

**OLD ORCHARD BEACH DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**May 1, 2017 – 6:00 p.m.**  
**Town Council Chambers**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**ITEM 1**

**Proposal:** Placement of A/C Unit and associated mechanicals (alteration of deck within view of public-street)

**Action:** Certificate of Appropriate Recommendation

**Owner:** Sameer Hasan

**Location:** 39 West Grand Ave., MBL: 310-6-1 (Unit 36), DD1

The white fence that separates his (Sameer Hasan) unit from the one adjacent to his is where the A/C will be put. Sameer Hasan, checked with Tammy about the structure, and she said it would have to be reinforced and that instead of going on the fence itself, go on a wooden post. The other problem are the wires, which he doesn't want to put a cover over. He has a tenet in the building until the end of the month of May; this project will be done once they have left.

One of the concerns the committee brought up, is that this is one of many units that could replicate this project, and what precedent should be set? The committee is discussing new codes that would govern these types of things. The biggest problem is whether or not it is visible to the public eye, whether you can see the A/C unit or any other added unit on a house when you come by.

The deck alteration would be about twelve inches out from the wall. In terms of fire code, this shouldn't be an issue. The State of Maine, Efficiency Maine is pushing these units because they are economical and efficient; we should expect to see people use these. The committee will give him until June 30<sup>th</sup> to meet all of the requirements set by them. A certificate of appropriateness based on design, by June 30<sup>th</sup>.

**Item 2**

**Proposal:** Replacement of siding on the Brunswick

**Action:** Certificate of Appropriate Recommendation

**Owner:** Tom Lacasse

**Location:** 39 West Grand Ave., MBL: 310-6-1, DD1

Work has already been started before anyone came to the committee. The building/structure will look the same, except the windows and different siding. This is for the auxiliary building facing West Grand Ave.

A certificate of appropriateness is in question, whether or not it is needed. This is not keeping with the rest of the building because it will be new siding and windows, making it look new, while the rest looked "...poor looking". This will be the first phase to renovate. Using azek trim and cedar siding would be an improvement.

Discussion of what other options there are, besides putting this through the entire system. We can approve it, determine that it's complete and then take a vote. Motion that the application is complete, approved.

1. Mass and scale are not being changed
2. Building heights are not being changed
3. Roof lines are not being changed

4. Nothing more to discuss about windows
5. Façade and materials will be cedar impressions (3x4 feet)
6. Architectural detail will be maintained
7. Fences and steps are not being addressed

Motion to grant a certificate of appropriateness for the Brunswick modification as shown.

**Other Business:**

April 3<sup>rd</sup> minutes: Motion to accept, seconded, all in favor.

March 6<sup>th</sup> minutes: Motion to accept, seconded, all in favor.

**Item 3:**

**Proposal: Climbing Wall**

**Action: Certificate of Appropriateness Recommendation**

**Owner: Rafi Jacobi**

**Location: 33 Old Orchard Street, MBL: 206-31-6, DD1**

There is no category for this, it's nothing you can find in a DD1 permitted use. Owner Rafi Jacobi of Coastal Convenience wants to put a climbing wall up at his parking lot. This can be listed as a recreational facility, this raises question of safety. It wouldn't be a bad idea to have something, but location comes to question. Amusement overlay district is there for this purpose. This is where the Everett was. This is an example of what could come to the DRC, and was recommended not to come as a proposal.

Questions whether the town could be liable and how it would look. The wall would be out on a truck, making the parking lot look bad, as it is already congested. Rafi was told that he would not get support from staff and that it would be hard to get the proposal through. The parking lot is an issue by how much space the contraption would take up. The clear zone is 36, 19 foot clear zone which is 19 parking spaces and then the truck. He needs to identify if he will be putting the wall in the foreground or back of the parking lot.

This does not fit into the current regulations because it is not a structure. We need to clarify "What is a structure?" Where does the town fit in to make sure that this is more or less liable? What does this mean for growth and history?

**Item 4**

DRC Ordinance Discussion:

Discussion on Bar Harbor and how they file buildings and zoning; there are historic and non-historic buildings. To preserve the history of the town and to keep local business and town members happy, places such as McDonalds and franchised hotels cannot be in the town. Bar Harbor encompasses three towns just like Old Orchard Beach is two towns (Ocean Park).

1. What do we feel should fall under DRC's jurisdiction
2. What sort of regulations should apply, should they be different in certain areas
3. What should those regulations be
4. Should we regulate
5. What should DRC's authority be

Will we run into problems with Ocean Park, with DRC? Allowing their board to come into our meetings to discuss what they are willing to relinquish.

They should widen Ross road for a major entrance to Old Orchard Beach before anything is built there. One thing we should caution is the regulation of uses, we have a brand new future land use plan which will be finalized.

Work on purpose and the applicability of review for the next meeting.