

Historic Preservation Review Board – May 28, 2008 @ 7:00 PM

The meeting of the Historic Preservation Review Board was called to order by Chair, Mary Jane Anderson, at 7:04 PM at Town Hall.

Chair Anderson called the roll.

Members present: Mary Jane Anderson, Chair; Michael Jean Carpentier and Kevin Peterson

Member Absent: David Waldron

Also Present: Sandy Strehlou, HPRB Coordinator; Doug Bison and Robert Walters, Vice-commander/Sgt. at Arms American Legion Post 163 and agent for the planned new construction.

Approval of the minutes for the HPRB meeting of April 23, 2008 was postponed due to lack of board members present who were also present at the April 23rd meeting.

Design Review: American Legion

The design review for the proposed construction of an elevated deck and storage structure for the American Legion Hall at 110 First Street falls under the category *Downtown New Construction* in the HP manual. The applicant, represented by builder Robert Walters, is requesting parking incentives.

Chair Mary Jane Anderson read the design review statement followed by Mr. Walters addressing the board regarding the project. Mr. Walters said that he was very willing to work with board recommendations and answered questions clarifying the project for board members.

General Guidelines – page 52

Beginning the design review process and regarding general guidelines HPRB Coordinator Sandy Strehlou, referring to exhibit #4, the staff report, stated that as a non-historic building the goal for the new construction on the 1950s American Legion building is not to “make it historic” but to keep it true to itself while keeping the surrounding historic buildings, the Whale Museum and the Grange Hall, in mind. It was also noted that as one side of the building is visible to the public right of way from Front Street and the other side is visible to the public from the shoreline both sides are of equal importance.

Compatibility Defined – HP Manual pages 53-54

Scale – Yes - Elements of the new construction fit with the original building in scale. The new windows are the same as existing windows. Scale and mass are consistent with surrounding buildings. Referencing exhibit #6 it was pointed out that the new construction will cover up a part of the existing building that does not match.

At 7:45 Doug Bison departed

Massing – Yes – Is consistent with surrounding buildings

Roof – Yes contingent on: The roof will be in compliance if the pitch of the new roof matches the pitch of the existing roof on the northeast corner. Reference exhibit #13

Setback – NA

Alignment – NA

Entry – NA

Openings – Yes contingent on: Doors and windows, including trim, must match existing doors and windows on each level of the building.

Detailed Guidelines – HP Manual pages 55-57

Building Exterior

1. Siding – Yes contingent on: Visually match the adjoining siding to the existing siding making the transition at the stair stringer.

2. Large areas of solid wall avoided – Yes

3. Windows - Yes contingent on: windows, including trim, must match existing windows on each level of the building.

4. Roof Elements - Yes contingent on: Rafters match detail on north façade, see exhibit #8.

5. False Fronts – NA

Materials - Yes contingent on: Redesign the stairway using cable ground rails and posts which match the deck posts. Use tempered glass only on the landing. As long as the roof is not seen from the public right of way metal may be used.

Utilities - Yes contingent on: Utilities must not show and there will be no additional utilities and no existing utilities will be moved. Lighting must be subtle and shine down not out. Lights must all be the same color. Gutters must be painted to match building.

Mary Jane Anderson, Chair

Peggy Sue McRae
9:02 Meeting adjourned