

**VILLAGE REVIEW BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 25, 2018**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Gary Massanek, Vice Chair Connie Lundquist, Rebekah Beaulieu, Claudia Knox, Laura Lienert, Annee Tara and Karen Topp

MEMBERS ABSENT: No members were absent.

STAFF PRESENT: Interim Director of Planning and Development and Town Planner, Jared Woolston

A meeting of the Village Review Board was held on Thursday, January 25, 2018 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at 85 Union Street, Council Chambers. Chair Gary Massanek called the meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.

1. Case # VRB 18-003 – 43 Pleasant Street (St. John’s Church/All Saints Parish) –

The Board will review and take action on a request for a revised Certificate of Appropriateness to modify front façade and clearstory windows as part of the new construction of a multi-use building at 43 Pleasant Street (Map U16, Lots 47-48). The original Certificate of Appropriateness was approved by the Board on November 15, 2016.

Jared Woolston introduced the application.

Scott Simons, Architect, reviewed changes that were made in the front façade, Pleasant Street elevation and in the clearstory window. Scott explained that the changes were made around the windows on the front façade are due to exposure of the building materials. They are requesting that the clearstory windows be changed to a translucent panel along the north and south sides to prevent snow build up along the windows. In addition, if there is an event during the night, there could be light spillage along the Pleasant Street side. Scott provided examples of similar projects using the translucent panels. Gary Massanek asked if the pitch of the roof has changed. Scott replied that it has changed. Claudia Knox said that it looks as though they have made the building narrower. Scott replied that he does not believe that to be the case as the gymnasium is a standard width; the renderings may be off slightly. Laura Lienert asked what the new height is and noted that the previous height was 29.3 feet. Scott replied that he did not know the exact numbers. Mike Oulette replied that the roof is a little bit narrower because of the way the roof is supported. Scott said that he believes the roof is still the same height. Anne Tara asked if some of these changes were done to reduce costs. Scott replied that some were. Karen Topp asked if the building has shifted. Scott replied that it was shifted to the left a little, but that was a previously approved change. Laura asked for the change in dimensions for the larger windows. Scott replied that he did not know the dimensions. Connie Lundquist asked if the plans submitted to the Planning Board were different from what was presented to the VRB. Scott replied that he is reviewing

changes. Claudia asked what version of the plans the PB reviewed. Jared Woolston stated that some of the changes before the VRB this evening had not been brought to his attention. Jared noted that he believes the height limit for this zone is 35 feet. If the proposal is above 35 feet then the plans will need to be reviewed as a minor modification to the PB findings. In addition, if the tower has shifted and made the footprint a little bigger then that too will need to be a minor modification to the PB findings. In terms of Village Review, Jared said that they should be looking at scale and façade modifications. Jared added that what the PB reviewed should have been the same as what the VRB reviewed. Connie asked if the changes need to go back before the PB. Jared replied that if this plan meets all the VRB requirements and provided it meets all the dimensional requirements, then these changes could be a staff level site plan modification. The bigger question is, is the VRB satisfied with the design. Scott said that the building height and building dimensions have not changed from what the PB approved. Scott pointed out that there were extensive discussions with Anna Breinich about the height of the clear tower and how the changes would not affect the overall height of the building. Gary did a rough scale of the building and stated that he believes the overall elevation has changed. Scott noted that the renderings are not construction documents and reiterated that the height has not changed. Gary disagreed. Scott stated that the height was approved at the PB meeting and his belief is that this change would be a Planning issue. Gary replied that the VRB is in charge of looking at the massing of the building. Connie stated that her concern is that the PB may have reviewed different plans than what they had approved. Jared reiterated that both Boards should have reviewed the same plans. Scott replied that what they submit to the PB is a set of construction documents including engineering. What they submit to the VRB is essentially a design concept and building materials.

Laura Lienert asked if the changes in the smaller window on the Pleasant Street side was a cost change. Renderings from September 2016 have this room as a music room, but they are now being told that this was the reason behind the change. Scott replied that it was a classroom and it is now an office room where you could have a private lesson.

Chair Gary Massanek opened the meeting to public comment. Hearing none, the comment period was closed.

Karen agreed with Gary regarding the point that the height had changed from the original plan. Laura Lienert stated that this was a very well discussed application when it came before the Board the first time. The real issue is the mass and scale of the building in a residential neighborhood. Although the changes may seem minor to the applicant, they have gone taller, and now they have 102 feet of wall. The wall is massive and has gone from three plus windows down to two; now those windows are becoming smaller. An addition there is detail being lost as they are going from concrete to metal. Laura has concerns with these revisions. Rebekah Beaulieu said that she likes the material for the upper portion as it adds efficiency inside and outside the structure and it also adds a little more movement. Rebekah said that she needs more information and identical renderings in terms of what they should be looking at. Rebekah is also concerned that in the information they received, there were no numbers. When the Board is looking at massing, appearance and integrity, they need the numbers. Laura agrees that they should

have the numbers. Connie stated that she has the same concerns as Rebekah. Claudia agrees with the confusion and stated that aesthetically, she felt the original rendering was visually stronger. She wants to be sympathetic to cost, but somehow the way the window was before and the size of the conceptual clear-story in the first drawing felt stronger. Claudia asked if there were mullions in the windows. Scott replied that the windows have them. Gary stated that he disagrees with Laura regarding scale. The scale seems smaller to him in the new rendition. Gary said that part of this change is by reducing the mass of the window and increasing the pitch of the roof; its taller, but more appropriate to what they see next to it. Gary is confused about widths and heights compared to what they originally reviewed. Rebekah agrees with Gary in terms of the window change and roof pitch. Connie understands that structural drawings can alter an initial concept and this may be leading to some confusion. In terms of review standards tonight, Jared noted that the exact height is a requirement, but it is not part of the ordinance this plan falls under. This Board has a fair amount of latitude. If looking at the rendering in terms of scale, the red building next door may be helpful. Rebekah recognizes the VRB role versus the PB, but it would be helpful to have the number in the change for the windows. Laura said that another issue they need to look at is the metal versus the concrete block around the windows. Because the windows are smaller, there is significantly more around the windows. Laura asked members how they felt about the metal. Connie replied that the metal leads to a more institutional look and she would shy away from that. Laura referenced the ordinance, and pointed out that the Board is also supposed to be looking at materials, not just mass and scale. She does not feel that metal is the look that they are looking for. Gary asked if the metal around the windows was a cost issue. Scott clarified that the drawing in the upper portion of the packet materials is the same as what the PB saw in terms of massing, heights and widths. The one on the bottom is what the VRB approved almost a year earlier. Gary pointed out then that the PB approved a building with a higher pitch and wider building that had not come back before the VRB. Jared reviewed the process and agreed that there was a mishap. Connie attempted to clarify that that what the PB approved was not the same plans as the VRB had approved. Gary stated that he believed that they were here to discuss some changes to the windows and since the meeting has begun, they have found other alterations that have been made. Gary would like a comparative set of drawings on what the VRB approved, what the PB approved, and the changes being proposed.

**MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO TABLE THE APPLICATION
PENDING FURTHER CLARIFICATION. MOTION SECONDED BY REBEKAH
BEAULIEAU. MOTION PASSED BY GARY MASSANEK, CONNIE
LUNDQUIST, REBEKAH BEAULIEU, LAURA LIENERT, ANNEE TARA AND
KAREN TOPP. CLAUDIA KNOX ABSTAINED. MOTION PASSES 6-1.**

Mike Oulette, builder, stated that the bottom rendering is what Anna Breincih approved. The top drawing is very similar as to what was submitted to the PB in shape, size and massing. Mike said that the branding around the window is not a cost factor and can be metal or smooth stone. Mike said that changes were made and Anna wanted to get closer to what the VRB saw; this rendering was the response from the architect. Mike noted that the big window sticks out a little on the sides and said that the smaller window on the

right was changed to a window with mullions. Mike noted that the elevation on the upper rendering is what the PB approved. Claudia Knox stated that it sounds like the choice between metal and smooth stone has not been finalized. Mike emphasized that the choice over one versus the other is not cost driven and if the Board chose smooth stone, he is sure the architect can adjust the rendering.

Claudia Knox asked how much of a problem will be created if the applicant has to stop construction until they can come back to the Board. Jared Woolston replied that for him its just a notice, but for the applicant it could be considerable.

2. Discuss Barba-Wheelock Contracted Scope of Work for Village Review Overlay Zone Design Guidelines Update and Associated Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Jared Woolston briefly summarized the contract and reviewed adjustments to the schedule. Jared to send out a revised workshop schedule.

3. Other Business

- Jared Woolston reviewed Janet Roberts credentials and stated that she is willing to assist Jared in preparing Findings of Fact for the Village Review Board.
- Gary Massanek thanked Rebekah Beaulieu for her service to the Board.

4. Approval of Minutes

MOTION BY CONNIE LUNDQUIST TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 16, 2017. MOTION SECONDED BY KAREN TOPP, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY CONNIE LUDQUIST TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 20, 2017. MOTION SECONDED BY ANNEE TARA, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Staff Approvals:

- 34 Federal St – Shed demo
- 123 Maine St – Windows
- 25 Mill St – Sign
- 153 Park Row – Sign
- 103 Maine St – Sign

This meeting was adjourned at 5:49 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted



Tonya Jenusaitis,
Recording Secretary