

**City of Hallowell
Planning Board Meeting
City Council Chamber
March 20, 2024
6:30 pm**

1. Call to Order

Mr. Landry called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call / Quorum

Mr. Landry took the roll call and established a quorum.

Present: Andrew Landry (Vice-Chair), Richard Bostwick, Darryl Brown, Melvin Morrison, Lisa Rigoulot, Richard Seymour (1st alt.), Keith Taylor (2nd alt.)

Audrey Duchesne, Community Planner; Daniel Kelley, Deputy Clerk

Excused: Judith Feinstein (Chair), Matthew Rolnick

Mr. Seymour and Mr. Taylor will both be voting.

3. Public Comments (The Board has agreed to limit the time allotted to Public Comment to fifteen minutes.)

None.

4. Approval of Minutes of the February 21, 2024 Planning Board Meeting

Motion to approve the minutes of the February 21, 2024 meeting as presented.

Moved: Brown

Seconded: Bostwick

Yea: Bostwick, Brown, Landry,
Morrison, Seymour, Taylor

Abstained: Rigoulot

Motion carried.

5. Certificate of Appropriateness for New Construction in the Historic District for Gregory Lucarelli, 226 Water Street, Map 9 Lot 189

Architect Justin Morgan represented Mr. Lucarelli in presenting an application for construction of a new single-family residence. He told the Board that they had moved the roof line up and reduced the clutter at the juncture of the roofs. They also adjusted the window spacing. Ms. Andrews, the Historic District Consultant, supports these changes. Ms. Rigoulot asked if the intent was to have a garage without doors; Mr. Morgan told her that Ms. Andrews discouraged having street-facing doors since under-barn storage space is historical. He added that having sliding doors was not feasible due to the space required. Mr. Morrison asked if the space was clear through the building; Mr. Morgan said it was. Mr. Morgan explained that Ms. Andrews said that the rear of the building is more flexible regarding window spacing and other design features.

Mr. Seymour noted that the deed refers to protecting a drain pipe according to a plan filed in 1919. There was a brief discussion. Mr. Kelley noted that he had not been able to find the plan in the Registry's index.

Ms. Duchesne noted that the roof was originally proposed as asphalt and is now proposed as metal; Mr. Morgan said that this was changed for longevity of the roof but could be changed back to asphalt. Mr. Seymour pointed out that metal roofing that looks like shingles is available.

Ms. Rigoulot asked what percentage of the lot was being developed; Mr. Morgan said he did not have the figure in his notes, but it is well below the 70% limit for shoreland development. Ms. Rigoulot said she preferred an asphalt-appearing roof and objected to the round window in the rear wall. There was general

discussion about the window's suitability. Mr. Morgan noted that the round window is in the vaulted space to improve lighting.

Motion to find the application complete.

Moved: Morrison

Seconded: Taylor

Unanimously approved.

Motion to find the application in harmony with Historic District standards subject to the modification of replacing the round window and using a metal roof to look like asphalt shingles as discussed and to approve the application as amended.

Moved: Taylor

Seconded: Brown

Ms. Rigoulot questioned the siding; Mr. Morgan said the siding would be hardie-board clapboard siding in a gray-blue tint. He added that they have changed to double-hung windows with a vertical mullion and black frames as Ms. Andrews requested. Ms. Rigoulot expressed concern about the large windows in the rear.

Mr. Brown asked what would replace the round window. Mr. Morgan suggested a triangular window, if possible, or a solid wall. There was further discussion. Mr. Landry pointed out that this is not an historic house and no one expects it to look historic, just to fit in. The general opinion of the Board was that a square or rectangular window would be better.

Mr. Bostwick asked about landscaping; Mr. Morgan said there is no landscape plan yet, adding that the owner enjoys gardening and there will be no hardscaping.

Vote:

Unanimously approved.

6. Certificate of Appropriateness for Replacement of Doors, Windows and Porch in the Historic District for Sutherland Properties LLC, 18 Warren Street, Map 9 Lot 31

Jonathan Ives represented Sutherland Properties in presenting an application for alterations to a previous approval. He provided the Board with a revised copy of Attachment 1 of his application. He pointed out that his application includes an itemized list of changes to the property and that he is requesting changes to Items 4 and 5, which were previously approved by the Board, and adding Items 6, 7 and 8. Item 4: instead of moving the 1st and 2nd floor windows to the right and adding doors to the left, the windows will be replaced by doors slightly left of the current window locations and aligned with each other. Item 5: instead of replacing an egress window on the third floor with a door, the window will be replaced with a similar in-kind window, not a door. Item 7: to replace a first-floor porch because the existing porch is in bad shape; they will consult with the Historic District Consultant. Item 8: to replace or repair the basement windows. Item 6: to add windows flanking an existing window on the third floor; the change is to increase light because an egress window is not necessary. Mr. Ives explained that since the application was submitted they have added two options to this item. Option 2 is to not add the two windows but make the existing window taller so it is the same size as the second-floor windows and remove the vent in the peak of the gable. Option 3 is to leave the window alone and add skylights on the downhill (east) side roof.

Mr. Landry said he disliked the three-window design. Mr. Seymour questioned the reasoning for not having an egress window; Mr. Ives explained that the living area has three egress routes. Mr. Taylor asked how many skylights would be installed; Mr. Ives said it would be one or two.

Mr. Bostwick asked about the window trim; Mr. Ives explained that they will reuse the trim from the first floor window that is being replaced.

The Board discussed which items should be included in the approval since Mr. Ives agreed that Items 7 and 8 were included as future projects.

Ms. Duchesne asked what the material of the doors would be; Mr. Ives said they will be hard-pressed plastic which has been previously used for other doors in the building.

Motion to find the application complete for Items 4, 5 and 6.

Moved: Morrison

Seconded: Brown

Unanimously approved.

Motion to find the application in harmony with Historic District standards for Items 4, 5 and 6 using Option 2 and to approve the application.

Moved: Bostwick Seconded: Seymour Unanimously approved.

7. Certificate of Appropriateness for Reconstruction of a Deck in the Historic District for John McNaughton, 10 Spring Street, Map 5 Lot 18

John McNaughton presented an application for replacement of a deck on his residence. He presented additional photographs of the property showing the existence of a deck at that location since 1935 or earlier. He explained that the existing deck is 28 years old. The intent is to replace the deck as it is. He said he has not discussed the project with Ms. Andrews but has received a copy of her memo. He said he is agreeable to using the designs for the railing and lattice she suggested but wants to retain the platform for safety reasons.

Mr. Landry observed that this is a chance to improve the appearance of the deck.

There was discussion of Ms. Andrews suggestion of lowering the deck to the level of the platform; Mr. McNaughton pointed out that lowering the deck would create a trip hazard at the kitchen door.

Motion to find the application complete with the additional information that the applicant will use the railing and lattice recommended by the Historic District Consultant and to approve the application.

Moved: Brown Seconded: Seymour

Ms. Duchesne told the Board that a plan is a requirement but that the Board can waive the requirement in a case like this.

Mr. McNaughton said he is willing to make one level by raising the landing. He also agreed to paint the railing and lattice white after the pressure-treated wood has had time to cure.

Vote:	Yea:	Bostwick, Brown, Landry, Rigoulot, Seymour, Taylor
	Nay:	Morrison
		Motion carried.

Motion to find the application in harmony with Historic District standards with the changes noted in completeness and the applicant's agreement to paint the railing white, and approve the application.

Moved: Brown	Seconded: Bostwick	Yea:	Bostwick, Brown, Landry, Rigoulot, Seymour, Taylor
		Nay:	Morrison
			Motion carried.

8. Other Business

None.

9. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn.

Moved: Brown Seconded: Bostwick Unanimously approved

Accepted as Presented on April 17, 2024, by a vote of 7 Yea to 0 Nay.

Attested: _____
Andrew Landry, Vice-Chair