

A regular meeting of the Bath Planning Board was called on 11-21-06 for the purpose of conducting regular business.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jim Harper, Chair
James Hopkinson, Vice Chair
Bob Oxtan
David King
Robin Haynes
John Underwood (non-voting student member)

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jennifer DeChant
Andy Omo
Chelsea Hall (non-voting student member)

STAFF PRESENT

Jim Upham, Planning Director
Morgan Decker, Recording Secretary

Mr. Harper, Chair, called the meeting to order in the third floor Council Chambers at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 21, 2006.

Minutes of November 7, 2006 meeting

DR. HAYNES MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. KING, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2006, MEETING WITH ONE CORRECTION:

- **THAT PAGE 4, PARAGRAPH 7 READ: "...AS THE ENTIRE NEIGHBORHOOD IS LISTED ON THE NATIONAL HISTORIC REGISTER."**

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

Old Business**Item 1**

Subdivision Plan, Sign Mylar, and Approve the Notice of Decision – Front Street (Map 21, Lots 231, 232 & 235); Old Shipyard Land, LLC, applicant.

Mr. Upham told the Board that he had received some of the information requested on November 21st but had not had time to review the information to comment to the Planning Board. Mr. Upham said he has spoken with Ms. Davis, and she and Mr. Upham are confident that all materials will be in time for the December 5, 2006, meeting. Mr. Upham recommended that this item be continued until such time.

MR. KING MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. HOPKINSON, TO CONTINUE SUBDIVISION PLAN REVIEW, MYLAR SIGNING, AND APPROVAL OF NOTICE OF DECISION UNTIL THE DECEMBER 5, 2006, MEETING.

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

Item 2

Land Use Code Text Amendment – Amend Section 8.12 – Historic Overlay District and Section 2.02 – Definitions. (Continued from the November 7, 2006, meeting)

Dr. Haynes said she would feel comfortable that the Planning Board not review Historic District Review applications provided there is no alteration of historic fabric or that changes created in renovation or restoration do not change the historic appearance.

Mr. Hopkinson said that he feels comfortable with this amendment to the ordinance since any member of the committee could ask for the full Planning Board review.

Dr. Haynes agrees that this process needs to be streamlined, but is concerned that if someone were not sensitive to matters of historic preservation that items that should be brought to the Planning Board may not be. Mr. Oxtan echoed Dr. Haynes's concerns, and said he wants to make sure that the committee is staffed appropriately, and wanted to know what would happen if the staff or Planning Board members were to change and no one sensitive to historic issues were to be on the committee.

Mr. Harper reminded Mr. Oxtan that the Planning Board is appointed by the City Council, and said that he and Mr. Upham would be willing to express these concerns to make the Council aware of how vital it is to have a mix of experiences and talents on the Board.

MR. KING MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. HOPKINSON, TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE LAND USE CODE TEXT AMENDMENT – AMEND SECTION 8.12 – HISTORIC OVERLAY DISTRICT AND SECTION 2.02 – DEFINITIONS, AS PRESENTED NOVEMBER 21, 2006, WITH LANGUAGE TO BE DELETED IN BOLD FACE (PARAGRAPH B2).

THREE IN FAVOR (HARPER, HOPKINSON, KING), ONE OPPOSED (OXTON), ONE ABSTENTION (HAYNES)

AMENDMENT APPROVED

New Business

Item 1

Request for Historic District Approval – 1 Edwards Street (Map 21, lot 182); Jeff Harris, applicant.

Mr. Upham explained that this applicant had received Site Plan Approval from the Staff Review Committee for a Home Occupation (office) at this location. He said that only the Historic District application would be reviewed by the Planning Board.

Mr. Harris explained his application. He said the Carriage House had been vacant for years, and an application was previously presented to the Board to make certain changes to the building in preparation to use the structure as a residence. He told the Board that the changes to the building proved to be too costly and he did not go through with that project. He said that because of a recent sale of the Bath Country Club, he needed to move offices out of the

Country Club, and wished to keep jobs in town. He explained to the Board that he would like to take a minimalist approach to the renovation.

Dr. Haynes expressed a concern that the plans did not appear to be complete. She mentioned information regarding a window to be moved, but said it is not noted on the west elevation. Dr. Haynes also said she would be more willing to approve the application if the entry were recessed eight or so inches and the arch kept intact.

Mr. Harris said the arch is a depth of 12-14 inches, and the plan is to recess the entry about halfway into the arch so that an internal doorway will not have to be moved.

Dr. Haynes said she could understand that depth, provided that someone may want to restore the arch and would be able to uncover that architectural detail.

Mr. Harris added that a set of windows to be modified on the west side according to the original plan will not be modified, and will be restored. Mr. Harris also stated that there would not be glass in the cupola as indicated.

Dr. Haynes mentioned that it was very important that the plans reflect which changes are and are not proposed, and furthered that this is a very important structure and the front façade must remain intact as much as possible. Dr. Haynes reiterated that shifting the window on the west side southward needs to be added to the plan where appropriate. Dr. Haynes asked what color the structure would be painted.

Mr. Harris said that through some conversations with family members, he has understood that the building was always white, and plans to keep it white.

Mr. Harper then opened the public session of the meeting to members of the public wishing to speak.

Elizabeth Hughes, 1158 Washington Street, said she is glad that the work will be done and thinks Mr. Harris is doing a good job. Ms. Hughes said, however, that the entrance to the drive should be preserved, and even though the Historic District Review does not deal with gates and fences, Mr. Harris should consider keeping the fence posts, as she feels the beauty of the property is in the details, and it would be less so without the fencing.

Mr. Harper said that although fencing was not to be reviewed, he understood that Mr. Harris would be preserving the fence as well as restoring and replacing some of the posts with some that reflect the original.

Rick Marco, 28 Carriage House Lane, said he and his wife are very much in favor of the proposed renovation.

John Keyes, 22 Carriage House Lane, said he is glad to see the structure restored, but is concerned about the character of the street, as he feels it is one place where one can step back in time due to the lack of utility poles.

Mr. Harris said he understood Mr. Keyes' concerns, and has recently buried the power underground, as he is concerned as well about maintaining the character of Carriage House Lane.

Hearing no more comments from the public, Mr. Harper closed the public comment portion of the meeting and returned to the Board for further comment.

Mr. Hopkinson stated he is in favor of the application and also said that Dr. Haynes raised some good concerns, but that they were met with no reluctance from the applicant, and that he would feel comfortable with the City Staff reviewing the details of the final drawing as a condition, so the application would not have to be continued to the next meeting.

DR. HAYNES MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. KING, TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR HISTORIC DISTRICT APPROVAL – 1 EDWARDS STREET (MAP 21, LOT 182); JEFF HARRIS APPLICANT, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **THAT A NEW SET OF FULL AND ACCURATE PLANS BE SUBMITTED FOR REVIEW BY THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND CITY STAFF FOR COMPLETENESS;**
- **WINDOWS OF THE CENTRAL DORMER WITHIN THE MAIN BLOCK RETAIN THEIR SMALL GRILLES;**
- **THE BAY TO BE FILLED ON THE FRONT FAÇADE WILL BE SLIGHTLY RECESSED OR SET BACK, MAINTAINING THE ARCH AND THE ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY OF THAT DETAIL;**
- **THAT THE FENCE INTERRUPTIONS AT PROPOSED ENTRANCES TO THE NEW BUSINESS SITE HAVE POSTS WITH DECORATIVE TOPS INSTALLED THAT RESPECT THE EXISTING ONES USED ON CARRIAGE HOUSE LANE; AND**
- **THAT ALL WINDOW TRIM, CORNER PILASTERS, AND DENTILATED CORNICE TRIM AND ADDITIONAL TRIM BE REPAIRED OR DUPLICATED.**

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

Mr. Upham reminded the applicant that some of the conditions are subject to the Planning Director receiving additional information within 35 days of this meeting, otherwise the plans will be void.

Other Business

Hearing none, Mr. Harper called for a motion to adjourn for the meeting.

MR. KING MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. HOPKINSON, TO ADJOURN.

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

Meeting adjourned 6:38 p.m.

Minutes presented by Morgan Decker, Recording Secretary.