

Town of Newcastle
Ad-Hoc Historic Preservation Ordinance Committee
Agenda
Meeting Date: June 8, 2023 at 5:00PM
Location: Fire Station Community Room, 86 River Road

1. Call to Order
2. Review of minutes of previous meeting: May 24, 2023
3. Public comment (an opportunity for members of the public to comment on items related to the Committee's work)
4. Overview of Historic Preservation Ordinance, Draft 5 changes
5. Committee discussion of Ordinance items flagged for additional direction and any revisions to Draft 5
6. Discussion of next steps
7. Other Committee comments/discussion
8. Adjournment

Town of Newcastle
Historic Preservation Ordinance Committee
Meeting Date 5/24/23 at 5pm
At the Town Community Room (Fire Station)

Members Present: Ben Frey, Karen Paz, Catherine Burke, Tor Glendinning, Karen Paz
Also Present: Isabelle Oechsle (Consulting Planner), approx. 24 members of the public

Minutes

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Tor Glendinning called the meeting to order at 5:03pm.
2. **Review of minutes of previous meeting: April 26, 2023:** *Ben Frey moved to accept the meeting minutes as presented. Karen Paz seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.*
3. **Overview of Historic Preservation Ordinance, Draft 4:** Prior to beginning this item, Chair Glendinning addressed members of the public regarding process for this meeting, noting that while this is not a formal public hearing, an opportunity for public comment will be provided following the conclusion of the Committee's business regarding Draft 4.

Discussion on Draft 4 focused specifically on Article 5: Standards for New Construction and Additions, Article 7: Establishment of Historic Districts and Article 8: Establishment of Local Landmarks.

Regarding Article 5, it was discussed that height and width should not reference the Core Zoning Code so as not to give applicants the impression that the Historic Preservation Review Board reviews Core Zoning Code standards. It was clarified that the Review Board is only tasked with reviewing the standards of the Historic Preservation Ordinance. Ben noted that this needs to be clarified in the Ordinance further, perhaps under the Authority & Compliance section. Returning to the height and width discussion, Ben suggested that perhaps this is redundant to the Core Zoning Code, which regulates height and width throughout the Town. Isabelle asked the Committee if they felt that there was value in requiring applicants to drill down to the neighborhood level to ensure that, for example, if the three houses in a row are all 1.5-story Capes, the new construction would not be a 3 story Federal. The Committee agreed that it was worthwhile to review this on a lot by lot basis. It was suggested by Committee members to return to language more like Draft 1 for this section: "Applicant must demonstrate that height and width of the proposed structure will be visually compatible with neighboring structures and the neighborhood as a whole." In addition, it was suggested to combine C.1.a, C.1.b, and C.1.c all into one statement regarding height, width and proportions (scale and form) of new construction. Regarding C.1.d.2 of the draft, it was suggested that this should refer to rooftop decks not simply rooftop additions, which could include dormers, cupolas, etc. which we do not want to prohibit.

Regarding Articles 7 and 8, Tor suggested combining these articles into one and referencing the section of the Core Zoning Code which already outlines the required Planning Board and Selectboard processes for zoning amendments. The Committee agreed that this would be simpler to read. Ben noted that he and Isabelle have been working together on reorganizing the draft to fit into the Town's InDesign format for Ordinances. It was suggested that changes to

drafts continue to be presented in red-lined Word format, and that once a final (or close to final) draft from the Committee is ready, Ben would put it into the InDesign template.

4. **Opportunity for public comment:** David Levesque, resident: Asked the following questions of the Committee:

- Why does the Committee exist given the Core Zoning Code and associated standards?
- Why is the draft more restrictive than neighboring Damariscotta regarding renewable energy systems? Can that be changed?
- What is the reference to the Planning Department? Does the Town have a Planning Department? How do they decide on applications?
- What is the reference to Permitting Authority? Shouldn't that just say Review Board?
- Article 9 seems to not allow changes while the property is under review? Why?
- How will the Town fill the Committee when it is currently difficult to find volunteers?

Allison Raiser, resident: Expressed concern that this Ordinance will be burdensome to homeowners and cost prohibitive. When creating "rules for the Review Board," there needs to be rules for recusal and conflict-of-interest standards. Also, if someone cannot afford to fix up their homes, can we do a low-interest loan or some other incentive to fix it up?

Adrienne Zoner, resident: Expressed concern about this being prohibitively expensive for owners. Asked how the openings on this Committee were advertised and how were Committee members chosen? Asked if there was any thought given to protecting entrance areas into the community from Rt. 1? Noted that they feel that the document should stand on its own rather than requiring applicants to hire a consultant to help Review Board review applications. Noted "should" versus "shall" concerns, asking that the document be more prescriptive. Noted concern about escrowing money to install a fence.

Becky Warner, resident: Indicated that the residents of these neighborhoods have already been working to preserve their own structures without this Ordinance in place. Expressed a general concern about what is considered historic and architectural integrity.

Jada Cavanaugh, resident: Expressed that they feel that this document puts the desires of the public over the needs of homeowners in the districts, and that the draft is frightening to a homeowner. Why are Ring doorbells and security cameras regulated?

Jason Erbauss, resident: Noted that they feel that the "structural maintenance" provisions [in Article 10] feel too open-ended as written.

Nina Angiotis, resident: A definition for historic preservation itself is needed, as well as terms used throughout the Ordinance.

5. **Discussion of Next Steps:** An additional meeting was set for June 8th at 5pm to review Draft 5 of the Ordinance, incorporating changes discussed this evening.

6. **Adjournment:** Adjourned without objection at 7:30PM.

To: Ad-Hoc Historic Preservation Committee
From: Isabelle Oechsle, Planning Consultant
Date: June 8, 2023 Meeting
RE: Draft 5: Historic Preservation Ordinance

BACKGROUND

During our fifth Committee meeting on May 24, 2023, you were provided with Draft 4 of the Historic Preservation Ordinance. Per your request, we focused our discussion at that meeting specifically on Article 5: Standards for New Construction and Additions, Article 7: Establishment of Historic Districts, and Article 8: Establishment of Local Landmarks.¹

In terms of edits for Draft 5, what I heard from you all centered around the following:

- Standards regarding scale and form of new construction (namely height and width) need to be reviewed alongside both adjacent structures and the neighborhood as a whole in order to give the applicants more options to compare their project against (rather than just the few buildings immediately adjacent)
- Ensure that it is clear that the only authority that the Historic Preservation Review Board has is to review projects against the Historic Preservation Ordinance itself, not the Core Zoning Code or any other Ordinances
- Combine Articles 7 and 8 to be more succinct, and reference the Core Zoning Code to be more specific regarding requirements for zoning amendments (following the Review Board's recommendation)

In addition, we heard a number of comments from the public regarding the draft Ordinance. In some instances, I have made changes to the Ordinance based on these comments (namely, on items that the Committee has not specifically discussed as policy considerations previously or which do not compromise the overall goals for the Ordinance as expressed by the Committee). These are described further in the Recommendations section below.

ANALYSIS

In the analysis below I have flagged the items that you all asked me to consider within the Ordinance and have provided an explanation of how I attempted to address your desires.

¹ See the meeting packet for more information, available on the Town's website here: <https://www.newcastlemaine.us/planning-department/ad-hoc-historic-preservation-committee/agenda/may-17-2023-meeting-packet>

- 1. *Revise standards regarding scale and form of new construction (namely height and width):*** It was suggested at the May 24th meeting that we revert back to a similar standard as was included in Draft 1 of the Ordinance, albeit with some tweaking of that language. In Article 5, Section C.1.a and C.1.b, I brought back similar language from Draft 1. The new language now reads:

“Height. The proposed height of the building shall be visibly compatible with immediately adjacent structures and the neighborhood as a whole when viewed from the public realm.

Width. The width of a building shall be visually compatible with immediately adjacent structures and the neighborhood as a whole when viewed from the public realm.”

- 2. *Clarify that the only authority that the Historic Preservation Review Board has is to review the Historic Preservation Ordinance itself:*** Similar to what the Core Zoning Code has in Article 7, Sections 27 and 28 (for the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals, respectively), I have added a section for responsibilities of the Historic Preservation Review Board to Article 2 of Draft 5 in an attempt to clarify that the only responsibility that the Review Board has is over this Ordinance specifically. In addition, I have removed any reference to “In addition to the requirements of the Core Zoning Code...” throughout the document so as to avoid any perception that the Review Board has authority beyond that expressly provided in Article 2 of Draft 5.
- 3. *Combine Articles 7 and 8 to be more succinct, and reference the Core Zoning Code regarding zoning amendments process:*** Articles 7 and 8 have been combined into one article (Article 7) and the remainder of the draft has been renumbered accordingly. Under “Further Action” (Sec. C.5 of Article 7), reference to all procedures that must be followed after the Historic Preservation Review Board has been revised to simply reference the relevant section of the Core Zoning Code. Note also that the process as outlined in the Core Zoning Code is, at a minimum, that which is required for zoning amendments under State law ([Title 30-A, M.R.S.A § 4352](#)).

RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section I have outlined some comments that were received from the public at the May 24th meeting and the recommended changes reflected in Draft 5 of the Ordinance intended to respond to these comments. As noted, I have only made

changes to items that were not previously discussed as policy considerations or which, in my opinion, do not comprise the goals as discussed by the Committee.²

1. ***Regulation of security devices:*** The installation of security devices, including peepholes, cameras, etc has been moved to an exempt activity **not** requiring review under this Ordinance (see Article 1, Section C).
2. ***Article 9: Changes to the property while it is being considered for local designation as a resource (either as an addition to the Historic Special District or as a Local Landmark):*** Based on the language of the previous draft, I am of the opinion that the Committee was not intending to regulate all changes to a property while it was being considered for local designation, simply that the intention was to ensure that demolition would not occur while the property was being reviewed. I have added some clarifying language to Article 8: Interim Protections for Nominations of Draft 5 that it would only be Article 4 of the Ordinance (Standards for Demolitions and Relocations) that the property is subject to while in this interim period.
3. ***Local Landmarks Designation:*** Similar to the above, it was confusing to the public at the last meeting what the intent of the Local Landmarks Designation process was. The direction that I got from the Committee was to provide a way for property owners who **want** their property to be subject to the provisions of this Ordinance to protect it in a way that is less restrictive than putting a preservation easement over it (preservation easements require a preservation organization to monitor the easement and conduct yearly visits). Preservation easements also cannot be removed from a property without the permission of the easement holder, while the addition of a property to this Ordinance does not prohibit the Ordinance from being amended to remove the property in the future for good cause. To address public comment, I have added some additional specific language to Article 7 of Draft 5 noting that the petition for Local Landmark designation would need to come from a property owner or their agents/assigns (such as a consultant hired by the property owner, or the lessee of a property with the owner's permission).
4. ***"Should" vs. "Shall":*** I have went through the document and have revised a couple of places where "should" (permissive/suggested) was used instead of "shall" (required/mandatory). This was frequently used when an alternatives analysis would be asked of the applicants to demonstrate why a standard could

² For more information on the Committee's identified goals, please see the meeting minutes from the first meeting of the Committee on February 16, 2023, available on the Town's website here: https://www.newcastlemaine.us/sites/g/files/vyhli6211/f/minutes/hpc_minutes_02.16.2023.pdf

not feasibly be met. In this instance only, an alternatives analysis would expressly be required and the references have been updated accordingly. The remaining references to shall or should remain the same depending on if a requirement is mandatory or if it is simply suggested. Note that Article 1, Section D: Meaning & Purpose explains clearly the distinction.

5. **Definitions:** One public comment focused specifically on definitions of terms used in the Ordinance that may not have a clear meaning to those unfamiliar with architectural terms or historic preservation as a concept. I have added a number of definitions to Article 11 of Draft 5, including an attempt to distill the broad concept of historic preservation down specifically for the purposes of this Ordinance.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/DIRECTION

- **Complementary versus copying:** Considerable time was spent at the last meeting trying to come up with language to clarify that the proportions of new construction may either be consistent with the established neighborhood context (the neighborhood as a whole or immediately adjacent buildings) or buildings from the time period in which it is trying to interpret/be inspired by. In preservation, it is typically frowned upon to attempt to mimic a historic building entirely (unless doing a Reconstruction of specific missing or destroyed portions of a building, see [Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Reconstruction](#)). Usually, you would seek to complement rather than mimic historic buildings in your new construction or addition. I think that requiring the applicant to choose a structure in which the proposed new construction is "visually related" (but not a copy) of is what the Committee was seeking. This means that the Review Board would need to understand from the applicants what their inspiration was for the new building and require that as a submittal in their application.

In Article 5, Section C.2.a, I deliberately use the term "on buildings to which it is visually related" to mean either nearby buildings within the neighborhood or the building which the new construction is inspired by. It might make sense to update references throughout Article 5 (I have only done so on Section C.2.a regarding proportions since that's what we discussed).

- **Fencing (Minor, Major, exempt?):** We spent time at both the 4/6 and 4/26 meeting (see meeting minutes available [here](#)) discussing whether fencing should be considered a Major or Minor project (subject to review of the Historic Preservation Review Board, or simply subject to administrative review by the Town Planner). It was ultimately decided, after discussion by the Committee, that fencing installed within the Frontage Zone of the property would be a Major

Project (requiring review by the Historic Preservation Review Board and accompanying escrow account to be established by the applicant), while fencing installed along any other property line could be a Minor Project. Comments from the public at the May 24th meeting suggested that the Committee review these provisions and reconsider, as concerns were expressed about having to escrow funds to build a fence. I would like some additional direction from the Committee regarding how you would like to handle the issue of fencing.

Previously, the consensus of the Committee seemed to be that there is value in reviewing fencing within the Frontage Zone since it changes the look and feel of the neighborhood (thus the decision to make that installation only a Major Project). I agree with the Committee that there is value in reviewing this at some level, but would like some direction about whether fencing (along the Frontage Zone and along other property lines) should be considered a Major or Minor project, or if it should be exempt from review altogether.

Attachments:

- 1. Newcastle Historic Preservation Ordinance, Draft 5 (tracked changes)*

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE

Article 1: General

A. Purpose and intent.

1. Protect Newcastle's historic, architectural, and cultural heritage.
2. Assist property owners with maintaining the architectural integrity of the district.
3. Protect, preserve, and enhance the outward appearance and architectural features of identified historic structures.
4. Prevent the demolition or removal of significant historic buildings or structures within designated historic districts.
5. Preserve, protect, and enhance the essential character of designated districts by protecting relationships of groups of buildings and structures.
6. Accept new buildings and structures which are designed and built in a manner which is compatible with the character of the district.

B. Applicability.

1. This Ordinance shall apply to the following within the Historic Special District as shown on the Official District Map in Article 1 of the Core Zoning Code:
 - a. Demolition of any building or portion of any Primary or Accessory Building in the Historic Special District.
 - b. Moving any Primary or Accessory Building or portion of any Primary or Accessory Building located within the Historic Special District.
 - c. Exterior Additions or Alterations to any Primary or Accessory Building or portion of any Primary or Accessory Building located within the Historic Special District when such construction would be visible from the public realm.
 - d. Reconstruction of any Primary or Accessory Building or portion of any Primary or Accessory Building located within the Historic Special District when such reconstruction would be visible from the public realm.
 - e. New construction of Primary or Accessory Buildings in the Historic Special District when such construction would be visible from the public realm.
 - f. The installation of Renewable Energy Systems within the Historic Special District.
2. In addition, Articles **3 and 4** of this Ordinance shall apply to designated Local Landmarks as described in this subsection.
 - a. **Reserved.**
3. In addition, Article **7, 8 and 9** of this Ordinance, ~~as may be applicable,~~ shall govern the establishment and expansion of Local Landmarks and Historic Special Districts.
4. In addition, Article **9** shall apply to any Local Landmark, as designated in Section B.2 above, or any structure located within the Historic Special District.

C. Exempt Activities.

Commented [1]: This entire thing will need to be put in In Design format that matches the Core Zoning Code and Roads, Driveways and Entrances Ordinance prior to the Planning Board's public hearing on this item.

This is intended to be a standalone Ordinance cross-referenced in the Core Zoning Code, similar to the Roads, Driveways and Entrances Ordinance.

This Ordinance is intended to comply with the Maine Historic Preservation Commission's Guidelines for the Certified Local Government Program in Maine. Participation by a municipality in the Certified Local Government program allows the Town to be eligible for participation in trainings by the MHPC and grant funding related to historic preservation planning and programming

Commented [2]: We did not specifically talk about the standards for demolition or relocation applying to Local Landmarks, as designated, at our April 26 meeting. However, if the intent is to regulate the structure on the property I believe that it would be warranted to review demolitions and relocations of the building as well.

Commented [3]: It is common practice to leave an area in the Code "Reserved" so as not to require renumbering an entire Ordinance when an amendment occurs. In this case, I am leaving this as "Reserved" in an attempt to indicate that this is where designated Local Landmarks would be placed following the process as described in Article 8 below

1. The only activities exempt from review under Articles 3, 4, and 5, as may be applicable, are the following:

- a. Alteration to or addition of mailboxes, flowerboxes, flags, or other similar removable decorative features.
- b. Change in paint color, except when the painting of brick, stone or other masonry is proposed.
- c. The installation of security devices, such as control panels, touch key plates, mirrors, cameras, and peepholes.
- b-d. Exterior placement of meters, vents, cable or telephone boxes, wiring, antennas, satellite dishes, and components of HVAC systems, when the placement is not on the primary facade;
- e-e. Alteration or replacement of existing non-historic gutters, downspouts, storm windows, conduit, venting or other non-original features which already exist and are required for the operation and physical health of the building and do not significantly alter the building or compromise historic features or character-defining elements on the structure (subject to the determination of the Planning Department).

Formatted: Line spacing: single, Border: Top: (No border), Bottom: (No border), Left: (No border), Right: (No border), Between : (No border)

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Font color: Black

D. Meaning & Purpose.

1. Words, phrases and terms used within this Ordinance are defined in the Definitions section or within the Articles that contain standards associated with the term.
2. Words, phrases and terms not defined in this Ordinance must be accorded their commonly accepted meanings as defined in the most recent edition of the Webster's Unabridged Dictionary.
3. The terms "standards," "regulations," and "requirements" are used to mandate a specific course of action or built outcome.
4. The words "must," "will", and "shall" are mandatory and when used require compliance with standards, regulations, and requirements of the Ordinance.
5. The words "may" and "should" are permissive.

E. Authority & Compliance.

1. Authority.

- a. This Ordinance is adopted under the authority granted by XXXXX.

2. Relationship to Other Standards.

- a. This Ordinance does not abrogate, annul, or otherwise interfere with any easement, covenant, and/or other private agreements.
- b. Where the standards of this Ordinance impose a greater restriction than required by other ordinances, regulations, resolutions, rules, easements, covenants, or agreements, the provision of this Ordinance must apply.
- c. Where standards conflict, the standards of this Ordinance must take precedence over those of other codes, ordinances, regulations, and standards that may be in conflict with this Ordinance. Additions or Alterations for the purpose of complying with other codes, ordinances, regulations, and standards are still subject to review by this Ordinance. This

Commented [4]: This would be the warrant article and election date that it was voted on (see Article 1, Section 4 of the Core Zoning Code for an example)

Ordinance does not abrogate or annul any other codes, ordinances, regulations or standards.

- d. All development activity must comply with relevant Federal and State laws and regulations. Where there is a direct conflict between this Ordinance and the standards of a Federal or State Law, Federal or State Law supersedes the standards of this Ordinance.

3. Hazard Buildings. No provision in this Ordinance shall be construed to prevent the Alteration, Demolition, or Relocation of a building when the Code Enforcement Officer certifies that such action is required for the public safety.

4. Appeals. An appeal from the final decision of the Historic Preservation Review Board may be taken by any party or person aggrieved to the Zoning Board of Appeals within 30 days from the date of the decision. Appeals from final decisions from the Planning Department may be taken by any party or person aggrieved but must be taken to the Historic Preservation Review Board within 30 days from the date of the decision.

Article 2: Administration

A. Historic Preservation Review Board.

1. **Membership.** The Historic Preservation Review Board's membership shall be comprised of five regular members. There shall be at least one member from each of the Town's three Historic Special Districts (Damariscotta Mills, Sheepscot Village, and Glidden Street).
2. **Appointment.** Members of the Historic Preservation Review Board (the Review Board) shall be appointed by a majority vote of the Selectboard to serve staggered terms of 3 years.
3. **Qualifications.** Appointments to the Review Board shall be made on the basis of demonstrated interest, knowledge, ability and experience to promote historic preservation in Newcastle. It is preferred that members have architectural design skills or other experience related to historic preservation, such as history, architectural history, landscape architecture, planning, engineering, law, archaeology and building construction or trades.
4. **Board Rules.** The Review Board may adopt rules of procedure and policy as it may deem necessary to conduct its affairs, following a public hearing thereon. Board rules shall include application forms and checklists of required submittals that will sufficiently allow applicants to demonstrate compliance with the relevant standards of review.

5. Responsibilities.

- a. The Historic Preservation Review Board reviews applications for Certificate of Appropriateness determined to be Major Projects under Article 2, Section C.3.b below. The review of such applications is limited to the applicable review standards under this Ordinance. The Historic Preservation Review Board's authority is limited to the standards of this Ordinance, as may be amended.
- b. The Historic Preservation Review Board provides a report to the Planning Board and Selectboard following a petition to establish or expand the Historic Special

District or a petition to designate a property as a Local Landmark as described in Article 7 below.

4-c. The Historic Preservation Review Board may provide advice to the Planning Board, Selectboard, or any other Town body regarding historic preservation and issues or opportunities related to historic preservation in Newcastle.

Formatted

B. Certificate of Appropriateness.

1. In the Historic Special District, a Certificate of Appropriateness issued by the relevant Permitting Authority shall be required for any projects noted in Article 1, Section B.1 above.
2. Permits. No Permit, including Demolition Permits, Use Permits, or otherwise, may be issued for any construction, reconstruction, alteration, or demolition until a Certificate of Appropriateness has been issued by the Review Board in accordance with this Ordinance.

C. Procedure.

~~1-~~ **General.**

2-1. **Application & Fees.** A Certificate of Appropriateness application must be filed, including payment of the applicable fee, with the Planning Department on forms created by the Town for that purpose.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Font color: Black

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", No bullets or numbering

a. **Escrow.** In order to assist with the review of Major Projects, the Review Board shall require the applicant to submit an additional escrow to the Town for the purpose of hiring a consultant meeting the professional qualification standards as outlined by the Secretary of the Interior (36 CFR 61). For Minor Projects, the Planning Department may require the applicant to submit an escrow for this purpose, if the Planning Department determines that a third-party peer review is needed. Any amount remaining in the escrow at the conclusion of the review process shall be returned to the applicant.

b. **Determination of Completeness.** Upon receipt of an application, the Planning Department shall determine whether the application is complete and shall determine whether the scope, nature, or scale of the proposed project requires review by the Historic Preservation Review Board or whether it is a minor or routine project that is appropriately reviewed at the administrative level.

3-2. **Minor Projects.**

a. **Permitting Authority.** Minor Projects shall be reviewed administratively by the Planning Department.

b. **Applicability.** Minor Projects include various projects in which the visual character of the property is not substantially changed, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. The removal of materials and features that are not in compliance with Section 3.C below (e.g. because they have no historical basis or create a false sense of historical development);
2. The replacement of materials and features not in compliance with Section 3.C below with materials and features that are in keeping with

Section 3.C (e.g. replacing architectural features that have no historical basis with ones that do);

3. The installation of missing historical materials and features, supported by documentation;
 4. Repointing and other masonry repairs;
 5. Construction or replacement of patios or decks where the majority of the patio or deck cannot be seen from the public realm;
 6. Exterior placement of meters, vents, cable or telephone boxes, wiring, antennas, satellite dishes, and components of HVAC systems, when so long as the placement is not on the primary facade;
 - ~~7. The installation of security devices, such as control panels, touch key plates, mirrors, cameras, and peepholes, so long as the placement is not on the primary facade;~~
 - ~~8.7.~~ Addition, removal or replacement of cloth, canvas or acrylic awnings that otherwise comply with the relevant review standards;
 - ~~9.8.~~ Removal of deteriorated accessory buildings which are not original to the site or otherwise historically significant;
 - ~~10.9.~~ Installation of a temporary structure designed to promote safe access for individuals with disabilities, so long as the temporary structure can be removed and does not impact the essential form of the property;
 - ~~11.10.~~ General maintenance and repair of structures (except for scraping and repainting, caulking and weather-stripping, and the replacement of window glass where the style or type of window is not changed shall be completely exempt);
 - ~~12.11.~~ The installation of fences or low walls of wood, stone, brick or similar (unless proposed in the Frontage Zone of the lot);
 - ~~13.12.~~ The replacement of exterior light fixtures and the installation of new light fixtures, including fixtures to illuminate signage.
- c. **Process.** Where staff determines that such an application meets the relevant review standards, the Certificate of Appropriateness shall be issued by staff within ten (10) business days, without presentation to the Historic Preservation Review Board for approval. If the Planning Department has not acted within ten (10) business days, the applicant may seek approval from the Review Board, rather than staff. Inaction by the Planning Department does not constitute approval or disapproval of the application.
- d. Applicants proposing Minor Projects may elect for their application to be reviewed by the Review Board according to the procedures and standards required for a Certificate of Appropriateness, as may be applicable.
- e. If the applicant is not satisfied with the determination of the Planning Department, the applicant shall be permitted to have the entire application reviewed by the Review Board. Staff can, for any reason, forward any Minor Project to the Review Board for review. The Planning Department shall provide the Review Board with written notice of any action taken on applications as an informational item at the next meeting.

4.3. Major Projects.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 2", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Font color: Black

a. **Permitting Authority.** Major Projects are reviewed by the Historic Preservation Review Board at a duly-noticed public hearing.

b. **Applicability.** Major Projects involve a change in the appearance of a property and are more substantial in nature than Minor Projects. They include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. New Construction or Additions to buildings;
2. Demolition of any part of a structure;
3. Discovery of any archaeological resource on the site;
4. Moving of buildings;
5. New Additional Structures;
6. Replacement of architectural details when there will be a change in design or materials from the original or existing details;
7. The installation of fences or low walls of wood, stone, brick or similar, when proposed to be installed within the Frontage Zone of the lot;
8. Changes to roof lines, including rooftop additions, rooftop decks, or dormers.

5-4. **Process.** If the Planning Department determines that the project is complete and should be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Review Board as a Major Project, the item shall be scheduled for the next available Review Board meeting, provided that the noticing requirements of Section 2.D can be met prior to that meeting. Within thirty (30) days of the closing of the public hearing, the Review Board must make a decision to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the application.

6-5. For projects that may require additional review by another Permitting Authority within the Town of Newcastle, see Section 2.B.2 above.

7-6. **Approval.** If the Permitting Authority determines that the proposed Addition, Alteration, Relocation, New Construction or Demolition meets the standards of this Ordinance, it shall approve a Certificate of Appropriateness, and shall notify the applicant and Code Enforcement Officer, in writing, of the determination along with any conditions of approval.

8-7. **Denial.** If the Permitting Authority determines that a Certificate of Appropriateness should not be issued, it shall make findings describing how the application does not meet the standards of this chapter. However, in order to prepare more detailed findings, the Review Board may postpone the decision for up to ten (10) business days in order to prepare and adopt more-detailed findings. The Review Board shall notify the applicant and the Code Enforcement Officer within ten (10) business days of the final determination.

D. Public Hearings.

1. The Review Board shall hold a public hearing on each application for Certificate of Appropriateness prior to a decision being rendered. A notice of the hearing shall be mailed to direct abutters via USPS first class mail, postmarked at least 7 days in advance of the hearing. A notice shall also be posted at the Town Office and on the Town's website. In the case of an application for a new Primary Building or an addition to an existing Primary Building, the noticing area shall be extended to abutting property

owners within 250' of the subject property. Notice shall be made by the applicants, with receipt of mailing required to be submitted to the Town.

2. Public Hearings or notification are not required for Minor Projects reviewed administratively.

E. Time Limits on Certificates of Appropriateness.

1. If substantial construction has not commenced within one year of the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness, the approval shall be null and void except that the deadline may be extended for one additional six-month period by the Code Enforcement Officer upon written request of the applicant. The written request for an extension must be submitted before the date of expiration of the initial approval. After the approval has expired or an extension has been denied, the applicant may reapply to the Review Board at any time without prejudice. The extension shall be approved by the Planning Department Code Enforcement Officer, as outlined above, unless there is:
 - a. Additional information that indicates that the plan does not meet the standards of this Ordinance;
 - b. A failure to meet a condition of approval;
 - c. An amendment to this Ordinance that prohibits or otherwise alters the proposed project.

Commented [5]: I would recommend this change because I don't think that the Code Enforcement Officer would be able to determine whether there is additional information that indicates that the Plan does not meet the standards of this Ordinance (since the CEO does not review the standards in the first place)

Article 3: Standards for Alterations and Additions

- A. **Purpose.** The purpose of this subsection is to further the purposes of this Ordinance by preserving the essential character of historic buildings which are important to the education, culture, traditions, and the economic value of the Town.
- B. **Applicability.** The following standards shall be used by the Review Board in reviewing applications for Certificate of Appropriateness when an Alteration or Addition to an existing Primary or Accessory Building is proposed in the Historic Special District, or when an Alteration or Addition to a designated Local Landmark is proposed, except for the installation of Renewable Energy Systems~~solar panels~~ which shall be governed by Article 6.
- C. **Standards.**
 1. The distinguishing original qualities or character of a structure and its environment shall not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any historic material or distinctive architectural features should be avoided when possible. If removal of historic material or a distinctive feature is proposed, an alternatives analysis ~~shall~~should be submitted which identifies: (1) what considerations were taken before ultimately deciding on removal and why the other considerations were not feasible; (2) if an alternative material is proposed, how the alternative material is considered a similar substitute in quality, permanence, and look.
 2. All Primary and Accessory Buildings shall be recognized as products of their own time period, place and use. Alterations that have no historical basis or create a false sense of historical development such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other time periods shall not be undertaken.

3. Changes which may have taken place in the course of time are evidence of the history and development of a structure, object or site and its environment. Changes that have acquired significance in their own right shall not be destroyed.
4. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of skilled craftsmanship which characterize a structure, object or site shall not be removed.
5. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced wherever feasible. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall ~~match~~ match the feature being replaced in composition, design, texture and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Repair or replacement of missing historic features shall ~~be~~ be based on accurate duplications of features, substantiated by documentary, physical or photographic evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different architectural elements from other structures or objects.
6. The surface cleaning of structures and objects, if appropriate, shall be undertaken with the gentlest means possible. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be undertaken.
7. Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve significant archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project. If resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
8. Contemporary design for Additions to existing properties shall not be discouraged when such Alterations and Additions do not destroy significant cultural, historical, architectural or archeological materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the property, neighborhood or environment.
9. New Additions or Alterations to structures shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if such additions or alterations were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would be unimpaired.
 - a. Additions should be made on a side or rear elevation, not on the primary façade, unless in the determination of the Permitting Authority an addition to the side or rear elevation is not possible due to unique constraints of the project.

Commented [6]: This means we either need to ask for documentation from applicants or maintain a local record of archeological resources in order to assist applicants

Article 4: Standards for Demolitions and Relocations

- A. **Purpose.** The purpose of this subsection is to further the purposes of this Ordinance by preserving historic buildings which are important to the education, culture, traditions, and the economic value of the Town. Furthermore, the purpose of this section is to afford the Town, historic societies, other preservation organizations, and others interested in preservation the opportunity to acquire or arrange for the preservation of historic buildings and structures, or important portions and features thereof, or proper removal of historic artifacts, or the proper recordation of the building, structure and/or site.
- B. **Applicability.** The following standards shall be used by the Review Board in reviewing applications for Certificate of Appropriateness when Demolition or Relocation of an existing Primary Building is proposed within the Historic Special District, or when the Demolition or Relocation of a designated Local Landmark is proposed.

C. **Stay.** At the hearing on the application for Demolition or Relocation, the Review Board may, in the interest of exploring reasonable alternatives, delay issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness for up to 90 days from the date of the hearing. If, 10 days prior to the expiration of the delay period, the Commission finds that there are still reasonable alternatives to explore, the Review Board may continue the delay for ~~one~~^{an} additional period of up to 30 days. The purpose of the delay is to assist the applicant in finding alternatives to Demolition or Relocation, such as:

1. Assisting in securing funding to preserve in place the structure or important features thereof; or
2. Finding other ways to preserve the structure, such as outright purchase if possible, or relocation; or
3. At minimum, to provide the opportunity for the proper recordation of buildings, structures, and sites, including photography and narrative report.

D. **Standards.** In order to approve an application to relocate or demolish a building within the Historic Special District, or the Demolition or Relocation of a designated Local Landmark, the Review Board must find that the proposal meets **at least one** of the following standards for approval:

1. The Review Board determines that the structure is not of historic significance based on findings from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission or a qualified architectural historian.
 - a. In order to make this determination, the Review Board shall require the applicant to obtain a letter from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission or escrow funds with the Town to hire a qualified architectural historian to make a determination as to the eligibility of the structure to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places, either on its own or as a contributing structure to an eligible Historic District. If the structure is considered eligible for listing and the applicant formally applies to the National Register and is declined, the status of the property may be reconsidered.
2. The structure, or predominant portions thereof, has been determined to represent an immediate hazard to the public health or safety because of severe structural deficiencies, which hazard cannot be abated by reasonable measures.
 - a. In order to make this determination, the applicant must escrow funds with the Town sufficient to hire a third-party structural engineer to provide a written report as to the integrity of the building.
3. No prudent and feasible alternative exists.
 - a. In order to assist the Review Board in making this determination, the applicant must submit an alternatives analysis indicating the alternatives to demolition considered and the reasons that they are not feasible. Economic hardship may be a consideration, but the applicant must demonstrate through quotes from qualified professionals that the economic hardship would be too great. In this case, Relocation will be encouraged rather than Demolition.

E. **Conditions of Approval for Demolition.** In approving an application to demolish a building within the Historic Special District, or the Demolition of a designated Local Landmark, the

Commented [7]: Notice here that they only need to meet one.

Review Board may impose the following conditions, or any others that it deems appropriate to properly document or attempt to save the structure:

1. The applicant shall allow the Review Board, Historical Society, or another historic preservation entity of the Board's choosing to document the structure inside and out prior to the structure's destruction.
2. The applicant shall advertise to the general public the structure as available for free, offering the structure to be moved or scrapped for salvage materials. The advertisement shall appear in a newspaper of local circulation a minimum of two times.

Article 5: Standards for New Construction and Additions

- A. **Purpose.** The purpose of this subsection is to further the purposes of this Ordinance by allowing new construction within the Historic Special District that preserves, protects, and enhances the essential character of the District. This subsection provides standards to ensure that new buildings are designed and built in a manner which is compatible with the essential character of the district.
- B. **Applicability.** The following standards shall be used by the Review Board in reviewing applications for Certificate of Appropriateness when New Construction of a Primary or Accessory Building, or an Addition to a Primary or Accessory Building, is proposed within the Historic Special District.
- C. **Standards.**

1. **Scale and form.** In addition to the requirements for the Historic Special District as outlined in the Core Zoning Code, Article 2: District Standards as well as any applicable Design Standards as outlined in Article 5, the following standards related to building scale and form shall also apply:

a. Height. The proposed height of the building shall be visibly compatible with immediately adjacent structures and the neighborhood as a whole when viewed from the public realm.

b. Width. The width of a building shall be visually compatible with immediately adjacent structures and the neighborhood as a whole when viewed from the public realm.

~~a. **Height.** Within allowable height limits, a proposed building or addition shall be visually related to its immediate neighbors. Where the new building or addition is proposed to be more than 20% taller or shorter than immediate neighboring structures, the applicant must demonstrate that the character of the streetscape and the scale and character of the pedestrian-oriented lower portions of the building are preserved.~~

~~b. **Width.** Within allowable setbacks, new construction within historic districts shall mimic the rhythm of facades along the street.~~

- c. **Proportions of principal facades.** The characteristic proportion of existing facades must be evaluated and new construction shall be compatible in proportion with existing buildings in the neighborhood.
- d. **Roofs.**

Commented [8]: Note that additions would be subject to both standards

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1.5", Space After: 8 pt, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, Font color: Black

1. **Roof shapes.** The proposed roof shape shall fit in with the established context of the neighborhood and of immediately adjacent structures.
2. **Rooftop decks.** Rooftop decks shall be designed so that they cannot be seen from the public realm.
3. **Rooftop utilities.** When rooftop utilities, including but not limited to communication antennae, satellite dishes, mechanical units, elevator towers, ~~renewable energy systems,~~ and vents are proposed, the utility shall be visually screened from the public realm by the placement of decorative elements that are in keeping with the established context of the neighborhood and of immediately adjacent structures. Alternatively, rooftop utilities shall be placed in such a way where they are not visible from the public realm, such as on the rear of the building.

Commented [9]: Has its own Article (see Article 6)

2. **Composition.**

- a. Characteristic sizes and proportions of window and door openings, rhythm of entrances, porches and other projections to public ways shall be consistent with the proportions of openings found either within the established neighborhood context and/or on buildings ~~to which it is visually related, from the time period which the applicant is attempting to interpret.~~
- b. **Relationship of materials.** Building materials shall be reflective of and complementary to existing buildings within the historic district. Materials shall be durable and of high-quality.

3. **Relationship to street.** In addition to the requirements for the Historic Special District as outlined in the Core Zoning Code, Article 2: District Standards, the following standards related to the relationship between the new construction and the street shall also apply:

- a. **Walls of continuity.** Facades and site structures, such as masonry walls, fences and landscape masses, should, when it is a characteristic of the area, form cohesive walls of enclosure along a street to ensure visual continuity with the structures, public ways and places to which such elements are visually related.
- b. **Unifying development pattern.** The new construction shall maintain any unifying development pattern such as orientation of buildings, setbacks, building coverage.

4. Other standards.

- a. **Uses.** ~~In addition to the requirements for the Historic Special District as outlined in the Core Zoning Code, Article 2: District Standards, as well as applicable Use Standards as outlined in Article 6 of the Core Zoning Code, e~~Every reasonable effort shall be made to provide a use for a property which requires minimal alteration to the character-defining features of the site and its environment or to use a property for its originally intended purpose.
- b. **Distinguishing original character.** The distinguishing original qualities or character of a site and its environment shall not be destroyed. If a distinguishing original feature is proposed to be altered or removed, an alternatives analysis must be submitted which indicates the reasons for alteration or removal.

Commented [10]: We talked about not referencing the Core Zoning Code so as not to give the impression that the Review Board has any authority to review those standards. However, it did seem that the majority of the group was in favor of keeping this standard in place (which is similar to #1 in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation) so I revised it slightly.

- c. **Archeological resources.** Every reasonable effort shall be made to protect and preserve significant archeological resources affected by or adjacent to any project. If, on the basis of an archeological site survey or other information, the Permitting Authority determines that there is an archeological resource on or immediately adjacent to the parcel, it may limit excavation or building to preserve or protect the site or may approve a plan or conditions to provide for appropriate evaluation, excavation or protection of the resource. If resources must be disturbed because no feasible alternative exists, documentation of the resource mitigation measures shall be undertaken and provided to the Town and to the Maine Historic Preservation Commission.

Commented [11]: It was noted at the last meeting that the Town could be better about documenting existing archeological resources. Tor suggested reaching out to Tim Dinsmore (local archeologist) for more information. Additionally, it was requested that this standard be strengthened. Added language was based on the old Design Review Ordinance (per Committee request).

Commented [12]: It was noted at the last meeting that the Town could be better about documenting existing archeological resources. Tor suggested reaching out to Tim Dinsmore (local archeologist) for more information. Additionally, it was requested that this standard be strengthened. Added language was based on the old Design Review Ordinance (per Committee request).

Article 6: Alternative Standards for the Installation of Renewable Energy Systems

- A. **Purpose.** Recognizing that historic properties may need to adapt to changing technologies, this section is intended to provide clear standards for the review of the installation of renewable energy systems, including but not limited to solar panels or windmills, on historic properties.
- B. **Applicability.** The following standards shall be used by the Review Board in reviewing applications for Certificate of Appropriateness when the installation of renewable energy systems are proposed on any property within the Historic Special District or on a designated Local Landmark property.
- C. **Standards.**
1. Permanent removal of historic roofing materials as part of the installation of solar panels on visible portions of a roof shall not be undertaken.
 2. Permanent removal or otherwise altering a historic roof element and configuration (dormers, chimneys, or other features) on visible portions of a roof shall not be undertaken.
 3. Any installation procedure that will cause irreversible changes to historic features or materials on visible portions of a roof shall not be undertaken.
 4. The placement of solar panels on top of visible slate or clay tile roofing shall not be undertaken.
 5. The placement of panels in an array shape that does not echo that of the visible roof plane shall not be undertaken. Solar panels must lay flat on the roof.
 6. Where possible, all renewable energy systems shall be placed in such a way that they are unable to be seen from the public realm. In addition to demonstrating compliance with the above standards, if the applicant is proposing to install a renewable energy system that would be visible from the public realm, the applicant shall submit an alternatives analysis demonstrating why the system could not be placed in a different area so as to be less visible or why ground-mounted solar is not feasible, if applicable. The Review Board may only approve energy systems that would be visible from the public realm if all of the above standards are met and, in the determination of the Board, a reasonable alternative does not exist.

Article 7: Establishment of Historic Special Districts or Local Landmarks

A. **Purpose.** To provide a clear amendment process for the establishment or expansion of Historic Special Districts or Local Landmarks, in accordance with Title 30-A, M.R.S.A § 4352 (Zoning Ordinances), as may be amended from time to time.

B. **Applicability.** This section shall apply to any petition to establish a new Historic Special District or expand an existing Historic Special District, regardless of who is petitioning. In addition, this section shall apply to the petition by the property owner or their agents/assigns to establish a Local Landmark.

C. **Procedure.**

1. **Application.** Any person or group seeking to add or expand historic districts shall request the amendment in writing to the Historic Preservation Review Board. Any proposal by the Selectboard or Planning Board shall be referred to the Review Board for comment before any further action. ~~After receiving the Review Board's recommendation concerning the request, the matter will be placed on the agenda for the Planning Board for further consideration.~~ Any applications ~~for designation of districts~~ shall be in writing.

2. **Studies and recommendations.** Before making its recommendation concerning the proposed establishment or expansion of an historic district or Local Landmark, the Review Board may conduct studies and research on the proposal. The Review Board shall make a report on every request received within six months. ~~The Drafts of the final~~ report shall also be mailed to the Maine Historic Preservation Commission for review.

3. **Public hearing.** Prior to making a recommendation concerning the proposed establishment or expansion of an historic district or Local Landmark, the Review Board shall hold a public hearing on the request, after due notice is provided twice in a newspaper of general circulation. The date of the first publication must be at least 12 days before the hearing and the date of the 2nd publication must be at least 7 days before the hearing. The notice must be written in plain English, understandable by the average citizen. Mailed notice of the proposal shall also be sent to the applicant, owners of all property to be included within the proposed designation, and property within a 250-foot radius of the property under consideration.

4. **Final report.** Not later than 30 days after the public hearing, the Review Board shall submit a final report to the Planning Board with the Review Board's recommendation.

5. **Further action.** After receipt of the Review Board's recommendations, as provided above, the petition will make its way through the Zoning Amendment process as described in Article 7, Section 21 of the Core Zoning Code. ~~the Planning Board shall, within 30 days of receipt, hold a public hearing (noticed in the same manner as described in subsection C.3 above) to consider said proposed designation and shall provide an additional recommendation on the request to the legislative body.~~

D. **Eligibility for Historic Designation.** The ~~properties designated historic districts established~~ in accordance with this section shall have one or more of the following characteristics:

1. **History of Newcastle.** Structures, buildings or sites at which events have occurred that contribute to and are identified with or significantly represent or exemplify the broad cultural, political, economic, military, or social history of Newcastle, the State of Maine, or the nation, including sites or buildings at which visitors may gain insight or see examples of particular items or of larger patterns in the North American heritage.

Commented [13]: We talked at the last meeting about making it clear that only the property owner may designate their property as a Local Landmark

2. **Persons.** Structures, buildings or sites associated with important historic persons.
3. **Ideas.** Structures, buildings or sites associated with important examples of a great idea or ideal.
4. **Architecture.** Structures or structural remains and sites embodying examples of architectural types or specimens valuable for the study of a period, style or method of building construction; for the study of community organization and living; landscaping; a single notable structure; or a site representing the work of a master builder, master designer, architect or landscape architect.
5. **Visual continuity.** Structures or buildings contributing to the overall visual continuity of the historic district.
6. **National Register.** Those sites or areas listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

Article 8: Establishment of Local Landmarks

- A. Purpose.** To provide a clear amendment process for the establishment of Local Landmarks, in accordance with Title 30-A, M.R.S.A § 4352 (Zoning Ordinances), as may be amended from time to time.
- B. Applicability.** This section shall apply to any petition to establish a Local Landmark, to be added to Article 1, Section B.2, regardless of who is petitioning.
- C. Procedure.**
 - 1. Application.** Any person or group seeking to add a Local Landmark to this Ordinance shall request the amendment in writing to the Historic Preservation Review Board. Any proposal by the Selectboard or Planning Board shall be referred to the Review Board for comment before any further action. After receiving the Review Board's recommendation concerning the request, the matter will be placed on the agenda for the Planning Board for further consideration. Any applications for designation of Local Landmarks shall be in writing.
 - 2. Studies and recommendations.** Before making its recommendation concerning the proposed establishment of a Local Landmark, the Review Board may conduct studies and research on the proposal. The Review Board shall make a report on every request received within six months. Drafts of the report shall also be mailed to the Maine Historic Preservation Commission for review.
 - 3. Public hearing.** Prior to making a recommendation concerning the proposed establishment of a Local Landmark, the Review Board shall hold a public hearing on the request, after due notice is provided twice in a newspaper of general circulation. The date of the first publication must be at least 12 days before the hearing and the date of the 2nd publication must be at least 7 days before the hearing. The notice must be written in plain English, understandable by the average citizen. Mailed notice of the proposal shall also be sent to the applicant and any property within a 250-foot radius of the property under consideration.
 - 4. Final report.** Not later than 30 days after the public hearing, the Review Board shall submit a final report to the Planning Board with the Review Board's recommendation.

~~5. Further action. After receipt of the Commission's recommendations, as provided above, the Planning Board shall, with 30 days of receipt, hold a public hearing (noticed in the same manner as described in subsection C.3 above) to consider said proposed designation and shall provide an additional recommendation on the request to the legislative body.~~

~~D. Eligibility for Historic Designation. The Local Landmarks established in accordance with this section shall have one or more of the following characteristics:~~

- ~~1. History of Newcastle. Structures, buildings or sites at which events have occurred that contribute to and are identified with or significantly represent or exemplify the broad cultural, political, economic, military, or social history of Newcastle, the State of Maine, or the nation, including sites or buildings at which visitors may gain insight or see examples of particular items or of larger patterns in the North American heritage.~~
- ~~2. Persons. Structures, buildings or sites associated with important historic persons.~~
- ~~3. Ideas. Structures, buildings or sites associated with important examples of a great idea or ideal.~~
- ~~4. Architecture. Structures or structural remains and sites embodying examples of architectural types or specimens valuable for the study of a period, style or method of building construction; for the study of community organization and living; landscaping; a single notable structure; or a site representing the work of a master builder, master designer, architect or landscape architect.~~
- ~~5. National Register. Those sites or areas listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.~~

Commented [14]: Combined with Article 7 above

Article ~~89~~: Interim Protection for Nominations

- A. **Nominated Local Landmarks and Historic Districts.** From the time of nomination until the Historic Preservation Review Board acts upon such nomination, a site, structure, object or area nominated but not yet designated as a Local Landmark or Historic Special District, including expansions to existing Historic Special Districts, shall be subject to all of the provisions of Article 4 governing demolition, to the same extent as if designated. Upon final action of the Historic Preservation Review Board recommending designation, the structure or area nominated shall be subject to all of the protections of [Article 4 of this Ordinance](#) until such time as a final decision on designation by the legislative body [of the Town of Newcastle](#) becomes effective. If the legislative body rejects designation or fails to designate a property, that property shall no longer be subject to the provisions of Article 4 of this Ordinance.

Article ~~94~~: Maintenance and Neglect

- A. All Local Landmarks, and all structures located in the Historic Special District, shall be preserved against decay and deterioration by being kept free from the following structural defects by the owner and/or any other person or persons who may have legal custody and control thereof:
1. Deteriorated or inadequate foundation which jeopardizes its structural integrity;
 2. Defective or deteriorated floor supports or any structural members of insufficient size to carry imposed loads with safety which jeopardize its structural integrity;

3. Members of walls, partitions, or other vertical supports that split, lean, list, or buckle due to defective material or deterioration which jeopardize its structural integrity;
 4. Structural members of ceilings and roofs, or other horizontal structural members, which sag, split, or buckle due to defective materials or deterioration or are of insufficient size to carry imposed loads with safety which jeopardize its structural integrity;
 5. Fireplaces or chimneys which list, bulge, or settle due to defective material or deterioration or are of insufficient size or strength to carry imposed loads with safety which jeopardize its structural integrity;
 6. Deteriorated brick facades when such deterioration jeopardizes its structural integrity or when such deterioration poses a safety risk to others, such as bricks falling into the public realm;
 7. Lack of weather protection which jeopardizes the structural integrity of the walls, roofs, or foundation.
- B. Complaints or concerns regarding neglect or lack of maintenance of structures shall be routed through the Code Enforcement Officer.
 - C. In investigating complaints regarding neglect or lack of maintenance the Code Enforcement Officer may, at the sole cost of the Town, hire a structural engineer or other qualified consultant to review the subject property.
 - D. If any of the above structural defects are determined to exist, the Code Enforcement Officer shall notify the property owner of the violation of this Article. Any such order shall be in writing, shall state the actions to be taken with reasonable particularity and shall specify dates for compliance, which may be extended by the Code Enforcement Officer for reasonable periods to allow the owner to secure financing, labor or materials.
 - E. The owner or such other person shall repair the building or structure within a specified period of receipt of a written order to correct defects or repairs, so that such structure shall be preserved and protected in accordance with the purposes of this Ordinance.

Article 104: Enforcement

- A. Where the applicant has done work or caused work to be done on a structure or a property for which a Certificate of Appropriateness is sought and such work is either not done in compliance with an approval received under this Ordinance, or any other Ordinance of the Town of Newcastle, or was performed without the approvals required under this Ordinance or any other Ordinance of the Town of Newcastle, no application for such structure or property shall be considered by the Planning Department or by the Historic Preservation Review Board until the work done without approval is brought into compliance with the requirements of the relevant Ordinance.
- B. Review of any application by the Planning Department or by the Historic Preservation Review Board shall not constitute waiver of any future claims by the Town concerning violations and shall not stop the Town from prosecuting any violation.
- C. Failure to perform any act required by this Ordinance or of any conditions of approval on any Certificate of Appropriateness issued hereunder, or performance of any act prohibited by this Ordinance, shall constitute a violation and be subject to a fine as provided in 30-A M.R.S. §4452,

as may be amended. Each day on which there is failure to perform a required act or on which a violation exists shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this section.

Article 112: Definitions

Accessory Building: Same as the definition found in Article 8 of the Core Zoning Code.

Addition: An improvement that increases the square footage of a structure. These include lateral additions added to the side or rear of a structure or vertical additions added on top of a structure.

Additional Structure: Same as the definition found in Article 8 of the Core Zoning Code.

Alteration: For the purposes of this Ordinance, this includes any change in siding materials, roofing materials, foundations, gutters, door and window sash and integral decorative elements, such as, but not limited to, cornices, brackets, window architraves, doorway pediments, railing, balusters, columns, cupolas and cresting and roof decorations. This definition also includes the addition of rooftop solar panels, skylights, utilities, and similar when seen from the public realm.

Applicant: Same as the definition found in Article 8 of the Core Zoning Code.

Architectural Feature: The architectural elements embodying style, design, general arrangement, and components of the exterior of any building or structure, including, but not limited to: decorative elements, the kind or texture of the building materials, and the style and type of all windows, doors, lights, and porches.

Certificate of Appropriateness: The approval documentation indicating compliance with the relevant standards of this Ordinance.

Character or Character-Defining: The visual aspects and physical features that comprise the appearance of a building, including the overall shape of the building and its materials, craftsmanship, decorative details, and unique aspects of its site or environment.

Demolition: The razing of a building or a structure or the removal of any exterior architectural feature or structure or object.

Frontage Zone: Same as the definition found in ~~A~~article 8 of the Core Zoning Code.

Hazard Building(s): Any building which, because of inadequate maintenance, dilapidation, physical damage (including damage from a fire, flood, or similar), unsanitary condition, or abandonment, constitutes a fire hazard or a danger to public health.

Historic Preservation: Broadly, this is a conversation about the past for the purposes of planning for the future. For the purposes of this Ordinance, this means identifying and regulating buildings, structures, sites or districts with cultural, social, architectural or historic value in order to communicate with future generations those places (including individual buildings or sites and whole neighborhoods) which have been important or significant to the broader story of the Town of Newcastle and its inhabitants.

Historic Special Districts: Those shown on the Official District Map of the Town of Newcastle, Maine as may be amended from time to time. The Official District Map is included in Article 1 of the Core Zoning Code.

Legislative Body: Voters of the Town of Newcastle at a duly-noticed Town Meeting.

Local Landmarks: Those properties, which may be located outside of the Historic Special Districts but which have significant architectural, social, cultural or historical value in their own right, but and which have been designated as Local Landmarks as provided in Article 7 of this Ordinance. Only property owners or their agents/assigns may initiate a petition to designate their property as a Local Landmark.

Minor Alteration: Incidental changes or additions to a building which will neither result in substantial changes to any significant historic features nor obscure such features. In no event shall any change be deemed minor when, in the determination of the Planning Department, such change shall alter the historic character of the building.

New Construction: New construction includes the placement of a new Primary or Accessory Building on a site, whether the new building is post-and-beam construction or factory-built/manufactured.

Permitting Authority: The Planning Department or the Historic Preservation Review Board, as may be applicable.

Primary Building: Same as the definition found in Article 8 of the Core Zoning Code.

Principal Facade or Principal Elevation: The front of a building facing the street.

Proportions: The relationship of the size, shape, and location of one building element to all of the other elements; each architectural style typically has its own rules of proportion.

Projections: A part or feature of a building which extends out beyond the enclosing walls (for example, steps, porches, or enclosed entries, or bay windows, balconies, and cornices).

Public Realm: All public or civic lands including publicly-owned parks and open spaces, roads, sidewalks, rights-of-way, frontage zones, and water bodies.

Reconstruction: The act or process of depicting, through new construction, the form, features, and details of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time (usually using documentary or photographic evidence).

Renewable Energy Systems: Systems that harness energy from solar, geothermal and/or wind sources.

Repointing: To repair the joints of brickwork or masonry with mortar or cement.

Review Board: The Newcastle Historic Preservation Review Board, as established by Article 2 of this Ordinance.

Rhythm: An ordered, alternating, recurring pattern of solids (walls) to voids (windows and doors) in building facades along the street. The recurrent alternation of walls to windows and doors (solids to voids) along the front facade of a building establishes a pattern which can be perceived when observing the building from a distance.

Temporary: For the purposes of this Ordinance, the term Temporary shall have the same meaning as Temporary Structure, as outlined in Article 4, Section 9 of the Core Zoning Code.