B)

Applicant: SSC, LLC

Owner: St. Sauveur Development Corp.

Project Location: 77 & 79 Cottage Street and 8 Summer Street (Tax Parcels 104-056-000,104-57-000 and 104-053-000)

Proposed Project: Construction of new building (new bed & breakfast)

Chairman Sassaman remarked that the graphics provided were helpful. Dan Pileggi, attorney for the applicant, explained that the additional information provided to the board consisted of additional details for the facade and window flower boxes which is the focal point of the design. The Cottage Street facade finish changes now shows elements to break the streetscape, as requested by the board. It includes an inset on the central panel. The front door has close to a four-foot setback from the sidewalk. The application included comparative volume calculations to demonstrate that the proposed building size is in line with other buildings in the area and for buildings on both Cottage and Summer streets. The proposed structure is less massive in appearance than that the neighboring Municipal building. It is consistent with the surrounding Cottage Street structures certainly more so than the Municipal Building or Hannaford. The color is consistent with Jordan's Restaurant and Atlantic Brewing. The flat roof blends in with the Post office and with the Municipal building. The setback from the sidewalk is consistent with the surroundings and with the prior structure that was sitting on the lot. It complies with 125-114 D. 5 and 6, that suggests a zero setback, and provides consistency with the other buildings in the areas. The roofline is consistent with area buildings including the Municipal building and the bank across the street. The front door is not flush with the sidewalk and is the focal point, as required per 125-114 C. 2. The side doors are not doors and the appearance of doors are just for visual impacts.

Mr. Bono asked questions pertaining to 125-114 B. 2. It was explained by applicant Tom St. Germain that the porches are faux balconies and that these will provide space to hide systems such as air conditioning.

Dan Pileggi stated that there are no mechanical equipment proposed over the third floor. Mr. St. Germain then said that mechanical equipment will not be visible from the public way.

Mr. Bono asked if the applicant considered changing the roofline of the center section (the edge of the facade), as it would help break the mass appearance on Cottage Street. Mr. St. Germain explained that the height as defined and calculated in the district prevents them the opportunity to do anything else. He also explained that the designed was consistent with other building in the area.

Tom St. Germain said that they will come back to the Board for their sign permit later and, at that time, they could propose some type of structural awnings to accentuate the center part.

Mr. Bono asked that the applicant consider eliminating all the railing spindles and continue the gray area. That would differentiate the top of the central area from the other two that have the spindles. The applicant agreed to do so.

Of the five color schemes provided, Tom St. Germain said they chose the one that is on top of the package that is labeled front elevation - the back with gray - and that is the preferred option as the vertical lines does not break up the horizontal lines.

Mr. Geel asked about proposed materials for the railings. Tom St. Germain said that it would have the appearance of wrought iron but it will be aluminum and black in color. Mr. Geel also asked if the balusters (over the railing) would have the same design as shown on the pictures and inquired if they would not be square tubes. Tom St. Germain said they would be curved and that they are referred as a Curved Juliette Balcony. Chairman Sassaman asked if the roofline would be the same kind of thing. Tom St. Germain responded it would be. He said that the balusters would curve out from the building. He also indicated that there would be window boxes. Mr. Geel asked if there were any submission regarding parking. Tom St Germain said that parking was not part of this review. Parking would be provided for the guest but that it would be all inside and therefore it was not part of this review.

Chairman Sassaman indicated that the LWA lights (the boxy ones) are allowed as they are 1,700 lumens (less than 1,800 lumens) but they were pointed upwards. She encouraged the applicant not to have them pointed up if possible. Tom St. Germain said that there are caps that can be installed to guide the light down.

Mr. Cole moved to approve the application as submitted with the understanding that the building constructed would be the top one in the package shown in the DRB-2021-14 addendum and that the balconies are to be Curved Juliette balconies and all other details to be built as shown with the addition that, if possible, the lights will be capped so they reflect down. Chairman Sassaman added to the motion that changes in the central roof pediment, to make it different than the flanking pediment, would be accepted by the board. All were agreeable to the change to the motion and Mr. Geel seconded. The motion then carried unanimously (4-0).

c. Certificate of Appropriateness

Application: DRB-2021-17 (Ice Cream windows & fence)

Applicant: Eben Salvatore

Owner: BH Piers

Project Location: 1 West Street (Tax Parcel 102-004-000)

Proposed Project: Change to the exterior appearance of non-historic building and installation of fencing (moving ice cream windows from east to south side of building and installing fence to screen deliveries and waste removal)

The applicant proposes to move the ice cream windows to the south side and enclose the area with the yellow bench and antenna area indoor for more restaurant operation such as delivery and trash at the Whale Watch building. That wall would be fixed and have a door, and would match the public restrooms.

Chairman Sassaman moved to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the height of the new wall will match the existing wall, that the face of the existing wall and the new wall on the sidewalk will be sheath to match the shingle pattern and color of the town's restroom building that is adjacent to it. Mr. Cole seconded. The motion then carried unanimously (4-0).

d. Certificate of Appropriateness

Application: DRB-2021-18 (Two Cats deck, #2)

Applicant/Owner: Diwas Thapa

Owner: BH Piers

Project Location: 130 Cottage Street (Tax Parcel 104-157-000)

Proposed Project: Change to exterior appearance of historic building (adding a 30' x 20.5' deck on the front of the building with composite decking and wood post/wire railings, building off of and replacing DRB approval of DRB-2021-15)

Mr. Geel moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Cole seconded. The motion then carried unanimously (4-0).

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Design Review Board Handbook.

Chairman Sassaman asked if everyone was comfortable with the revisions made to the handbook. No one had any issues. The chairman asked if the board could revise the document whenever they wanted. Mr. Fuller indicated that it is his understanding that the document could be change/amended by the board itself at any time. Hard copies of the handbook will be available at the office.

Chairman Sassaman move to approve the changes to the handbook with the addition that a staff person will add the link to the map. Mr. Geel seconded. The motion then carried unanimously (4-0).

b. Signage LUO amendment – replacing signs under multi-tenant sign plans

The board discussed the review of sign for multi-tenant properties with multi-tenant signage plans as it pertains to the conflict between section 125-67 BB. f. and 125-67 BB.(6)(0).

Signs proposed in a multi-tenant signage plan need to secure a building permit per 125-67 BB., regardless if it needs approval by the board. The board agreed that there is an exemption from board review triggered by the word “replace.” The meaning of the word “replace” was discussed as meaning an identical sign or a sign of the same dimension and the same location as show in the approved multi-tenant sign. If so, then there is no need for board review required. Chair Sassaman asked all members where they stood on the interpretation of the exemption from board review. All were supportive, however, Mr. Geel change the subject of the conversation slightly and never verbalized his position on the matter.

It was agreed by all that the word multi-tenant should be hyphenated.

It was agreed that at the June 24 board meeting, the board would start discussion on the design overlay map as the properties need to be linked it to map and lot number instead of a district.

IX. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA

X. ADJOURNMENT

At 6:00 PM, Chairman Sassaman moved to adjourn. Mr. Cole seconded. The motion then carried unanimously (4-0).

Signed as approved:



10-18-21

Peter Bono, Secretary
Designed Review Board, Town of Bar Harbor

Date