



# City of Gardiner

## Historic Preservation Commission

[www.gardinermaine.com](http://www.gardinermaine.com)

---

6 Church St.  
Gardiner, Me. 04345

Telephone 207-582-6892  
Fax 207-582-6895

### REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

December 14, 2004 – 6:00 PM  
Gardiner City Hall, Council Chambers

Present: Clarence McKay, Chair    Mike Giberson    Derrick Grant    Gail Ham  
          Kirk Mohney                    Geri Robbins-Doyle

Absent:                    Victor Tessari (Alt.)    Deborah Felder (Alt.)

Also Present: William Najpauer, Kennebec Valley Council of Government (KVCOG), Staff  
                  Barbara McPheters – CEO  
                  Dorothy Morang – Recording Secretary

Gifford Swanson            Tim Fortin

- 1.) Chair McKay called the meeting to order at 6:02 PM.
- 2.) Roll call was taken.
- 3.) Derrick Grant made a motion to approve the October 1, 2004 minutes. Kirk Mohney seconded the motion.  
Vote: 6 in favor. 0 opposed. Motion passed.

## NEW BUSINESS

### 4.) **Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness Application from Lemon Lime Enterprises, Gifford Swanson, Applicant**

**Proposal: Replace windows on second floor both front and back**

**Location: 279 Water Street, City Tax Map 37, Lot 119**

**Land Use Ordinance Reference: Section 9, Article F.**

Gifford Swanson described his proposed project for the building at 279 Water Street. Currently it houses Focus Fitness on the first floor, an art studio on the second floor and the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, apartments. The windows on the rear of the building, which appear to be original to the building, are 6 over 6. On the Water Street side there are some 2 over 1 and 1 over 1s. He would like to replace them 6 over 6 so that they all match and the historic character of the building is maintained. They would maintain the original trim and match the muntins in size and shape so as not to lose light. The jamb liner would be plastic.

Kirk Mohny thanked the Applicant for giving thought to the standards. He went over the history of the building and had a few photos to show. He thinks there were four windows on the second and third floors and sometime between the original construction, 1850's and the 1896 flood additional windows were added to the Water Street side of the building, and by 1920 there were 1 over 1s in the front elevations. From the pictures, we know that the windows were 1 over 1s but although the current are not the original, if we put in 6 over 6s, it may create an appearance that did not exist in the building. Given the size of the muntins on with windows in the rear of the building, they are probably the originals. Probably 6 over 6 is the closest to the original profile. He said the challenge is the front elevation. Do you look to documentation that we have or make the windows all look alike?

Gail Ham said the building looks right because that's what she remembers. Looking downtown, a lot of people have put 6 over 6s on the second and third floors in their buildings as a good faith effort to match the original buildings. She added that it could create a false sense of historic character if they put in the 6 over 6s where the only picture shows 1 over 1s, although they were probably changed prior to the 1896 flood when the windows were added.

Kirk said we should look at the front and back elevations separate. Gifford said he would look at them together. Kirk said over time merchants often fixed up the fronts and not the backs. A lot has gone on and not necessarily documented. He thinks the 6 over 6s are original. The muntins and mullions show that. Derrick said the most concrete evidence is the 6 over 6s on the back and he also guesses that they were consistent on the front and back windows.

Derrick Grant moved to permit the replacement of the front second floor 6 windows with 6 over 6 windows and the rear elevation windows, 6 over 6.

Mike Giberson seconded the motion.

After a long discussion concerning previously stated issues and the Applicant's proposed design for the 1<sup>st</sup> floor, Kirk Mohney said that he could not support the motion because 1 over 1s are documented and the other might not be correct. He wants to ensure that the 6 over 6s match the 6 over 6s on the back in muntins, mullion and materials.

Derrick Grant amended his motion to add: to have 7/8" muntins and mullions on the 2nd floor windows.

Vote: 3 in favor. 2 opposed. 1 abstained (Gail Ham – couldn't decide)

Gifford thanked the Commission and said he knew it was not easy. Geri thanked Gifford for buying the building and fixing it up.

**5.) Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness Application from Gardiner Savings Institution, FSB, Tim Fortin, Applicant**

**Proposal: Rebuild and secure brick framing pockets and parapets, re-deck & re-shingle roofs, re-point bricks and secures knee walls and facade**

**Location: 153 & 157 Water Street, City Tax Map 34, Lot 138 and Map 37, Lot 167**

**Land Use Ordinance Reference: Section 9, Article F.**

Tim said this proposed project is part of a phased approach to get these buildings up to good repair. He showed several drawings of the various phases of the proposed project. He said the roofs leak badly on both of these buildings. Phase I will get the roofs repaired. Their engineer said that they need to support the roofs with I-beams, securing the parapets and brick pockets that hold these timbers. An internal drain is behind the parapets. They plan to remove the asphalt and wooden façade that has deteriorated and want to go back to the original façade and re-point the bricks. They will go out to bid for contractors that know the correct way for re-pointing.

Commission members and Tim discussed aspects of the other phases including parking, dormers, etc.

Kirk Mohney made a motion to grant the Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the roofs and remove the wooden elements above the brick parapets and to reconstruct the parapets in kind, maintaining the same design that exists presently, number of courses, pattern on the bricks and that the re-pointing and strength of the mortar is developed in accordance with Preservation Brief 2 and that the Commission be given the opportunity to review masonry spec. when it's developed. Derrick Grant seconded the motion.

Kirk Mohney amended the motion to assume that the existing reverse dormers will be covered over with that re-roofing of building three.

Kirk Mohny further amended the motion: to include in the scope of the work, the removal of existing dormer on the rear of building two. Geri Doyle seconded the amended motions. Vote: 6 in favor. 0 opposed. Motion passed.

The Commission members continued to discuss possible designs for other phases with the Applicant reference the dormers, roof shape, decorative features, catwalk, etc. Kirk said when you consider work done to the back of the buildings, it's important to consider how visible the backs are. These building backs are pretty hidden.

## **6.) Adjourn**

Geri Doyle made a motion to adjourn. Gail Ham seconded the motion. Vote: 6 in favor. 0 opposed. Motion passed.

**Meeting adjourned 8:13 PM**