



# 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

February 15, 2005 – 6:00 PM  
Gardiner City Hall, Council Chambers

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

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

Also Present: Barbara McPheters – CEO  
                  Dorothy Morang – Recording Secretary

              Tim Fortin            Chris Paszyc            Francis Grey

- 1.) Chair McKay called the meeting to order at 6:25 PM.
- 2.) Roll call was taken.
- 3.) Geri Robbins Doyle made a motion to approve the December 14, 2004 minutes. Gail Ham seconded the motion.  
Vote: 5 in favor. 0 opposed. Motion passed.

## NEW BUSINESS

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

**Proposal:** The addition of an elevator, corresponding stairwell and catwalk across building one, connecting to building two; the addition of dormers on the river side of buildings two and three; eight over eight windows throughout each of the three buildings; eight over eight windows on the Water Street side of the elevator shaft and two over one windows in the new stairwell; shutters on building two; a deck along the river side of either building two or three.

**Location:** 149 - 151, 153 & 157 Water Street, City Tax Map 34, Lot 139 and Map 34, Lot 138 & Map 37, Lot 167.

Tim Fortin noted that he had met with the Gardiner Maine Street (GMS) Design Committee and has made changes that address the GMS Design Committee's concerns and some ideas that they thought were better and also fit better with Gardiner's waterfront plans.

Kirk Mohney asked about the use. Tim said a lot is up in the air at this time. He does expect that the top floors will be used for business offices. Tim noted that the deck on the lower level was moved so as not to be between the two buildings or near the grease vents coming out of Tilbury Tavern. The plans are for the lower floors to be used for retail, but nothing is carved in stone. On the left end, it is currently being used for loan processing, but he is not sure of the future use.

Kirk asked Tim if they had looked at alternative ways to incorporate the elevator. Tim said they originally had planned to locate it inside, but it took up too much room and the building has had a lot of alterations, some to the structural beams and they did not want to further alter the joists.

Chris Paszyc noted that originally, in the first scenario, the elevator was planned for the back side of Bob White's building when they were talking about a five-building block. But now the plans involve only three buildings.

Kirk indicated that, in looking at the standards, a couple of things concern him with this project. The first is the scale of the building on the south end and the guidelines referencing roofs. He said if they look at the building currently, it is a 2-story, flat roof. The proposal would substantially add to the scale and with the glass connection, you would have a very different prospective of building one. He also added that with respect to roof top additions, they should set back and be as inconspicuous as possible.

Tim said they were not a lot of options and to make them ADA compliant.

Kirk asked Tim if they had looked at alternatives to reduce the visual impact. Tim said that they thought the goal was not to mimic the existing conditions with the addition. Kirk said that was correct, but also it should be limited in scale and size of the historic building and should be as inconspicuous as possible. He said you have a 2-story, flat roof and are proposing a 2 ½ - 3 story, a catwalk that can be seen from the street and a gable roof. Can you minimize the catwalk to minimize the visual impact? Tim asked if Kirk was proposing a shed type flat roof? Kirk said that would minimize the scale. Tim said their original thought was not to mimic what was currently there.

Chris Paszyc said this is something the City has worked on for years with Gardiner Savings Institution (GSI). We were given direction to make a good application. The City Staff and Council support this wholeheartedly. Gardiner Maine Street has been involved and is helping GSI put this proposal together and Gardiner Maine Street comes out of the National Historic Trust.

Barbara McPheters, Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) mentioned to Tim that at a previous meeting, they talked about reducing the impact and including glass in the cat walk to do that where the previous plan included large double doors.

Kirk asked about the canopy attached to the building. Tim said it is an open steel structure and was designed to add interest to the entrance to the building. Kirk asked about the material for the elevator. Tim said all brick. Kirk asked about the existing windows. Tim originally said they were vinyl clad and then corrected it to aluminum clad wood. Kirk asked how the proposed window systems relate to the size area, muntins and mullions of the existing. Tim said as close a match as they can get. They were not going to change the frames much. They should be able to just pop out the old window and pop in the new. The old frames are not sufficient to use. Kirk asked if they were going to match the brick profile to some extent? Tim said they were going to try to maintain what is there.

Clarence McKay asked if they proposed a metal roof across the elevator and backside? Tim said yes. Kirk asked if there would be a hallway from the connector to feed the offices. Tim said he believes so, although no floor plans have been drawn up at this time, but it makes sense to.

Kirk asked what the implication of the large dormers on the back means for future requests. He then asked Tim if they were trying to maximize space with the size. Tim said yes, but the existing dormer footprint on building two is the same footprint proposed for the additional one. Kirk asked if they planned to use it as a conference room. Tim said he thought executive offices probably. Clarence asked if the dormers would open to a balcony? Tim said one plan shows windows only and another plan is for doors with a small walkway. It is undetermined at this time because it hasn't been determined if it structurally can be done.

Gail Ham asked if the windows were eight over eights in the picture they were given. Tim said yes. Geri asked if the second dormer was proposed to balance the look. Tim said yes, they have been talking about one office and one conference room. Geri asked Kirk what

would be the problem for future requests? Kirk said that roofs are considered character-defining features of buildings and dormers will change the appearance of roof profiles. Gail said they would visually impact the buildings that are beside the parking lot. Tim said there are already a variety of dormers along that area. Tim showed the Commission members a drawing of the proposal as would be seen from the railroad tracks. Tim said he had had a discussion of the dormers at the Maine Street Design Committee meeting and discussed the differences between the two areas. In the Arcade Parking area, it is very visible from the back, but in this proposed block, you might see a little from Randolph or from the waterfront.

Gail said when you look at the present pictures; this is certainly an improvement. Clarence asked what they planned to put on the dormer roofs? Tim said asphalt shingles to match existing roof. Kirk asked about the elevator shaft in relationship to building two. Tim said he did not have those dimensions. Kirk asked how soon they might have further drawings and renderings – it is hard to answer questions with these drawings – they can't fully appreciate the height of the new shaft and the elevator in relation to the existing buildings. Tim said they did not want to commit further money into this without approval. Clarence asked if the tower was higher than the Library tower? Tim said he doesn't know.

Kirk referenced Standards 2 & 9 and said aspects of the concepts meet the standards and there are some that don't. The walkway needs further work on the design to minimize visually and to be more compatible with building one and revisit the entrance concept to the tower. The plan already covers up 1/2 of building one with the framework and diminishes the character of the building. It needs more design work to make it more compatible.

Tim said the entrance is flexible. The catwalk is more challenging. With the slope of the building, he can't move it back and look appropriate. Kirk asked him to set it back as much as possible to preserve as much as possible, but the use of the back of the buildings and use may preclude moving it back. Whatever can be done to the connector to minimize the visual impact would be good because you lose the flat roof of building one with this. Tim said he thought the goal was not to mimic. Kirk said it shouldn't mimic, but with respect to character and scale of the existing building, a catwalk with a flat roof with a slight slope to the back they would see more of the roof from the street. The material is not as important as the slope.

Gail said from the back, it looks like you're trying to keep a continuum from the back to the catwalk. Tim said if they turned the roof into a shed roof, it would extend beyond the tower roof. Kirk said he didn't see the profile of the catwalk roof needing to have any relationship to building two. Gail asked if it was to have the roof as flat as possible? Clarence asked if their architect would do an inside-outside drawing? Mike asked if they had talked with any other architects? Tim said Coffin Engineering will also work on this. Their goal here tonight is to get the concept approved and then finish the detailed plans. Kirk said he was not in a position or has enough information to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Tim said he wants to move forward, but can't work on the interior plans without approval of the exterior.

Geri said, conceptually it is a good idea and asked if they could bring the architect up to help answer questions? Tim said others are also a part of this project and if the Commission members have specific questions he can get the answers for them.

Gail said that they need to sum up the recommendations for the Applicant. The following information was suggested:

1. Information on height of elevator shaft in relation to building 2 and the stairs as they relate to building 2 and its tower.
2. Catwalk roof – slope
3. Window design for dormers and more information on the replacement windows – glass area of existing profiles, glass proportion - void to solid and what the brick molding might look like, drawings of cross section of jamb and head for existing windows or good picture and same information on proposed windows.
4. Design of entrance to stair tower.

Kirk asked about the existing shutters. Tim said they are wood, but not workable. Kirk asked if they had considered removing them altogether? Tim said they would rather not but would if had to. Kirk said fake shutters tend to be narrower than the window and are mounted with non-historic hardware. Tim said the ones on the building look custom made.

Gail said that the fact that there is a dormer on one roof would appear to her to be all right for the second one. They would overlook the riverfront and it is different than along the Arcade parking lot because this area is shielded, but doesn't want to set a precedent for other applications. She said it is a nice package visually and she likes it, but has a concern for setting precedent.

Tim said they are two different blocks with two different views.

Gail said the Commission members need to come to some consensus about precedent setting.

Tim said that if this is not approved, it is possible they won't do the other work either. The goal is to have both.

Kirk Mohny made a motion to table the consideration of this application pending the presentation of additional information and further review of this project. Gail Ham seconded the motion.

Tim asked to be sure that he has all of the issues listed. 1. Minimize the presence of the catwalk from Water Street; 2 Height of tower elevator shaft in relation to building two; 3. Eliminate the steel structure; 4. Information on windows, glass area, jamb, head; and 5. Dormers. Tim said that his client is adamant about the two dormers and he needs to know.

Kirk said that it is a struggle. He doesn't know if they can say these two are special and the others are treated differently. He can't be held to that standard. He doesn't know if it is important to preserve the back profiles.

Tim said that once the waterfront project is developed, wouldn't it be more visibly important – the look of the back of those buildings is a disgrace. This three-building project and its design make it a whole lot more beautiful from the Waterfront Park and from the south entrance to the District.

Gail said she like the two dormers – it's more balanced, but are we setting a precedent for other projects or are we breaking the rules. Clarence asked if there was any evidence of a second dormer in the second building? Tim said from pictures at the Library, he can't tell. The inside has been structurally altered to the extent that he can't tell from inside either and the existing roof has structural issues. He said that if you look from block to block, there are a variety of dormers on the buildings all along the street.

Geri Robbins Doyle left the meeting.

Kirk said we have to determine is it a character-defining feature that needs to be protected. He asked Tim if they had thought about an alternate design for that building, such as two small gable dormers rather than one long shed dormer. Tim said there would not be a lot of usable space with 2 small gable dormers.

Gail asked the CEO, from her point of view, would they be setting precedent? The CEO said, in previous conversations with town attorneys, if we condition this and deal with the merits case by case, it would not be setting precedent and we would be covered legally.

Mike said he feels better about it, that they wouldn't be setting a Citywide precedent.

Gail said the backs of the buildings are extremely visible from the waterfront and Randolph and her concern is, also, that now there is a nice view of the Library and would the elevation shaft block that.

Kirk said the Commission should analyze the back of the buildings and determine if they are character-defining features that they need to protect. In most circumstances, the standards are looking at the front elevations, not the back. Gail said that she

became conscious of the backs of the buildings with Ray Schofield's paintings. Clarence asked Kirk if he could research the federal standards. Kirk said yes.

Vote: 4 in favor. 0 opposed. Motion passed.

A workshop was scheduled for March 1, 2005 @ 6:00 PM to work on this.

## 5.) Adjourn

Gail Ham made a motion to adjourn. Mike Giberson seconded the motion.

Vote: 4 in favor. 0 opposed. Motion passed.

**Meeting adjourned 8:25 PM**