



6 Church Street, Gardiner, ME 04345
Phone (207) 582-4200

Debby Willis, Chairperson
Angelia Christopher, Administrative Assistant

PLANNING BOARD
Meeting Minutes
Thursday February 16, 2023 @ 6:00 PM
City Council Chambers

1. Call the Meeting to Order- Chair Willis called the meeting to order at 6pm.

2. Roll Call- Board members- Debby Willis, Pam Mitchel, Zach Hanley, Adam Lemire, Shawn Dolley, Lisa St. Hilaire. Jacob Waltman was unable to attend. Applicant- Paul Boghossian, Jim Coffin- Engineer, Mark Bower- Attorney, Jon Grosvenor- Architect via zoom. Jon Pottle- City Solicitor, Andrew Carlton- City Manager, Kris McNeill- CEO. Others present- Phyllis Gardiner, Mike Gent, Cheryl Clark, Auta Main, Jan Joyce, Melanie Mohny, Robert Monniere, Susan Shavy, Pat Hart, and Angelia Christopher.

3. Review of the October 13, 2022 meeting minutes- Chair Willis asked for changes or corrections. The Board discussed a couple of small changes. Pam Mitchel offered a motion to approve with minor amendments. Lisa St. Hilaire seconded the motion. No further discussion. All in favor.

4. Public Hearing: Gardiner Green- Continuation of the December 15, 2022

Meeting for the Final Subdivision & Continuation of Site Plan development Public Hearing at 150 Dresden Ave. City Tax map 032 Lots 023-023A in HDR. - Lisa St. Hilaire recused herself as she is a direct abutter to this project.

Chair Willis opened the application stating that the meeting would go until 9pm. She inquired the status of the Public Hearing to Attorney Pottle, who stated that the hearing was closed, but there could still be questions and comments. The Board had left off at 6.5.2.1- HDR criteria. Attorney Pottle advised the board that this submission has different features, and they could review the criteria again, to make sure that all areas are covered.

Pam Mitchel moves that they reconsider this criteria in light of the recently submitted materials. Adam Lemire seconded the motion. No further discussion, all members in favor.

Mr. Boghossian's architect, Jon Grosvenor, is attending the meeting via Zoom. He tells the group that he has been in business for years and is also a licensed Maine architect. This new application submission has significant buffering around the building, and around the parking areas. Mr. Grosvenor states that this project is a renovation, not a reconstruction, therefore the standards in 6.5.2.1 do not apply. At the last meeting, 12/15/22, the Board voted that this project was considered a reconstruction. Mr. Grosvenor- According to the standards listed with the National Park Service- up to 75% of the original structure is kept, it qualifies as a renovation.

Mr. Grosvenor explains that the parking area is being improved with much of it being reclaimed as green space. They are working on fashioning a warm and inviting façade that the community will embrace. He feels that they are well on their way to a successful project. Chair Willis asks if Board members have any questions. Adam Lemire asks if the rendering is showing all of the windows and what is the material of the balconies and patios beneath them. It seems that there are some inconsistencies between the plans and the rendering. Mr. Grosvenor states the rendering is just a visual of the project and most towns do not focus on details such as this. Paul Boghossian states that the balconies are beams with glass panes, and stainless hardware. They have changed the design of these balconies in order to meet code, to blend in better, and to please the Board.

Mr. Grosvenor tells the Board that the cypress panels are meant to help to warm up the appearance of the building which can be very severe. He points out that the landscaping plan is going to make huge changes to the appearance, and will significantly reduce the amount of impervious surface on the lot.

Chair Willis asks if there are any more questions or public comment in regards to 6.5.2.1. Lisa St. Hilaire has comments about the sizes of the apartments, and balconies, and the changes to the north façade. She states that the sizes of the apartments that have the recessing element, and the size of the new larger balconies, have not changed on the plans. Phyllis Gardiner would like to know what the depth of the recessed areas is, and how that affects the unit sizes. She states that this submission does not reflect the character of the neighborhood on Dresden Ave. She states that there is no significant gain in greenspace, contrary to what Mr. Grosvenor indicated earlier. She spoke of Mr. Grosvenor's comments about renovation standards per the National Park service. She feels that those comments are irrelevant, that this is not a historic property and those standards will not apply. She wants to know why the granite block that was intended to be a sign base for the address is still there, if a sign is not allowed there. Cheryl Clark comments that the English Garden, that is supposed to be such an attractant, sits between decaying buildings. She feels that this will keep people from enjoying the garden. Pam Mitchel that the changes are improving, but she wants to see the windows on the west façade, on the rendering.

Jon Pottle asked what the beams would be made of. Mr. Grosvner indicated wood, in same color as concrete band (the fascia below the roofline). Jon indicates that 6.5.2.10 and 11 speak to the use of materials as part of being sensitive to the character of the neighborhood and have relevance here. Board should focus on these as well, not just the HDR design standards.

Kris McNeill- CEO submitted a memo to the Board, reviewing renovation/reconstruction. If the project were deemed a reconstruction, the project would need to meet the standards in 7.8.4.3. In his opinion ~~R~~ reconstruction is the overall redesign of the structure. A renovation would not trigger the standards in 7.8.4.3. Reconstruction can mean different things in different contexts. Reconstruction is tearing parts or all of a building down, and putting something back up. Phyllis Gardiner states that the Board has already taken a vote, (12/15/22) and decided it was a reconstruction. Attorney Pottle- 'when new info is provided, the board can reconsider and revote.

Pam Mitchel moves that with the additions in this submission and the changes to the North and West façade, that this proposal does meet the criteria in 6.5.2.1 and that it is sensitive to the character of the site, and neighborhood. Zachary Hanley seconds the motion. There was a discussion about the windows on the floor plan. Adam Lemire feels the side that faces Dresden Ave has improved significantly. The pattern of windows and extent of the large, blank wall on the front façade does not fit the building in the neighborhood. (neighborhood pattern being window-space-window). Perhaps more windows on the ~~front façade~~ both ends of the west wall will make it look more appealing. The neighborhood is full of homes with front porches, not modernistic balconies. There are ways to help this building fit in better, make it warmer in appearance. The extent of the blank wall is insensitive to the character of the neighborhood.

Chair Willis states that it is not the Board's duty to design this project, but it is to review it for applicability to the ordinance and if it fits in with 6.5.2.11

Shawn Dolley is bothered by inconsistencies between plans and elevations and that the elevations should reflect how this will be built. He feels that most of the effort has been put into one façade. It would be best to look at the balance of the building and treatment of the facades/ Adding windows to the front, helps to put the application in the right direction to approval. Kris McNeill notes that the renderings and elevations DO matter, as they are part of determining if this fits character of the neighborhood, however floor plans are typically not final at this stage. The Board wants to see what the rendering will look like with added windows to the front facade.

Mark Bowers suggested the Board approval this standard with conditions. Pam Mitchell was not sure this particular criterion is appropriate for conditions, and this is not something the CEO should check off, rather it should come before the board for approval. Chair Willis reminds the Board that they have a motion and a second. Does the

Board want to table or withdraw their motion and wait for more information? The Board decides that they would like to see more improvements, and the motion is withdrawn by both Pam Mitchel and Zachary Hanley.

6.5.2 The proposal will not have an adverse impact on the neighborhood properties. After discussion, Pam Mitchel moves that 6.5.2.2 has been satisfied. Adam Lemire seconded. No further discussion. All Board members present in favor. Pam Mitchel makes a motion that 6.5.2.3 has been met. Adam Lemire seconded. All in favor. Pam Mitchel motions that the criteria in 6.5.2.4 is satisfied. Adam Lemire seconded the motion. All in favor. Pam Mitchel moves that the criteria in 6.5.2.5 is satisfied. Adam Lemire seconded. All members in favor. Pam Mitchel moves that the criteria in 6.5.2.6 is satisfied. Zachary Hanley seconded the motion. All members in favor. Pam Mitchel moves that the criteria in 6.5.2.7 has been met. Adam Lemire seconded the motion. All members in favor. Pam Mitchel moves that the criteria in 6.5.2.8 has been met. Adam Lemire seconded the motion. All members in favor. Pam Mitchel moves that the criteria in 6.5.2.9 has been met. Adam Lemire seconded the motion. All members in favor. 6.5.2.10- Jon Pottle notes that if architectural features might change, it may be prudent to wait on this criterion. Pam noted this refers to walls more than 50' long. Adam noted that the standard just asks if features are there. Pam Mitchel moves that the criteria for 6.5.2.10 has been met. Adam Lemire seconded the motion. Adam Lemire seconded. All in favor.

6.5.2.11 materials Debby asks if the materials fit the standard. Pam Mitchel moves that the criteria for materials is met in 6.5.2.11. Zachary Hanley seconded the motion. Jon Pottle suggested waiting on this. Adam noted balcony railings are stainless steel with glass infill. Kris McNeill noted that the LUO refers to steel and glass as trim or accent only, and that the majority should be made of wood. Three members were in favor, Chair Willis and Adam Lemire opposed. The motion passed. Pam Mitchel moves that the criteria in 6.5.2.12 have been met. Shawn Dolley seconded the motion. All members in favor. 6.5.2.13- Pam Mitchel moves that this standard does not apply. Adam Lemire seconded. All in favor. Additional Site Plan criteria review- complete.

The Board circled back to 10.16.3.9- Open Space- this has been voted on, but the plan for open space has changed significantly. Jim Coffin explains that they have submitted what the Board asked for. They were specifically asked to move it, and to add green space around the building. This application represents what they requested. They have moved the walking trail further away from the Steven's property. Lisa St. Hilaire feels that some of these designated green/open areas do not meet the requirement for a yard. Jim Coffin asks if the LUO states that the requirement is to be 1000' of continuous land. Chair Willis asks what the Board wants to do with this standard. Jon Pottle indicated that the plans show the woods remaining vegetated, and Jim Coffin confirmed they would remain so. Jon noted that if there are ever any proposed changes to this area that the applicant should come back before the Board for approval. Pam Mitchel moves that the open space requirement 10.16.3.9 is met with the condition that all the little spaces around the Gardiner Family Medicine building not be used in the

total calculations and that more space is added around the trail. Adam Lemire requested they take away areas around the Annex. Zachary Hanley seconds the motion. All in favor- motion passed.

Applicant asked for guidance regarding balconies and railings. The Board declined to provide this and stated it was not willing to design this project.

The Board needs to go back and review 6.5.2.1 and 14.4.9. They requested changes to the west façade and a rendering without the vegetation. The applicant will bring a new submission for the April 12th meeting. If the Board approves the improvements to the west façade, they can vote on 14.4.9 and 6.5.2.1.

There will be a condition that Mr. Boghossian will have to supply a financial commitment letter from a financial institution before any permits are issued. There will also be a condition on the amount of open space- and where it will be so that it is set in place in the event that there is any future development at this site.

Pam Mitchel moves to table this application until April 12th. Adam Lemire seconded the motion. All members in favor.

5. Other Business- none at this time

6. Adjourn- Lisa St. Hilaire moves that the Board adjourns at 8:50pm. Zachary Hanley seconded. All members in favor.