

**WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD  
TUESDAY, JULY 7, 2020, 7:00 P.M.  
TELECONFERENCE MINUTES**

In accordance with Public Law Chapter 617 adopted as emergency legislation by the Maine State Legislature on March 17, 2020 and signed into effect by Governor Mills, 1 MRSA § 403-A permits public proceedings through remote access during the declaration of state of emergency due to COVID-19.

**Chairman Rene Daniel** opened the Planning Board meeting.

**1. Call to Order**

**Rebecca Spitella - Roll Call attendance:**

<b>Jason Frazier (Ward 2)</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Joseph Marden (Ward 3)</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Robyn Tannenbaum (Ward 4)</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Rd Reidman (Ward 5)</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>John Turcotte (At Large)</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Nancy Litrocapes Alternate)</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Larry McWilliams (Alternate)</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Vice Chair Rebecca Dillon (Ward 1)</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Chairman Rene Daniel (At Large)</b>	<b>Present</b>

**For the record, the following Staff are in attendance:**

**Jennie Franceschi, Planning and Code Director  
Rebecca Spitella, Assistant Planner  
David Finocchietti, Code Enforcement Officer**

**2. Call to Order**

**3. ~~Approval of Minutes~~**

**NEW BUSINESS**

- 4. ~~Item withdrawn at the applicant's request 2019.32 – Site Plan – 267 Conant Street – MGM Builder, Inc:~~ The applicant is proposing to construct a +/- 10,080 square foot commercial complex and shared parking area. Tax Map: 031 Lot: 033 Zone: City Center District, Rural District**

**REGULAR BUSINESS**

- 5. ~~Item withdrawn at the applicant's request 2020.20 – Site Plan Amendment, Shoreland Overlay Zone – 5 Bradley Dr – Abbott Diagnostics – Public Hearing:~~ The applicant is proposing a +/- 46,200 sf**

~~expansion to an existing building for manufacturing use and associated site improvements, improved access drive and an expanded 416-space parking area. Tax Map 005B Lot 034 Zone: Manufacturing District, Shoreland Overlay Zone—General Development; Resource Protection~~

Rebecca Dillon moved to go to Workshop

2<sup>nd</sup> by Robin Tannenbaum

Roll Call Vote:

Jason Frazier (Ward 2)	Yes
Joseph Marden (Ward 3)	Yes
Robyn Tannenbaum (Ward 4)	Yes
Rd Reidman (Ward 5)	Yes
John Turcotte (At Large)	Yes
Nancy Litrocapes Alternate)	Absent
Larry McWilliams (Alternate)	Yes
Vice Chair Rebecca Dillon (Ward 1)	Yes
Chairman Rene Daniel (At Large)	Yes

Motion carries

## WORKSHOP

Rebecca Spitella introduced Item:

6. **2020.22 – Site Plan – 5 Karen Drive – 5 Karen Drive Associates, LLC: The applicant is proposing an 18,000 sf expansion to an existing building located in the Glassworld Business Park. Tax Map: 002 Lot: 052 Zone: Industrial Park District**

**Kaleb Bourassa** Gorrill Palmer on behalf of 5 Karen Drive Associates, LLC, I am happy to present this project located at 5 Karen Drive. This is an existing building on Karen Drive off County Road, part of the existing County Road Business Park. This is an existing warehouse facility.

The building currently has four tenants, an HVAC company, Odwalla, that make fruit drinks, a glassware company, and a laundry facility.

*Showed site plan of the lot on screen.*

All uses are warehouse as currently exists today. Trucks entering for pick up and deliveries enter through Karen Drive and loop the building from the south and easterly side of the site to various loading docks.

The proposed expansion is on the south side of the existing building. It is proposed for a 14,000-sf expansion, not 18,000. It is a steel framed building with a pitched roof towards the south. The two units will have well docks and at grade docks as well on the westerly side of the expansion. The proposed

expansion is for tenants that are expanding. Unit 1 will be occupied by Odwalla, who is expanding and a tenant for Unit 2 has not been confirmed yet.

*Showed floor plan and building elevation on screen.*

**Kaleb Bourassa** reviewed

- The entrances and docks for each unit.
- Explained company vehicles and parking area
- Required and proposed parking. A few parking spaces will be removed as part of the application but noted that the remaining parking is more than required by the Ordinance.
- Entrance from Scott Drive will be removed
- Utilities. The project will utilize the existing sewer connection. Domestic water will be tapped from the existing building. Sprinkler and Fire alarm will be extended into the expansion. Coordination efforts with CMP are in place to obtain an additional service for Unit 2. New gas service. Stormwater will be managed by an existing stormwater design located westerly of the site and serving the business park. Stormwater treatment will be provided to the Board with the final application.
- Will provide a landscaping plan with the final application.

*Showed existing pictures of the facility, existing building elevations and explained loading docks, traffic flow, location of proposed addition location*

Happy to have a Site Walk if the Board chooses.

- Planning on submitting for final approval for the August meeting.
- I will turn it over to the Board for any comments

**Jennie Franceschi**– Staff have provided the applicant with a list of comments that the applicant will address at final submission.

*General*

1. *Noticing fees due - \$6.45*
2. *Building uses need to be clarified as part of final submission. Uses should be stated on plan as a permitted/conditional use within IPD zone.*
3. *State maximum number of employees per shift with parking standard as plan note to demonstrate conformance with Ordinance.*
4. *Show space and bulk standards on site plan (existing & proposed)*
5. *Need signed Planning Board application*
6. *ABS letters for water and sewer required*
7. *General cleanup of plan – plan is difficult to read. Provide clearer differentiation of the parcel line vs easement lines.*

*Traffic/Site Circulation/Parking*

8. *Site needs to provide accessible parking in compliance with ADA standards*
9. *Provide documentation turning radius can be achieved into Unit #1 loading bay*

10. *What is the anticipated increase in traffic generated by expansion.*
11. *Extend pedestrian walkway along frontage of building expansion.*
12. *What is the intent of door on southerly side of building? Is this emergency egress for employees or intended for daily use? Will need pedestrian connection either to access drive (emergency egress only) or westerly alongside of building to connect with walkway to parking area.*

#### *Utility*

13. *Extend sprinkler service into building expansion*
14. *Stortz connection needs to be upgraded to 5" (plan shows 4")*
15. *Extend fire alarm into building expansion. Fire alarm needs to be separated for each unit and have an addressable system*
16. *Show lateral on utility plan. No more than one service per building is permitted*
17. *Need confirmation existing sewer service is sized appropriately for building expansion*

#### *Stormwater*

18. *Clarity needed on current SLODA permit – does building expansion require an amendment?*
19. *Unclear on the placement and functionality of the rain garden/filter bed. Provide stormwater BMP detail with final submission. Would suggest subsurface treatment.*
20. *During recent BMP inspections, an illicit discharge was noted from the 36" cross culvert located on the northerly side of the building into the Long Creed Watershed. There appears to be some connection into the stormdrain from the 5 Karen property that needs to be addressed as part of this approval.*
21. *Contact Long Creek Watershed Management District to change permit. Provide documentation with final application*
22. *Clarity on grading/retaining walls in loading bay area – Need for northerly retaining wall? Grade appears to be in line with existing conditions.*

#### *Misc.*

23. *Firewall required separating Unit 1 from existing building*
24. *Consistency in language – Narrative refers to Glassworld Business Park, plan set states County Road Business Park*
25. *Clarity needed - Narrative states 3-overhead doors for unit 1 and two overhead doors for unit 2, plan does not appear to depict this. Narrative states there are 4-overhead doors on easterly side of building but does not identify where the 5<sup>th</sup> overhead door is located*
26. *Final application should include separated Site Layout and Grading, Drainage & Utility plans*

#### *Required with Final Submission*

27. *City GIS does not appear to be up to date with current boundary lines. 4<sup>th</sup> Amended Subdivision Plan (dated 11-15-2004 and approved 7-13/2010) recorded but not on file. Provide stamped boundary survey with final application.*
28. *Landscaping plan with final submission*
29. *Provide photometric plan to ensure adequate lighting for all parking areas and the access way. Cut Sheets required on any additional lighting proposed. All lighting should be down casting with cutoff to eliminate spill over*

30. *Signage – provide inventory of all signage on site. Include square footage of all building mounted and pylon signs*
31. *Review final plan submission requirements to ensure complete application upon submission.*
32. *Provide building elevations with final application. Elevations must show a minimum of two loading bays as required with 14k sf expansion in Industrial Zone*

**Board Action:**

1. *Provide feedback to applicant*
2. *Schedule a public hearing (upon receipt of a final application)*
3. *Staff can provide a virtual site walk during the meeting to show the Board the location.*

**Rene Daniel opened public comment.**

**Seeing none, close public comment.**

**Rene Daniel** Would anyone like to have a virtual site walk? None noted.  
Open the floor to Board comment or question.

**Jason Frazier** Question about the rain garden. Can you describe it? It seems like a strange location for a rain garden. Can you explain the purpose of this and how it works?

**Kaleb Bourassa** Yes, the rain garden was from our original design and we did not know if we required additional treatment other than the drip edge. I did not want to touch on this at this time as this garden will be removed from the final submission. Mostly focusing on the design as the drip edge will provide the required treatment for the existing roof area and the proposed addition.

**Robin Tannenbaum** Is the primary circulation changing much? Or as I understand it, will the trucks continue to go around to the back side and the employees slip in at the north side? Is this staying fundamentally the same?

**Kaleb Bourassa** Correct. One thing I may not have touched on as much. *Showed Site Plan on screen.* There is an existing easement in place between 5 Karen Dr Associates and the Maine Medical building. The side can be entered from either Scott Drive or Karen Drive. The circulation will remain mostly the same however delivery vehicles will always enter from Karen Drive and circulate around the building from the South to the East.

**Robin Tannenbaum** if I may ask a follow up question, is the traffic in the employee parking area going to become one way now?

**Kaleb Bourassa** they will have the option to exit in either direction.

**Rene Daniel** Any other comments.

None noted.

I am going to follow up to what you said, you will have more information about landscaping at the next presentation.

**Kaleb Bourassa** Yes. There will be.

**Rene Daniel** do you have any idea when you will come before us again?

**Kaleb Bourassa** hoping to submit on Thursday for the next Planning Board meeting.

**Rene Daniel** Thank you

**Rebecca Spitella introduced item:**

7. **2020.23 – Site Plan – 65 Spiller Drive – Christopher Holdings, LLC: The applicant is proposing a new 6,000 sf commercial building to be divided into two 3,000 square foot units for commercial use on an existing vacant lot. Tax Map: 004 Lot: 302 Zone: Manufacturing District.**

**Kaleb Bourassa** Gorrill Palmer on behalf of Christopher Holding LLC (David and Emmie are here) presented aspects of the new 6,000 sf commercial building located at 65 Spiller Drive in the Westbrook Heights Business Park.

*Showed location of Westbrook Heights Business Park, off Saco Street on screen. Explained other businesses and showed location of the proposed project.*

This will be a 6,000 sf steel framed building and will be built like what is already in the area. Coloring will be similar as Virostat building, but a darker tone with a gray stripe across the top of the building.

The building will be split evenly down the middle into two units that will have David and Emmie's businesses.

The building is closer to Spiller Drive where we will have access.

I will turn it over to Davis and Emmie to introduce themselves and their businesses.

**David Christopher** I am the owner of Glass Solutions. I started in 2011 in a 1500 sf unit which I grew out of quickly and now I share with Emmie a 3,000-sf space that we share and have outgrown that space.

We are extremely excited about having our business in Westbrook. My business does store front installations, residential shower doors, any type of custom glass. Luckily, I purchase my materials across the street at Sigco.

As I said, we are looking forward to occupying the space in Westbrook.

**Emmie Christopher** I currently own and operate a mobile pet grooming business called Ossie Pet Mobile.

Part of my space will be warehouse space where I have all our grooming supplies, some auto parts as I have three vans that my employees take out on the road every day to groom pets locally. In addition to that I have a business manager who does all the telephones and scheduling so she needs her office there and I will have my office there. The space will have a small area for staff meetings.

I also plan to open an exclusive cat grooming salon. It will be by appointment only and one cat at a time and no dog grooming. It will be a very high-end salon and will be the first cat salon to open in Maine and maybe New England. I have not done my research yet. It is rare. I am really excited about that. Being the first mobile pet grooming in Maine, I like being the first.

**Kaleb Bourassa** thank you David and Emmie. We are excited about this project and we like doing business in the City of Westbrook. This will be a great addition to the business park as well.

*Showed the location on screen of the 6,000-sf building near the bottom of the hill.*

It is a modest sized building and at the tallest will be 18 feet. The roof will be pitched from north to south towards Spiller Drive.

- Entrance from Spiller Drive
- A small grade
- Cutting into the hillside for the building
- Maine parking from the front at the southern and east location
- Both businesses have company vehicles that will be on the road most of the time
- Snow storage is around the building
- Dumpster to the rear
- Stairs at the front of the building at each entrance
- Grading shown on screen
- Will not see building from Saco Street
- Existing vegetation along Saco Street
- Stormwater on site was designed by Deluca Hoffman and is collected along Spiller Drive and goes out to the east to an existing wet pond that was designed to treat the entire site to 80% of each lot
- We are well within the 80% of Stormwater that we are generating from our site
- We have quite a bit of slope to work with on each side of the building that will have swails to slow the water as it comes down to prevent erosion, install a culvert, cross over the driveway then to the catch basin on Spiller Drive have a swail in the front so the water does not spill over to the road to the inlet pipe.
- We will be grading the rear of the building back.
- Utilities – this lot built out for gas, water, sewer and power connections are from the front of the building off Spiller Drive
- There is a hydrant located on Spiller Drive
- The building does not require a Sprinkler System
- No issues with utility capacity for the use

*Showed landscaping plan on screen with a mixture of Spruce, Maples and hydrangeas. Showed vegetation from the northwest location from Spiller Drive that has a meadow area and plenty of tall trees. Then showed the same location from Saco Street.*

I believe this will be sufficient screen so would like to focus screening in the rear to the side for our next submission just in case there is more development on lot #1.

With that I will turn it over to the Board for any questions.

## **Rene Daniel Staff Comments?**

**Jennie Franceschi** we have provided the applicant with the Staff comments that will incorporate in the final submission. Also, we ask the Board if they wish to have a virtual Site Walk?

### ***Staff Comments:***

1. *Noticing Fees Due: \$41.25*
2. *Provide employee counts for each business*
3. *Expand site plan to show entire site rather than a blow of the area to be developed*
4. *Provide a stamped boundary survey*
5. *Building uses need to be clarified and stated on the plan that is in conformance with allowed uses within Manufacturing zone.*
6. *Provide detail on dumpster enclosure. Staff recommends a chain link, black privacy slats*
7. *State parking required and proposed as plan note to demonstrate conformance with Ordinance*
8. *Where it is an egress location, provide pedestrian path along westerly side of the building in both directions to connect to the northerly and southerly walkways*
9. *Provide building elevations & proposed signage with final submission*
10. *Provide a photometric plan with final submission*
11. *Show north arrow on site plan*
12. *Sewer – cleanout required at 45-degree angle*
13. *Remove O-W separator and CB details from plans as they are not included with the project*
14. *Provide detail on protection for storm drain with final plan submission. Recommend use of Agri Drain (or comparable) bar guard*
15. *Provide stormwater analysis at constriction points to ensure inlet areas are sized appropriately and water does not overflow causing flooding on Spiller Drive.*
16. *Concern noted of potential erosion located downslope of the easterly parking area. Additional BMPs may be required based on infield inspections depending on the conditions of the slope post construction.*
17. *Show snow storage on final plan*
18. *Remove vacant detail blocks and consolidate detail sheets*
19. *Concern noted for feasibility of truck turnaround for dumpster and loading bay access. If turnaround is not possible in the area to the rear of the building, consider a need for a hammerhead to assist*
20. *Curb landscape/walkway around building for protection.*
21. *Pedestrian circulation - Staff recommends shifting the 4-plantings located at the easterly corner of the building toward the flowering perennial bed to allow for a walkway along the front of the building to serve the 8-easterly parking spaces. Additionally, provide walkway along the side of the southerly parking space to connect to the stairway to serve the window manufacturing business.*

### ***Board Action:***

1. *Provide feedback to applicant*
2. *Schedule a public hearing (upon receipt of a final application)*
3. *Staff can provide a virtual site walk during the meeting to show the Board the location*

**Jennie Franceschi** we also received an e-mail that was provided to the Board in their packet, could Kaleb or the applicant speak to any noise that will generated at this location to provide with a level of understanding to what the noise level will be created by your particular operation?

**Kaleb Bourassa** yes, we held our neighborhood meeting last night and the abutter did attend that as well and we talked to him about the subject. He said as far as Sigco and Syntas companies create a lot of noise that is generated early in the morning with trucks entering and leaving and honking horns as well.

For both Emmie and David's businesses, they work normal hours. Emmie's business does work on Saturdays but these are vans and vehicles that come to work and do not honk their horns and there should not be any loud noise generated from this site.

**Rene Daniel** thank you

**Public Comment open**

None noted

**Public Comment closed**

**Rene Daniel does the Board have any questions, suggestions or comments?**

No comments

**Rene Daniel** I will remind you about landscaping and you mentioned about sidewalks, are there any sidewalks there?

**Kaleb Bourassa** yes there is an existing sidewalk on Spiller Drive.

*Showed sidewalk location on Screen*

**Kaleb Bourassa** we did receive Staff comments to have sidewalks internally so pedestrians will not be walking in the parking lot.

**Rene Daniel** I am assuming that your power will be underground?

**Kaleb Bourassa** yes correct.

**Rene Daniel** what kind of signage do you plan on having? On the building or a sign at the entrance?

**Kaleb Bourassa** David or Emmie would you like to speak to that?

**Emmie Christopher** we were planning on having signage on our building, above each of our doors, in the front and in the back.

**Rene Daniel** Kaleb, when do you plan to come to see the Board again?

**Kaleb Bourassa** we are planning on submitting for final submission on Thursday and will be at the next Planning Board meeting if all goes well.

**Rene Daniel** thank you Kaleb, Emmie and David.

*Emmie and David thanked the Board for their time.*

Rebecca Spitella introduced the item:

**8. 2020.24 – Subdivision, Site Plan - Brook Street Apartments – 171 Brook St - The Lefevres, LLC: The applicant is proposing a lot split and 9-duplexes, totaling 18-units, on an existing vacant lot. Tax Map: 019 Lot: 029 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2**

**Norm Chamberlain** as Rebecca said this is in Residential Growth Area Two

- Proposing nine duplex buildings for eighteen separate residences.
- Three bedrooms each.
- Proposing 500 feet of 20 foot wide road
- Currently showing a five foot sidewalk but will address later
- Two dedicated parking spaces for each unit one in the driveway and one in the garage with one additional space per unit 16-overflow spaces.
- Buildings will be served by City water
- Onsite septic systems
- The applicant has completed other projects within the City, namely Longfellow Street, Harrisburg Street and Merganser Street.

*Showed Longfellow Street Development, two story buildings with a garage and decks on screen*

- This is the kind of development that is proposed on Brook Street
- Quite a bit of elevation on this site, 30 feet of drop, three buildings will be above the road a bit and the remaining will be below with daylight basements
- Stormwater management in the detention pond
- The entire development will be in a Stormwater threshold so we are looking for detention in the pond
- The flat area near the CMP lines will be used for dedicated recreation area and a walking path in the woods
- We had Staff comments, the additional noticing fees that were paid today, minutes of the neighborhood meeting were sent to Staff yesterday, the question of this parcel that is split off the Wormell properties and are doing another split prior to this one and are doing it in a way so the three lots do not become a subdivision.
- Recreation Conservation Commission we are trying to get on the agenda for the July 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting
- There was a comment of the recreation area in the flood zone *shown on screen*
- This is what is on the flood maps and frequently can be wrong as this area is higher than the stream, the Flood Zone is closer to the stream
- Potential for habitat on the property and I looked at the Habitat Maps that Inland Fisheries has online and did not find anything but we will reach out to them and ask for any specifics in the area

- There is a comment on the nitrate study, we have done the nitrate study and having discussion with Staff about that now. We will let you know at the next submission
- Have HHE 200 forms for the site at final submission
- There was a comment on having a hydrant on the property

*Showed location of existing hydrant about 500 feet from entrance and another hydrant about 425 feet in the other direction*

- I question if we really need a hydrant, will ask the Fire Department if it is required
- We have been provided a truck turning template and have placed it on the site and the truck will turn around
- Software called auto pad that shows that movement as well
- Asked for a photometric plan and are looking at the smaller scale lighting fixtures
  - Will reach out to the company for the plan for 15 foot poles with not a lot of light coming from them
- There were a couple comments about sidewalks
  - We showed at grade and the reason is to raise the sidewalk at curb we would be going up and down and seemed like overkill
  - Showed you previous development that is wide open and lots of room for pedestrians and vehicles
- Would like to remove the sidewalk if we can as there is plenty of room. If we are required to have it, it would make more sense to have it at grade without curb facilitate plowing
- The other comment on the sidewalk was to extend it down toward Route 302
- If required we will place it to the property line as we have a concern about the road as there are no shoulders on the road so do we put a curb and a sidewalk next to the travel way or do we have an esplanade? A few issues that need to be addressed before the sidewalk goes there. The first thing that would happen is that we would have to move the neighbors split rail fence along the road and also run in to mailboxes, utility poles the hydrant.
- The several obstacles would make the installation of a sidewalk difficult.
- That addresses the Staff comments and I will open it up for questions.

**Rene Daniel** thank you Norm, Chris would you like to say anything?

**Chris LeFevres** for those who do not know me, I have been a developer for the last 10 or 11 years along with my Brother and my Mother as my Partners and have built duplexes mostly in residential areas as demonstrated on Harrisburg, Longfellow and Merganser in Westbrook. We are looking to do a similar project as those shown by Norm, although these will be slab so they will vary slightly. Happy to be working in Westbrook again.

**Rene Daniel** – Staff comments?

**Jennie Franceschi** the applicant did walk through the comments and have no additional comments beyond what has been discussed during the applicant's presentation. The Planning Board has received two abutter letters and would like the applicant to respond to the time of construction as well as how this development will fit into the neighborhood.

***Staff Comments:***

1. *Noticing Fees Due - \$174.45*

2. *Neighborhood Meeting is scheduled for June 25<sup>th</sup> ; Please provide documentation (attendance and minutes) to Planning Office*
3. *Standard boundary survey shows lots as merged. Documentation needed to demonstrate that the two parcels are separate parcel and have not been merged into single ownership. Legal review of parent parcel's division is required.*
4. *Provide stamped boundary survey of the lot split with final application*
5. *Open Space requirement – 5,400 sf – Provide an open space plan with final submission. Plan will need to be presented to the Recreation and Conservation Commission for recommendation prior to the public hearing with the Planning Board.*
6. *Recreation area is currently located within the flood zone which proposed uses would need to be reviewed.*
7. *High Value Habitat shown on Beginning with Habitat map – Provide letter from IF&W reviewing layout and verifying development does not impede into High Value habitat areas.*
8. *Driveway will need to be named for E-911 purposes. Provide 3 potential names to Linda Gain in the PACE office to verify with Public Safety.*
9. *Provide a landscaping plan with final submission (Applicant is working with Peter Burke)*
10. *Landscape Architect is required to be on team for design of subdivisions of >5 units or lots.*
11. *Provide ABS letter from PWD*
12. *Provide nitrate study to demonstrate requirement of 10 ml at westerly property line and 75-foot setback from Minnow Brook*
13. *HHE-200 forms required with final submission*
14. *Private fire hydrant internal to the project required*
15. *Provide a turning template (Staff to send)*
16. *Photometric plan required with final submission*
17. *Sidewalks - Staff suggests the construction of a sidewalk beginning at the project driveway and continuing westerly along the frontage of the abutting three properties (map/lots 059-039, 059-040 and 058-017) to total approximately a third of the distance from the project site to Brook Street where there is existing infrastructure.*
18. *Provide raised sidewalk internal to the development – plan shows at-grade pedestrian path*
19. *Clarity needed on number of bedrooms will the units be providing.*

**Board Action:**

1. *Provide feedback to applicant*
2. *Schedule a public hearing (upon receipt of a final application)*
3. *Related to a Site walk, Staff can:*
  - a. *Provide a virtual street view site walk during the meeting to show the Board the location, or*
  - b. *Have the applicant conduct a video tour of the property and provide to Staff to email to all the Board members and post to the Website for the public as part of the next submission packet, or*
  - c. *Schedule an on-site tour “virtually” similar to the Bridge St Project.*

**Norm Chamberlain** Chris has met with the direct abutting neighbor regarding screening for her property. The timing of construction will be within normal working hours. There is nothing out of the ordinary there. The other comment about this not fitting into the neighborhood, this is an allowed use by the Zoning Ordinance so it seems reasonable that if this is allowed we should be allowed to do it. It seems to be an appropriate development.

**Rene Daniel** Thank you.

### **Open public comment**

**Susan Everhart** 169 Brook Street. I am the direct abutting neighbor. I submitted a letter to the Planning Board. I understand that the Wormell farm will be developed. My largest concern is the timing of this during the Pandemic where I am working full time from home right now with no office to go to. I know that Norm spoke to the timing but it is sort of an unusual circumstance in the Nation right now so that was my largest concern.

I do have an issue with how large these units are. My house is only 1400 square feet. These are right on my property line. To me, it does not fit in the neighborhood.

The other question I have is that I am not aware of any duplexes in Ward 5. I was wondering if the Board could look into that and answer that question for me.

**Charlene Bisson** 73 Brook Street I am concerned about the sidewalks that would be on Brook Street from Susan Everhart property that goes to my property next door to Susan's property and the property next to me. My concern is I am not sure how far that would encroach onto my property or anyone else. I have a Maple Tree with a Hosta garden surrounded by rocks that I put in. I have a large berm that takes up space in that whole area with large growth. I am concerned about curb appeal and I think it would take a lot away from the curb appeal of my lot. I do not know how much the City would take away from the property. I do not think you can install a sidewalk without impacting these gardens. This may not be the correct time to mention this, I would be glad to talk to someone privately but I did want to mention my concern.

**Rene Daniel** any further public comments?

None noted

### **Public comment closed**

**Rene Daniel** who can answer the question about the sidewalk.

**Norm Chamberlain** we agree that it does not seem reasonable to install a sidewalk in this area. If you look at the site, there is a lot of things that people have done with their yards, that may be in the right of way on Brook Street but I think a sidewalk along Brook Street would put it right in their front yard. We do not want to be a part of that, let's put it that way.

**Rene Daniel** that doesn't answer the question.

**Norm Chamberlain** her point is that if we put a sidewalk in there and possibly knock out her trees and landscaping could possibly impact her trees or landscaping and we agree with that. It would take Ms. Everhart's fence, it would take the trees and landscaping boxes and push them back towards the houses.

**Rene Daniel** I would think that we should begin by knowing if these items are on City or Private property. Without knowing we are making assumptions that does not benefit anyone. So we need clarity whether the fence and hasta are on City or private property. I personally am a garden lover, but if my garden is on City property my garden is illegally placed. I would feel more comfortable if we knew for sure.

Did anyone catch another question?

**Jennie Franceschi** Ms. Everhart did bring up a concern about construction interference. The scale of the units and a follow-up question where there are other Ward 5 duplex locations that would be a follow-up answer.

**Rene Daniel** we will have to follow up on these items. Either Staff or the Developer will have an answer at the next meeting. I open the floor to comments from the Board.

**John Turcotte** I couldn't tell from the existing conditions of the plan to the sketch plan as to whether there is already a natural buffer between the applicant's property and Ms. Everhart. Personally I would prefer a natural buffer opposed to fences in this area. I could not tell if there were more trees or natural vegetation between there. That is something I would like to see.

I was curious about the parking because there appeared to only be one space per unit, but I assume the second will be in the garage.

I checked the sidewalk from google earth and offer no opinion at all but it does look like many of the fences and improvements are probably in the City's right-of-way. That is an issue that we need to have answered.

**Rebecca Dillon** I would like to have the sidewalk on Brook Street evaluated to see what can and cannot be done, which might involve a discussion with the neighbors. But it is worth investigating further. I am also in favor of the internal sidewalk with the number of units that are proposed. That makes sense to keep that sidewalk.

There is concern with the buildings fitting into the fabric of the neighborhood, having variety and I struggle with this all the times as this is a subjective issue. In basic terms the buildings have sloped roofs, porches, residential siding, residential windows, so a very simplistic sense they do fit in with the other buildings in that area. When you look at the footprint of the proposed buildings compared to the footprint of the adjacent buildings across the street, the original farm house I believe, the Leroy Wormell home, the footprint of theses duplexes is smaller than the Wormell building so I do think in a very simple sense they do fit into the neighborhood.

Is there a way the applicant could look at adding variety in siding colors so as to not have 18 units with the same color scheme.

**Jason Frazier** I have concerns with the driveway. The intersection with Brook Street is directly across from the Wormell house across the street. Is there an option to shift the driveway down and shift the houses back with more buffer?

My other comment is I am in favor of the internal sidewalk and think it should be raised. Having the sidewalk at grade is just a bike lane.

**Robin Tannenbaum** I am struggling with this a little bit. I appreciate the applicant showing the other projects as I am familiar with those and I believe the projects have been quite successful. What is different with those projects is they have been infill and in more suburban areas, as they fit the housing pattern.

I would argue that this is a new paradigm for this area. I feel there is a lot of work that could be done on how these are situated. I feel like the buildings could be reorganized to provide a feel that fits this area. The other buildings pattern have the long face of the building face the road. Would like this to be looked at with more detail and possibly rearranged so that you are not only viewing the back of a building from either direction along Brook Street. I do not know what the answer is, but would like to have it looked at a little more.

I also think this site plan doesn't acknowledge the extreme topography. I am interested in seeing the integration of this with the topography might influence the building layout and add something that is more site specific or responsive.

I am fairly neutral on the sidewalk in general. I like sidewalks in neighborhoods but looking at the plan, to me it is one massive driveway, with constant rows of parking on either side. In my mind the benefit of a sidewalk is fairly small. I would rather see that effort go into better recreation areas. I think you are fighting an uphill battle when I see so much pavement.

Those are my comments and will like to see efforts go into trying to make the development fit the land/neighborhood better.

**Larry McWilliams** I am in support of sidewalks within the project. Looking at the Harrisburg project, it looks tight when people back the cars up, not knowing where kids could be.

I would like to see sidewalks on Brook Street. I know it is a narrow road and would disagree on the sidewalk from Route 302 down.

I am not usually a fan of duplexes but think duplexes will fit well at that location on Brook Street. The farmhouse/barn has been in disarray for many years and a new addition for this type of development into Ward 5, I would encourage it. Thank you for bringing this development to Westbrook.

**Ed Reidman** are they going to tear down the yellow barn?

**Norm Chamberlain** Yes, all existing buildings will be removed.

**Ed Reidman** I live off of Brook Street almost into Falmouth and the volume of traffic during the morning and evening rush hour is tremendous. I would like to see a sidewalk for safety.

**Rene Daniel** I would like to see a landscaping plan on the next submission. I assume the CMP connection will be underground from Brook Street property line.

I would like to have assurance from the Staff that the floodplain will not flood recreational area. I certainly would feel more comfortable, especially with children, to have hydrants close as possible and would like to see one on site.

I believe that a raised sidewalk internal to the development is necessary, especially with development that will have young children.

Norm referred to daylight basements as well as slabs. I would like clarification on which is proposed.

**Norm Chamberlain** the three buildings on the uphill side will be slab-on-grade. The other buildings could have full basements, if they would like.

**Rene Daniel** the other thing that puzzles me is that you refer it as a road and then refer to it as a driveway. When you speak to driveway are you referring to the area to the garage? Or is the road going to be a street accepted road or a driveway?

**Norm Chamberlain** proposing a private road/driveway if you will. I was saying the section where the garage is as a driveway.

**Rene Daniel** I would like to see sidewalk on Brook Street. I do have empathy for those who care for properties into the front of the property, City right-of-way. Would like the developer to have an ongoing conversation with landowners as well as City Staff to make sure that we know where the boundary lines are so we can have the least impact possible as the project progresses.

I want to thank Chris LeFevres for his other developments, job well done.

**Chris LeFevres** thank you and I appreciate that.

**Jennie Franceschi** would you like the applicant to respond to Planning Board comments/questions.

**Rene Daniel** Norm, can you address?

**Norm Chamberlain** noted comments about sidewalks and traffic.

**Jennie Franceschi** this could come out from your next submission but the potential about talking on the variability of other design elements, construction materials, color are items that could be brought in as part of the final submission.

**Chris LeFevres** this is a subjective matter and I can point out a subdivision in Portland that I believe is called Summer Place that the houses are all a different colors but structure is the same, but I am amiable to changing it up to please the Board and the neighbors to make it look more esthetic. We felt that what we built in the past fit the neighborhoods that we built them in with a clean look. I am open to discussions on that for sure. I am not sure who to have that discussion

**Norm Chamberlain** there was also a comment on changing the layout on the site, the problem is with the grade elevation variation from the barns to the pond it really limits us to this layout. The new layout actually has a little curve at the end of the road to follow that grade but there is not much opportunity to change and still have access to the garages from the road.

**Rene Daniel** Chris if in Jason Frazier, would you like to have the virtual site walk now?

**Jason Frazier** yes.

*Jennie Franceschi shared screen for the virtual site walk and walked along frontage of property along Brook Street. Located trees, mailboxes, fence and landscaping in question. Showed topo, stream area and flood plain area on GIS.*

**Rebecca Dillon** In regards to our Ordinance and the language that over 5-unit subdivision, a multidisciplinary team including a Landscape architect. Would like to know who the landscape architect is and what their involvement has been to date. Something like that could address what Robin's comments were.

**Norm Chamberlain** Peter Burke has been retained to help us with this. I have spoken with him and he agrees with the limitations of this site and the layout as proposed and the layout of the site and the organization.

**Rene Daniel** may I ask for a motion to come out of workshop to address Planner's business.

**Robin Tannenbaum** so moved.

**2<sup>nd</sup> by John Turcotte**

**Roll Call Vote:**

<b>Jason Frazier (Ward 2)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Joseph Marden (Ward 3)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Robyn Tannenbaum (Ward 4)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Rd Reidman (Ward 5)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>John Turcotte (At Large)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Nancy Litrocapes Alternate)</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Larry McWilliams (Alternate)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Vice Chair Rebecca Dillon (Ward 1)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Chairman Rene Daniel (At Large)</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**Motion carries**

**Jennie Franceschi** Two items of business. We will be moving out of Zoom format and coming back to live meetings for the July 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

We have been working with Staff and City Councilors to hold a meeting at the Performing Arts Center. Ask everyone who would like to attend to wear a mask and Planning Board members to be masks. Proper social distancing will be observed. If anyone has any question reach out to Planning Office with questions.

Also, MMA is having a zoom format for Planning Board training. Would like any Board members who have not had an MMA to reach out to Linda to request to be registered. Also open to Board members who have attended and would like a refresher we would like to offer this training.

**Rene Daniel may I have a motion to adjourn?**

**Robin Tannenbaum so moved.**

**2<sup>nd</sup> by John Turcotte**

**Roll Call Vote:**

<b>Jason Frazier (Ward 2)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Joseph Marden (Ward 3)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Robyn Tannenbaum (Ward 4)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Rd Reidman (Ward 5)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>John Turcotte (At Large)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Nancy Litrocaples Alternate)</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Larry McWilliams (Alternate)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Vice Chair Rebecca Dillon (Ward 1)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Chairman Rene Daniel (At Large)</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**Motion carried**

**Adjourned**