

CITY OF LEWISTON
HISTORIC PRESERVATION REVIEW BOARD
Thursday, March 3, 2022, @ 3:00 p.m.

DRAFT MINUTES

I. Roll Call: This meeting was called to order at 2:59 p.m., and David Chittim chaired the meeting.

Members Present: David Chittim, Douglas Hodgkin, John Clifford, IV, Mark Lee, Shanti Deschaine

Members Absent: Sandra Marquis, Margaret Craven

Associate Members Present: Kevin Michaud, James “Pat” Webber

Associate Member Absent: none

Staff Present: Douglas Greene, Deputy Director of Planning and Code Enforcement, Shelley Norton, City Planner

Guest Present: Charles Young, Harriman

David Chittim appointed Kevin Michaud and Pat Webber as full voting members for the meeting.

II. New Business:

A. Lewiston Public Library COA – Application to replace windows

Charles Young described the project. The proposed windows are the same as presented a few months ago with some more details from the manufacturer and some of the interior details are different. We are using a custom color to match the charcoal gray that exists on the first floor.

The Chairman had brought up a concern that the board have on file documentation providing Harriman authorization to represent the owner, who is the City of Lewiston. Douglass Greene provided email authorization from Louis Turcotte for Harriman to represent the City.

The board confirmed for the applicant that they have no jurisdiction over interior changes. While they appreciate the applicant’s intent to replace trim it is outside their review authority.

Mark Lee recused himself and did not vote due to a relationship with the applicant’s consultant, Harriman.

The following motion was made:

MOTION: by John Clifford to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the application of the Lewiston Library. Second by Kevin Michaud.

VOTED: 6-0-1 (Mark Lee abstained).

B. HPRB review of Appendix A Text Amendments

Doug Greene went over the Staff memo and proposed changes to the ordinance language.

The board discussed Article XV, Section 5, Certificates of Appropriateness. Changes requested are shown as **additions** and **removals**:

- (b) Certificates of Appropriateness may only be issued **only** by the Historic Preservation Review Board . . .
- (f) (4) Staff Approvals of Signs, a. When Required. Staff Approval is required for the installation or alteration to any sign, **when minor in nature**, located on the premises. . .
- (f) (4) Staff Approvals of Signs, b. Application Contents Involving Signs, 5.iii. Color-Simple color scheme **compliments complements** the building.

The board approved of the language for the Staff approval of signs, Article XV, Section 5, Subsection f (4).

The board discussed Article II, Section 2, Definitions. In this process the board discussed what is a sign and what is a mural and the definitions for both. No changes were requested to the revised “sign” definition as provided in the Staff memo. The following were changes/discussion surrounding the new definition for “mural” that is being proposed. Following is a summary of text changes to the definition of mural, discussion of the board follows this.

Mural means **an original** hand-painted, hand-tiled, digitally printed work, or any visual art that is either affixed to or painted directly on the exterior wall of a structure or fence with the permission of the property owner and must not contain trademarks, logos, or ~~other identifying symbols or~~ words associated with **a the** business, or obscene **or hateful** material. Not more than **tenone** (10) percent of a mural maybe devoted to sponsoring organization(s) without otherwise being regulated as a sign.

Doug Greene discussed murals, and agreed that they would like to treat each request on a case by case basis and have a full COA application submitted to allow a determination if the mural is complementary to the building.

There was discussion about inventorying historic buildings in town to pre-determine good locations for murals. Mark Lee stated that each mural is different so it is tough to evaluate if a mural is contextually appropriate as a pre-approval. Chair Chittim stated it is necessary to be careful not to evaluate improvements based on artistic merit, and it is necessary to ensure the historic integrity of historic structures and determine if there is an adverse impact. We would need criteria for whether a wall is appropriate for a mural.

Doug Greene stated that something that didn’t make it into the proposed text amendments is repainting/repairing old painted signs. The National Park Service Preservation Brief 25, “The

Preservation of Historic Signs,” has guidance on this. Chair Chittim stated when he had looked into this there was information on mechanical repairs but no guidance on painting, and without that reference we shouldn’t reference the Brief in the ordinance. Mark Lee stated there should be some guidance provided so someone qualified does the work. **There was general agreement to add language requiring that repainting/ touching up of historic signs be done by a person experienced in sign restoration.**

Discussion ensued on sponsorship/advertising on murals. Doug Greene stated that because there wasn’t a mural definition one is being proposed to be added to help differentiate that it isn’t a sign. Board member Sandy Marquis had sent an email concerning whether a mural can depict anything related to a business, and the examples in her email were read. Doug G. mentioned that there have been cases with a business using an image related to their line of work and government challenging it as an advertising sign such as an image of a fish displayed by a bait and tackle shop in Florida. The board discussed how much of a mural should be allowed to be devoted to sponsorship or other words identifying a business, advertising or the artist and agreed that it did not need to be visible from a car and that a maximum of 1% was sufficient. The board agreed that murals are not signs unless they have trademarks or logos but felt that symbols common for a type of business such as the scales of justice for a law office would be okay.

The board was concerned with obscene or offensive language or image and asked Staff for guidance at the next meeting on what a municipality can regulate.

At the next meeting the draft of the Lewiston-Auburn Public Art Policy will be shared.

No motions were made.

III. Discussion Items:

A. Consideration of Policies and Procedures, no discussion.

V. Minutes: Approval of October 7, 2021 and November 4, 2021 minutes. Chair Chittim had one correction to the Nov. 4th minutes.

MOTION: by **Jack Clifford** to adopt the minutes as amended. Second by **Kevin Michaud.**

VOTED: 7-0 (Passed).

VI. Adjournment:

MOTION: by **Jack Clifford** to adjourn the meeting at 3:58 p.m. Second by **Doug Hodgkin.**

VOTED: 7-0 (Passed).

The next scheduled Historic Preservation Review Board meeting is April 7, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley Norton, City Planner
Planning & Code Department