

**WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2018
MINUTES**

Present: Ed Reidman, (Chair) (Ward 5), Rene Daniel (Vice-Chair) (At Large), Rebecca Dillon (Ward 1), Dennis Isherwood (Ward 2)

Absent: John Turcotte (Alternate), Greg Blake (At Large), Joseph Marden (Ward 3), Robyn Tannenbaum (Ward 4)

Staff: Jennie Franceschi, Rebecca Spitella, Richard Gouzie

MINUTES MAY NOT BE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. SECTIONS MAY BE PARAPHRASED FOR CLARITY. A COMPLETE RECORDING MAY BE OBTAINED BY CONTACTING PLANNING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT at 207-854-0638 ext. 1220 and lgain@westbrook.me.us

Ed Reidman explained the public hearing process.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **2018.01 – Site Plan - 401 Brook – Spurwink Services, Inc. – The applicant is proposing an expansion to their existing parking area to accommodate 20 additional parking spaces. Tax Map: 19 Lot 5 Zone Residential Growth Area 2**

Eric Williams with SGC Service Presented aspects of the parking lot expansion.

- No sufficient parking
- Circulation is one way
- 20 angled parking spaces
- Stormwater drainage
- Southerly point existing drainage inwardly will continue, and control run off
- No other permits required by DEP
- Not complex

Ed Reidman comments from the staff?

Staff Comments:

1. Fees: Abutters notices & PH notice – \$238.30
2. What is the condition of the outlet of the stormwater pipe? Is there an existing plunge pool? If not, one must be installed as part of this project.
3. Provide 1 mylar and 1 paper of the approval plans for signature. If the applicant wishes to retain a signed copy, please provide additional copies for signature.

Board Action:

Based upon the minor changes at this site as the use of the site has been a nursing home in the past, Staff feel that the application can move forward to the public hearing without the need of a workshop, therefore in consultation with the Chair the application has been posted as a public hearing.

Board will hear public comment at this meeting and may provide any adjustments or additions to the proposed conditions stated in this document.

Public Hearing Open

No comments

Public Hearing closed

REGULAR MEETING

2. Call to Order.

3. Approval of Minutes.

Rene Daniel move to approve the January 2nd, 2018 minutes as presented.

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote is unanimous in favor 4-0

4. 2018.01 – Site Plan - 401 Brook – Spurwink Services, Inc. – The applicant is proposing an expansion to their existing driveway to accommodate 20 parking spaces. Tax Map: 19 Lot 5 Zone Residential Growth Area 2

Ed Reidman does the Board have any questions?

Dennis Isherwood, I saw that you are taking down two trees, will you replace them?

No plans to replace

Rene Daniel, I hope you are open to replant trees somewhere on the property.

Ed Reidman do I hear a motion?

Rene Daniel move the Site Plan application for Spurwink Services, Inc to expand their existing driveway and construct 20 additional parking spaces at 401 Brook Street, Tax Map: 19 Lot: 25 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2 is to be **approved with conditions** and the following finding of fact, conclusions and conditions as stated on pages 2 through 3 of this Staff Memo dated February 2, 2018 are adopted in support of that approval.

Site Plan – Finding of Fact:

Utilization of the Site – *Adequate.*

Adequacy of Road System - *Adequate.*

Access to the Site – *Adequate.*

Internal Vehicular Circulation - *Adequate.*

Pedestrian and Other Modes of Transportation - *Adequate.*

Stormwater Management - *Adequate.*

Erosion Control - *Adequate.*

Utilities – *N/A.*

Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials – *N/A*

Technical and Financial Capacity – *N/A*

Solid Waste – *N/A.*

Historic, Archaeological and Botanical Resources - *Adequate*

Landscape Plan – *Side buffers are not being disturbed.*

Conclusions:

1. The proposed site plan **will not** result in undue water or air pollution.
2. The proposed site plan **has** sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the site plan.
3. The proposed site plan **will not** cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply.
4. The proposed site plan **will not** cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results.
5. The proposed site plan **will not** cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed.
6. The proposed site plan **will** provide for adequate sewage waste disposal.
7. The proposed site plan **will not** cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste.
8. The proposed site plan **will not** have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat identified by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or the municipality, or rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline.
9. The proposed site plan **conforms** to the duly adopted site plan regulation or ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan, or land use plan.
10. The developer **has** adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section.
11. The proposed site plan **is not** situated entirely or partially within the watershed of any pond or lake or within 250 feet of any wetland, great pond or river as defined in Title 38, Chapter 3, subchapter I, article 2-B M.R.S.A.
12. The proposed site plan **will not** alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water.
13. The proposed site **is not** situated entirely or partially within a floodplain.
14. All freshwater wetlands **have** been shown on the site plan.
15. Any river, stream, or brook within or abutting the site plan **has** been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application.
16. The proposed site plan **will** provide for adequate storm water management.
17. The proposed plan **will not** negatively impact the ability of the City to provide public safety services.

Conditions:

1. Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated January 5, 2018 and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Planning Board, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the City Planner or the Planning Board.
2. Consistent with Section 504.3, the Code Enforcement Officer shall not issue any permits until a site plan has been approved by the Planning Board and a Mylar signed by the Planning Board. Mylars must be submitted to the City within 90 days of Planning Board approval or the approval shall be null and void.
3. Prior to any permits being issued for the project or any ground disturbance:
 - a. All Staff comments must be addressed.
 - b. A pre-construction meeting must be held with City Staff and the site work contractor. Contact the Planning Office to coordinate.
 - c. An inspection fee shall be made payable to the City of Westbrook for inspection of site improvements made by the Code Enforcement Officer and/or other appropriate City staff. This fee is required per Section 500.8 of the Land Use Ordinances in order to cover the costs of inspection of site improvements. 2% of site improvement costs.
 - d. The applicant shall file a performance guarantee with the City of Westbrook. The amount of the guarantee shall be agreed upon in advance with the City of Westbrook and shall be of an amount to ensure completion of all on- and off-site improvements necessary to support the proposed project.
 - e. The applicant shall provide the digital data as required by Section 504.5.B.12 and 13. – verification with GIS coordinator
4. Prior to release of the performance guarantee, the site will be in compliance with the approved plan and as-built plan provided in City approved format for the GIS system.
5. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of local and state authorities for life and safety requirements.

2nd by Rebecca Dillon

The vote is unanimous in favor 4-0

5. **2018.02 – Amended Site/Subdivision Plan/Conditional Use – 95 Maple Street & 95 Blue Spruce Farm Road – Autumn Woods – Risbara Properties, LLC: The applicant is requesting an amendment to approval condition 4b on the site/subdivision plan approved February 21, 2017 to adjust criteria for CO issuance related to off-site improvements. Request is due to an extended traffic plan review process and winter conditions. No changes to the on-site plans are proposed. Minor adjustments (widening) to the offsite improvements in Spring Street are required per MDOT’s traffic movement permit process. Tax Map: 26 Lot: 20 & 14A and Tax Map: 8 Lot: 216. Zone: Residential Growth Area 1.**

Project Description:

The applicant is requesting an amendment to approval condition 4b on the site/subdivision plan approved February 21, 2017 to adjust criteria for CO issuance related to off-site improvements. Request is due to an extended traffic plan review process and now winter

conditions prohibiting them from being able to conduct the work. No changes to the on-site plans are proposed. Minor adjustments (widening) to the offsite improvements in Spring Street are required per MDOT's traffic movement permit process, which staff support and are in keeping with the intent of the original approval.

Project History:

October 18, 2016 - Sketch Plan Review – Introduction of the development

October 20, 2016 - Rec and Con Meeting – Discussion of Recreational and Open Space amenities

November 5, 2016 - Site Walk – Reviewed building locations & balloon tests

November 15, 2016 - Workshop – Reviewed updates to architecturals, site layout, site amenities and site circulation.

November 17, 2016 - Rec and Con Meeting – Reviewed and discussed the proposed community gardens, open space and trails.

December 6, 2016 - Public Hearing – Entire application discussion open to the public and Board

February 21, 2017 - Public Hearing – Continuation of the Public Hearing

February 21, 2017 – Final Approval

February 6, 2018 – Amendment to Conditions of Approval

Nancy St. Clair with St Clair Associates presented offsite plans

- Change one Condition of Approval
- Offsite improvements – left turn lane
- As part of the original plan simple striping, everything fit
- Striping did not delay construction
- Occupancy was not an issue
- MDOT requires increased shoulder on the road
- Slight widening
 - Showed slide
 - 3-foot shoulder widener
 - Road construction is problematic this time of year
 - Early Spring is the timing of what we are proposing to do

Ed Reidman Public Hearing? Site Walk?

No interest

Ed Reidman this will allow development to issue occupancy for 5 buildings

Question from the Board?

Dennis Isherwood, I remember that there were questions about the width of the road when you first presented this, and you told me there was plenty of room.

Nancy St Clair limits of pavement, the change happened when we were required to widen the shoulder. That is what made this change happen.

Dennis Isherwood when I looked at road I thought it was too small to fit this turn lane in. A truck could not go by a car on that road, I am concerned that I did not get the correct answer and am wondering how that is going to change if we add a shoulder.

Dennis Isherwood move to table

Jennie Franceschi may staff comment before the tabling motion goes into effect?

Staff Comments:

Staff has amended the conditions of approval to allow for the CO issuance on the first 5 buildings. Staff do not see the delay of the implementation of the traffic improvements in Spring Street to be of concern as the applicant will have the work underway as soon as the roads are cleared for construction. The basis for most improvements in our existing road systems is typically well after the improvements triggers the need, which would be when the City applies to MDOT for funding the improvement. In the instance of this project, the road improvements are proactively being installed for the projected need. Staff does not see the minor time delay in the construction of the improvements as an issue and supports the requested amendment on the condition for CO issuance.

The Condition #4 previously read:

4. Prior to the first Occupancy Permit issuance,
 - a. Provide documentation of maintenance contractor for Stormwater Best Management Practices.
 - b. All MDOT required traffic improvements installed.
 - c. Sign design and E911 requirements shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Codes Department.

We would recommend amending the condition to read as follows:

4. Conditions related to Occupancy Permit issuances:
 - a. The issuance of occupancy permits for any new 12-unit Apartment Building in Autumn Woods shall be limited to a maximum of 5 apartment buildings, until all MDOT required traffic improvements have been installed in Spring Street.
 - b. Prior to the issuance of any CO for the Autumn Woods 12-unit apartment buildings:
 - i. Provide documentation of maintenance contractor for Stormwater Best Management Practices.
 - ii. Sign design and E911 requirements shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Codes Department.

Outstanding items:

1. *Fees: Abutter notices - \$137.70*
 2. *Provide updated subdivision plans (paper and mylar) with edited conditions of approval for re-signature.*

Staff feels that this plan is an improvement and will evolve post approval.

Ed Reidman any comments?

No comments

Ed Reidman do I hear a motion?

Rene Daniel move the amended Site Plan, Subdivision & Conditional application for Risbara Properties, LLC to construct (9) market rate 12-unit apartment buildings, with uses as stated in the Project Description section of this Staff Memo, at 95 Maple Street and 95 Blue Spruce Farm Road, Tax Map: 26 Lot: 20 & 14A and Tax Map: 8 Lot 216 Zone: Residential Growth Area 1. Is **approved with conditions** and the following finding of fact, conclusions and amended conditions as stated on pages 5 through 10 of this Staff Memo dated February 2, 2018 are adopted in support of that approval.

Site Plan – Finding of Fact:

Utilization of the Site – Adequate. Site features meet dimensional requirements of the ordinance.

Adequacy of Road System - Adequate. The applicant received a Traffic Movement Permit Amendment from MDOT dated December 19, 2016, and plan was approved by MDOT in January 2018- Plan dated 01-08-18 by St. Clair Associates titled “Offsite improvements – Left Turn Lane of Blue Spruce Farm – Phase II”.

Access to the Site – Adequate. The applicant has 2 access points which allow for diffusion of traffic on to Spring St. Additionally, emergency vehicles can access the site from Maple Street.

Internal Vehicular Circulation - Adequate. The applicant has provided two raised cross walks for pedestrian safety and an internal three way stop at the intersection of Autumn Woods Drive and Blue Spruce Farm Rd.

Pedestrian and Other Modes of Transportation - Adequate. A school bus stop is being constructed as a part of phase 1 as well as improvements to the pedestrian sidewalk system throughout the site.

Stormwater Management - Adequate. The applicant is in the process of being reviewed by MDEP for an amended site location permit and a Stormwater Permit/approval. Approval will be conditioned on receipt of stormwater permit from MDEP.

Erosion Control - Adequate. Applicant has provided an erosion and sediment control plan for the project.

Utilities – Adequate. Applicant is installing underground power, gas, water and sanitary sewer.

Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials – N/A

Technical and Financial Capacity - Adequate. The applicant has provided a letter of financial capacity from NBT Bank dated October 24, 2016.

Solid Waste – *Adequate. The applicant will be responsible for disposal of all solid waste generated by project.*

Historic, Archaeological and Botanical Resources – *None Known*

Landscape Plan – *Adequate. The applicant has provided a plan for screening the project and will install street trees as requested by the Planning Board.*

Subdivision – Finding of Fact:

Pollution and Sewer Disposal – *Adequate. Disposal of the Sewage from the project will be via the City Public Sewer system, and therefore will not cause a pollution issue.*

Water - *Adequate. The applicant has received an ability to serve letter from the Portland Water District, dated December 23, 2016.*

Soil Erosion - *Adequate. Site has shown on the plans appropriate BMPs to address erosion.*

Traffic – *Adequate. The applicant received a Traffic Movement Permit Amendment from MDOT dated December 19, 2016, and plan was approved by MDOT in January 2018- Plan dated 01-08-18 by St. Clair Associates titled “Offsite improvements – Left Turn Lane of Blue Spruce Farm – Phase II”.*

Sewage - *Adequate. The applicant has received an ability to serve from the Westbrook Sewer Department.*

Solid Waste - *Adequate. The applicant will be responsible for disposal of all solid waste for the development.*

Aesthetics

1. *Project to Site – Adequate.*
2. *Project to Surrounding Property – Adequate.*
3. *Landscape Design – Adequate.*
4. *Lighting – Adequate.*
5. *Signs – Condition of approval – in compliance with the ordinance requirements & to satisfy the needs of Public Safety.*

Conformity with Local Plans and Ordinances – *Adequate.*

1. *The proposal is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.*
2. *Subdivision Plan meets requirements of the Land Use Ordinance*

Financial and Technical Capacity – *Adequate. The applicant has provided a letter of financial capacity from NBT Bank dated October 24, 2016. Applicant has retained the services of St. Clair Associates which demonstrates technical capacity.*

River, Stream or Brook Impacts – *Adequate. The applicant is in the process of being reviewed by MDEP for an amended site location permit and a Stormwater Permit/approval. Project is outside of the 250’ Resource Protection Zone from the Stroudwater River.*

Conditional Use – Finding of Fact:

Uses specific to this section are: Dwelling, Multiple-Family

- A). Certain Requirements Met. That the use requested meets the dimension, parking, loading, and sign requirements of this Ordinance. - *Adequate. The applicant has exceeded the 1.5/unit parking standard by providing 2 spaces per unit.*
- B). Value. That the use requested will not significantly devalue abutting property or property across public or private way. - *Adequate. In discussions with several appraisers and assessors, it was stated that although it would be hard to determine an effect (Value) in either direction (plus or minus), the impact should be neutral. Current single-family homes being constructed in the phase I project directly adjacent to the multifamily structures are showing higher than average land value for the area, thus the multifamily units proposed are not devaluing single family home real estate.*
- C). Effects of Land Use. That the use granted will:
- (1) Maintain safe and healthful conditions.
 - (2) Not cause water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation.
 - (3) Not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird or other wildlife habitat.
 - (4) Conserve shared tree cover and visual, as well as actual, access to water bodies.
 - (5) Not burden on-site septic or off-site waste disposal.
 - (6) Not burden existing public ways. – *Adequate as to C) (1) through (6)*
- D). Performance Standards. That the use granted is compatible with adjacent land uses and that it meets the following performance standards:
1. Landscape Environment and Enhancement. The landscape must be preserved in its natural state insofar as practicable. It must be designed so as to stabilize the slopes and buffer the site, where necessary.
 2. Surface Water Drainage. Surface water drainage must not have an adverse effect on surrounding properties, downstream water quality, soil stability, or the storm drainage system.
 3. Water, Air, Soil Pollution. The development will not cause unreasonable water, air, or soil pollution.
 4. Soil Integrity. The development will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or reduction in the capacity of the soil to hold water.
 5. Natural Environment. The development must not have an unreasonably adverse effect on a historic site or irreplaceable natural areas.
 6. Nuisance Factor. The development must not cause unreasonable noise, odors, dust, gas, fumes, smoke, light or other annoying or dangerous emissions.
 7. Special Features. Exposed storage areas, machinery installation, service and loading areas, and similar facilities must be set back, screened, or buffered so as to minimize any possible adverse effect on the surrounding uses.
 8. Vehicular Access. The site layout must provide for safe vehicular access and egress, including that for emergency vehicles.
 9. Parking and Circulation. The layout of vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns must provide for safe interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and storage of plowed snow and the parking shall comply with the parking requirements set forth in Section 505.1 A-D, regardless of whether the special exception requires site plan review.

10. Public Services. The development must not impose an unreasonable burden on the water supply and sewage disposal systems, fire or police services, public ways, schools, recreational facilities, and other public services or facilities.
- Adequate as to D) (1) through (10)

Conclusions:

1. The proposed site plan **will not** result in undue water or air pollution.
2. The proposed site plan **has** sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the site plan.
3. The proposed site plan **will not** cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply.
4. The proposed site plan **will not** cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results.
5. The proposed site plan **will not** cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed.
6. The proposed site plan **will** provide for adequate sewage waste disposal.
7. The proposed site plan **will not** cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste.
8. The proposed site plan **will not** have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat identified by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or the municipality, or rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline.
9. The proposed site plan **conforms** to the duly adopted site plan regulation or ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan, or land use plan.
10. The developer **has** adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section.
11. The proposed site plan **is not** situated entirely or partially within the watershed of any pond or lake or within 250 feet of any wetland, great pond or river as defined in Title 38, Chapter 3, subchapter I, article 2-B M.R.S.A.
12. The proposed site plan **will not** alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water.
13. The proposed site **is not** situated entirely or partially within a floodplain.
14. All freshwater wetlands **have** been shown on the site plan.
15. Any river, stream, or brook within or abutting the site plan **has** been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application.
16. The proposed site plan **will** provide for adequate storm water management.
17. The proposed plan **will not** negatively impact the ability of the City to provide public safety services.

Conditions:

1. Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated September 6, 2016 and January 11, 2018 all supporting documents and subsequent submissions and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Planning Board, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the City Planner or the Planning Board.
2. Consistent with Section 504.3, the Code Enforcement Officer shall not issue any permits until a site plan has been approved by the Planning Board and a Mylar signed by the

Planning Board. *Mylars must be submitted to the City within 90 days of Planning Board approval or the approval shall be null and void.*

3. Prior to any ground disturbance or permits being issued for the project:
 - a. Submission of the MDEP Site Location Permit amendment (Including NRPA & Stormwater)
 - b. All outstanding Staff comments must be addressed.
 - c. Final Maine Department of Transportation Traffic Movement permit - Received
 - i. Provide final Spring St traffic striping & lighting plans for review and approval by City (Construction ready plans once reviewed by MDOT -Steve Hunnewell)
 - ii. Improvements at Blue Spruce Farm Dr. /Landing Road shall be installed per Original Approval (With the exception of final striping on Blue Spruce Farm Dr., if Final Pavement has not been installed.)
 - d. Updated site plan set based upon all State permits, if necessary (Mylar & Paper form)
 - e. Copy of the recorded subdivision plan provided to Planning Office.
 - f. Copy of SWPPP shall be provided to Planning Office
 - g. Copy of Maine Construction General Permit to Planning Office
 - h. The applicant shall provide the digital data as required by Section 504.5.B.12 and 13. – verification with GIS coordinator
 - i. A pre-construction meeting must be held with City Staff and the site work contractor. Contact the Planning Office to coordinate.
 - j. Final Sewer Plans reviewed and approved of by City Sewer Department.
 - k. An inspection fee shall be made payable to the City of Westbrook for inspection of site improvements made by the Code Enforcement Officer and/or other appropriate City staff. This fee is required per Section 500.8 of the Land Use Ordinances in order to cover the costs of inspection of site improvements.
 - l. The applicant shall file a performance guarantee with the City of Westbrook. The amount of the guarantee shall be agreed upon in advance with the City of Westbrook and shall be of an amount to ensure completion of all on- and off-site improvements necessary to support the proposed project.
 - m. Stormwater components:
 - i. All Grassed Underdrained Soil filters will have cleanouts.
 - ii. All sediment forebays will have concrete pad in base of forebay
 - iii. Best management practices shall be adhered to during all ground disturbance operations. All Street Catch basins in the vicinity of earthwork operations shall have silt sacks installed & maintained for the duration of the work.
 - n. Site Components:
 - i. Verification that all truncated domes in City ROW will be cast iron type.
4. Conditions related to Occupancy Permit issuances:
 - a. The issuance of occupancy permits for any new 12-unit Apartment Building in the Autumn Woods shall be limited to a maximum of 5 apartment buildings, until all MDOT required traffic improvements have been installed in Spring Street.
 - b. Prior to the issuance of any CO for the Autumn Woods 12-unit apartment buildings:
 - i. Provide documentation of maintenance contractor for Stormwater Best Management Practices.
 - ii. Sign design and E911 requirements shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Codes Department.

5. Prior to release of the performance guarantee, the site will be in compliance with the approved plan and as-built plan provided in City approved format for the GIS system.
6. The applicant shall comply with Chapter 37, the local Post Construction Stormwater Management Ordinance. On January 15th every year, a copy of the maintenance log for the previous year for the stormwater treatment features associated with this project needs to be provided to the Planning Office.
7. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of local and state authorities for life and safety requirements.
8. The Sanitary Sewer System installed as part of the Phase 2 project from the connection at the main line in Blue Spruce Farm Rd and all the way through the Autumn Woods Project is to remain forever a privately maintained system. The City will not take ownership of the sanitary sewer system if ever in the future Autumn Woods Dr. should become a City Street, due to depth of sewer line below grade.
9. Maple Street shall only provide access for the residents of the 2 original Chick home dwelling units and emergency and maintenance vehicles. The gate shall be locked at all other times to prevent residential traffic from exiting onto Maple Street.
10. Traffic Conditions:
 - a. All mitigation stated in the MDOT amended Traffic Movement Permit dated 12/19/16 for this project including the associated Blue Spruce Phase I project.
11. Project letters with conditions to be part of the approval:
 - a. Westbrook Fire Department – letter from Mike Corey, Fire Inspector dated October 31, 2016.
 - b. Westbrook Sewer Department – letter from Eric Dudley, P.E. dated October 28, 2016.
 - c. Portland Water District ability to serve letter – Letter from Gordon Johnson dated December 23, 2016
 - d. Westbrook Police Department – letter from Steven Goldberg, Police Captain dated October 28, 2016.

2nd by Rebecca Dillon

The vote is unanimous in favor 4-0

WORKSHOP

6. **2017.70 – Conditional Use/Home Daycare - 14 Glenwood Ave – Tatyana Nsankete Ekila – The applicant is proposing a 12-child home daycare in her residence. Tax Map: 29 Lot 14/159. Zone: Residential Growth Area 1.**

Tatyana Nsankete Ekila presented aspects of home daycare

- Love children
- My house has 2 floors and finished basement
- Living area
- Showed play area
- Showed floor plan of home
- Showed outdoor play area

Ed Reidman Rick have you reviewed the application for the appropriate specifications?

Richard Gouzie yes

Ed Reidman any items that need to be addressed?

Richard Gouzie fencing needs to return back to the house

Ed Reidman, we have reviewed several daycares. Does the Board wish to have a Site Walk?

Board Members showed interested

Jennie Franceschi Site walk could be held on February 24th @ 9:00 am

Rene Daniel move to schedule the site walk at 9:00 am on February 24th located at 14 Glenwood Avenue

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote unanimous in favor 4-0

Ed Reidman Public Hearing?

Rene Daniel move to schedule a **Public Hearing**

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote is unanimous in favor 4-0

Elyssa Merit 20 Glenwood Avenue expressed concerns of the fencing, increased traffic, play area and parking.

Ed Reidman asked if she had been to City Hall to look at the plan and invited her to attend the site walk.

Any other comments?

Jennifer Prouty 24 Glenwood Avenue asked about commercial trash haulers and what time it would be picked up.

Jennie Franceschi house – not asking operating as currently are

****Unidentified Speaker** explained the fence is in back of house not near 20 Glenwood Avenue. It is a fence in back for a play area. No play area in the parking lot or driveway.

Ed Reidman we will see you at the site walk.

Any other comments?

No comments

- 7. 2018.03 –Site/Subdivision Plan - 688 Main Street – Ryan Le – The applicant is proposing to construct a new 12-unit apartment building and expand an existing parking lot. Tax Map: 33 Lot 33. Zone: City Center District and Village Review Overlay Zone**

Project Description:

The applicant is proposing to construct a new 12-unit apartment building and expand an existing parking lot. The applicant is under negotiations with the abutting land owner MTR Development, to acquire additional lands for the project.

Project History:

January 22, 2018 – Neighborhood Meeting held
January 30, 2018 – Village Review Committee
February 6, 2018 – Planning Board Workshop

Andy Morrill BH2 Engineers presented plans to add an apartment building to the back side of 688 Main Street.

- Eight-unit square building
- January 16 met with staff
- Discussed density
- Interested in a portion if the rail parcel, approached MTR Development to purchase .41-acre parcel
- Came back with new revision
- 12-unit building
- Neighborhood meeting
- Francoeur concerned about a fence
- Village Review (VROZ) Committee meeting made changes to their recommendation
- Revised to a rectangular building with green space with landscaping and a pedestrian walkway to William Clarke Drive from Main Street.
- VROZ committee supportive
- Discussed snow storage
- Moved dumpster location and added fencing
- Showed elevations
- Looking forward to getting Board opinions

Ed Reidman explained workshop and allowing public format

Comments?

No comments

Ed Reidman questions from the Board?

No questions

Ed Reidman site walk?

Jennie Franceschi February 24th @ 10:00 am

Rene Daniel so moved

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote is unanimous in favor 4-0

Ed Reidman Public Hearing?

Board said yes

Ed Reidman I can set the Public Hearing

Rene Daniel mentioned to have the landscaping plan as this building will be visible from William Clarke Drive. One other major concern is traffic. The drive in is going to be difficult when two cars pass. You can explain that at the site walk.

Other than that, the plan looks good.

How many bedrooms?

Ryan Le one and two

Andy Morrill 900 square feet units

Rebecca Dillon the long building looks good and I like the sidewalk.

Ed Reidman comments?

No comments

Jennie Franceschi staff is pleased how this application has evolved.

8. **2018.04 – Site Plan – 1 IDEXX Drive – IDEXX Laboratories – Synergy East Expansion - The applicant is proposing a 135,000+/- sf expansion to the existing building, 4 additional parking lots and other associated site improvements. Tax Map/Lot: 5B/5 & 2/30. Zone: Manufacturing Zone District.**

Project Description:

The applicant is proposing a 135,000+/- sf expansion to the existing Synergy building which will be called Synergy East Expansion. This expansion will allow for approximately 600 additional employees on the site. In addition to the building, 4 new parking lots along a portion of the CMP corridor and other associated site improvements will be constructed.

Project History:

January 8, 2018 – Neighborhood public meeting
February 6, 2018 – Planning Board Workshop

Staff Comments:

1. Fees: Abutters (TBD), Newspaper notices (TBD) & Site plan (\$2,000) fees due at Final submission
2. Fire Related Comments:
 - a. Approval will be necessary from Fire Dept for the final location of all fire alarm systems and hydrants; including but not limited to fire doors (won-door), remote annunciator and Knox box locations
 - b. The existing fire lane will be pushed back from current location to accommodate the Synergy East expansion but will remain 15-feet. The fire lane accessing the Innovation Center will remain intact
 - c. Synergy East roofline will be approximately the same height as Synergy for rooftop fire access.

- d. Radio testing will be conducted during the course of construction to ensure adequate ability of public safety personnel to communicate into the building
- e. Hydrant locations to be determined
3. Stormwater related comments:
 - a. Stormwater increased by the rear parking areas will be managed by subsurface filter systems collecting and draining into the existing stormwater infrastructure. All stormwater infrastructure will be designed to meet Chapter 500 stormwater standards and will result in a net reduction of runoff for 2, 10 and 25-year storms.
 - b. Stormwater design needs to incorporate/location temporary sediment ponds for the new parking lots.
 - c. DEP/Army Corp Permits underway – condition of approval
4. Building codes; state has adopted 2015 which will go into effect after April 23, 2018.
5. The sketch plan submission includes a boundary survey for the development on the lot leased by CMP but does not include an updated boundary survey for the IDEXX lot. Applicant will provide full survey plans in final submission.
6. Final plan will include signage and speed bumps along parking lots access drive to control speed
7. CMP will provide height requirements for the utility poles (35-feet above parking lot grade?)
8. Requesting bottle fill stations in lieu of water fountains. Will require final approval from CEO
9. Synergy East building will be built to LEED gold standards – Because the existing conditions are a parking lot, there is no increase in impervious area and all stormwater will be recycled within the development, improving existing conditions
10. Final application will include phasing plan. Phasing plan must indicate how much parking is required to meet parking standards for Synergy East and identify a timeframe for construction. All additional construction can be built “as needed” (but within the phased time frame).
11. Provide on plan total parking provided/parking required, handicap accessible space requirement/provided. In response, provide dialog on phasing of parking lots based on employee demand.
12. Access drive will need to be named and parking lots will need a designation. – Coordinate with our E911 Coordinator Linda Gain – suggest a meeting with appropriate staff once IDEXX determines a naming plan for the parking lots.
13. Plan Set comments:
 - a. Sheet C-200 –
 - i. Missing pedestrian/fire lane connection behind existing Synergy Center toward outdoor court space. Will this be addressed?
 - b. Sheet C-202 –
 - i. ADA sidewalk access at the start of the new sidewalk connection. Will new sidewalk match into existing system on southern end?
 - ii. Stop bars and signs needed at end of each row accessing driveway between Calpine and Saco St.
 - iii. 1.1-CB1 – Can the grate handle the flow of 4 cfs? Can you provide cut sheet on your grates to show flow rates?
 - c. Sheet C-203 –
 - i. Stop bars and signs needed at end of each row accessing driveway between Calpine and Saco St.
 - ii. Details on the (2) box culverts need to be provided – will they be embedded?

- iii. Should there be a removable bollard at the sidewalk exiting parking lot like other locations?
 - d. Sheet C-204 –
 - i. Stop bars and signs needed at end of each row accessing driveway between Calpine and Saco St.
 - e. Sheet C-205 –
 - i. Stop bars and signs needed at end of each row accessing driveway between Calpine and Saco St.
 - ii. SF-2 Filter Bed – OCS – beehive grate? Which detail does this refer to? Filter bed piping needs to show clean outs in the design that can be accessed by the maintenance company.
 - f. Sheet C-206 –
 - i. Please provide a crosswalk connection from end of walking trail around wet pond across the drive aisle to the walkway behind the manufacturing building.
 - g. Sheet C-207 –
 - i. Crosswalk as mentioned in comment f.
 - ii. Crosswalk connection across access drive (drive heading towards parking lot access road) south of walkway from Lot #2. This would require a tip down in the sidewalk and a crosswalk.
 - iii. Stop bars & signs needed at end of parking aisles and need to look at reconfiguring the islands to better delineate the drive. (Sketch)
 - h. Sheet 301 –
 - i. Fire lane – Does sidewalk function to allow access for Fire apparatuses?
 - ii. West End of Fire Lane – lacking connection to existing system as well as pedestrian connection.
14. Landscaping Plan to be provided.
15. Police Comments
- a. Traffic Signals are needed at either end of Eisenhower – Spring and Saco Streets. Both intersections are congested. Spring Street at Eisenhower is a high crash intersection. The lights at Saco Street should include Public Works.
 - b. The new parking lots should have adequate lighting – similar to what is already in the existing lots. If they could install the emergency call boxes like they have in the existing lots, I’m sure the employees would appreciate it.
 - c. Is the new road connecting Calpine Drive and Saco Street a public or private road? Regardless, it needs to have adequate room for two-way traffic throughout and especially where it connects to Saco Street.
 - d. I read that they want to do an expansion of the Thomas Drive parking lots. Are they adding more staff to that site? The intersection with Thomas Drive and Spring Street has been identified as a high-crash intersection. If they are planning an expansion there that might be an intersection we have to look at for potential improvements.
16. For Final plan:
- a. Signature block on the cover sheet
 - b. Final conditions stated on the cover sheet.
 - c. Survey Plan of property for both main lot and the CMP lease area.
 - d. Condition on time of year for tree clearing to address Long-ear bat habitat. Oct 16th – April 19th.
 - e. Complete set of plans in both paper and mylar.

Potential Board Actions for discussion:

1. Site Walk
2. Public Hearing

Dana Fortier Engineering and Maintenance Manager for Idexx introduced the project team, John Harper and Denise as mentioned in application 3 story office building improvements turn over to John and Denise

Denise Cameron with Woodard & Curran showed proposed expansion

- Orient where we are
- Red is where the building
- Connected to Synergy
- Expansion result of growth
- Up to 600 employees over a number of years
- Support need parking
- Idexx property full with parking
- Screen corridor along the brook
- Idexx has lease with CMP for parking

John Harper explained the expansion.

Denise Cameron mentioned additional parking will be phased in.

- Showed full build out
- Broken into 4 central areas
- Lessen the burden on Eisenhower
- Break up parking with green corridors
- Review by DEP for wet land impacts
- Parking lot
- Substantial landscaping
- Goal to have a place the employees can enjoy in an outside space
- Courtyard for employees
- Showed back parking entrance
- Storm water
- DEP will review, soil filters, subsurface in this area and water reuse
- Detention basin
- Substantial improvement to traffic
- Comments from the public
- DOT traffic permit

Happy to answer questions

Dana Fortier in closing, Idexx has made significant improvements to the site and is a most innovative world class leader. Idexx strives to take a careful approach and we are happy to answer any questions.

Ed Reidman what is your construction time schedule?

Dana Fortier we would like to start in the spring and conclude in 2019.

Ed Reidman if everything goes well, when do you need approvals?

Dana Fortier in April or May along with the DEP permits.

Ed Reidman Public Hearing – I have the right to schedule Questions?

Rene Daniel I am sure the landscaping will be well done.

Dennis Isherwood thank you for your presentation. I remember the building when it was Data General. The building had snow problems on the roof and there has always been issues with snow storage for everyone. Calpine dumps out heat, have you thought of snow melters? You have no place to put snow and you will continue to build parking lots to accommodate snow.

Dana Fortier snow melters are a great idea but they have challenges with the expense of the units.

Ed Reidman go back to when Data General was built, as part of addendum to the Deed it stated the building would have a brick façade. Staff can research that and identify when you come back before the Board.

Other questions or Comments?

Carleton Meserve 430 Saco Street near the corner of Eisenhower and Saco, spoke about traffic concerns especially during high commuter traffic times. Concerned about drivers speeding and mentioned that a traffic light would not help, it would only cause rear end accidents due to the speeding. The speed limit is 35 and drivers are doing 50 at my house and asked the Board to observe the traffic for themselves.

Ed Reidman we will be taking a Site Walk and you will also be notified.

Richard Meserve 430 Saco Street expressed concerns about traffic and speeding vehicles. Spoke in opposition of a traffic light at the top of a hill, could cause more accidents. Safety is my biggest concern. Request a Maine Department of Transportation Public Hearing.

Ed Reidman could you speak to the request for a Maine Department of Transportation Public Hearing?

****Unidentified Speaker**, Steve Landry at MEDOT did not see the need for a Public Hearing due to the project size, location and possible lack of potential impacts.

No further comments

Ed Reidman motion to close workshop

Rene Daniel so moved

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote is unanimous 4-0

Adjourn

THANK YOU, respectfully submitted by Linda Gain lgain@westbrook.me.us