



WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 2020
WESTBROOK MIDDLE SCHOOL



**WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 2021, 7:00 P.M.
MINUTES**

Present: Rene Daniel (Chair) (At Large), Jason Frazier (Ward 2), Robyn Tannenbaum (Ward 4), John Turcotte (At Large), Larry McWilliams (Alternate), Karen Axelsen (Alternate)

Absent: Rebecca Dillon (Vice-Chair) (Ward 1), Nancy Litrocapes (Ward 3), Ed Reidman, (Ward 5)

Staff: Jennie Franceschi, Planning & Code Director; Rebecca Spitella, Associate Planner

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.

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes

Rene Daniel asked for a motion to approve the June 1, 2021 Planning Board minutes.

John Turcotte move to approve the June 1, 2021, minutes with edit to state **Karen Axelsen** as present.

2nd by Jason Frazier

The vote is 6-0 in favor

NEW BUSINESS

Rebecca Spitella introduced item:

3. 2021.22 – Conditional Use – 630 County Road – A1K9, LLC – Public Hearing: The applicant is requesting approval to offer boarding services for up to 6 dogs at their existing dog training and daycare facility located at 630 County Road. Tax Map: 002 Lot: 024B Zone: Industrial Park District Use: Boarding Kennel

Taylor Gross presented aspects of the request approval to offer boarding services for up to 6 dogs at their existing dog training and daycare facility located at 630 County Road. We would like to offer 24/7 board and 24 hour services. Showed pictures of existing facility, indoor facility for training and gym for dogs, Will be paving the driveway by October. Will be expanding services for dog grooming as well. Will be on-site with the facility to ensure any issues are addressed by himself or an employee. I would like to live within the building when I have long extended boarding. Dogs will get exercised, trained and conditioned.

Presentation on file at the Westbrook Planning Department and on the Westbrook Website link shown below:

<https://westbrooktv.viebit.com/player.php?hash=mnmSyol1NrXQ>

Rene Daniel Staff Comments?

Jennie Franceschi provided Staff comments: The applicant is proposing to provide 4-5 parking spaces along the front of the building and will be paving the entrance and parking area as part of this application. The applicant has been operating as a service business in this location but would like to add Boarding Services to their business.

Rene Daniel open Public Hearing

No comments

Rene Daniel close Public Hearing

Rene Daniel Board comments?

No Board comments

Rene Daniel did you consider having any landscaping?

Taylor Gross where about?

Rene Daniel around your building

Taylor Gross around the building will be tarred. We are not proposing, as around the building is technically not my space, it would be an owners issue as I am only a leasee.

Rene Daniel may I have a motion?

John Turcotte move to grant a Conditional Use Permit for A1K9, LLC for a boarding kennel located at 630 County Road Tax Map: 002 Lot: 024B Zone: Industrial Park District is approved with condition and the following findings of fact, conclusions, and conditions as stated on pages 2 through 3 of this Staff Memo dated June 11, 2021, are adopted in support of that approval.

Conditional Use – Finding of Fact

Standard	Finding
Landscape Environment and Enhancement	The operation of the proposed use is within the limits of the existing structure(s) on the site. No additional clearing is required. The currently gravel driveway and parking area will be paved to provide adequate site stabilization for the increase in use.
Surface Water Drainage	The operation of the proposed use is within the limits of the existing structure(s) on the site. No changes to the existing stormwater management are proposed. The addition of any additional buildings or structure will require updated surface drainage plan as part of the building permit process.
Water, Air, Soil Pollution	Animal waste will be contained in appropriate trash receptacles and removed from the site so as to not impact water/air/soil in the surrounding area.

Soil Integrity	The currently gravel driveway and parking area will be paved to provide adequate site stabilization for the increase in use.
Natural Environment	Not applicable
Nuisance Factor	The site is located within the Industrial Park District, which is appropriate for a commercial operation. The operation provides for a fenced area for outdoor animal play/training. The use includes 24-hour staffing to address evening care of the boarded animals.
Special Features	The fenced play yard is setback from the road and not located within the close vicinity of any residential zones or abutters.
Vehicular Access	Vehicular access is via an existing curb cut from County Road.
Parking and Circulation	The currently gravel driveway and parking area will be paved to provide adequate site stabilization for the increase in use. A minimum of 4-5 stiped parking spaces will be provided associated with the boarding kennel use.
Public Services	The use does not generate an unreasonable burden on available public services.

Conclusions

1. The landscape **is** preserved in its natural state insofar as practicable and **is** designed so as to stabilize the slopes and buffer the site, where necessary.
2. Surface water drainage **does not** have an adverse effect on surrounding properties, downstream water quality, soil stability or the storm drainage system.
3. The development **will not** cause unreasonable water, air, or soil pollution
4. The development **will not** cause unreasonable soil erosion or reduction in the capacity of the soil to hold water.
5. The development **does not** have an unreasonably adverse effect on a historic site or irreplaceable natural areas
6. The development **does not** cause unreasonable noise, odors, dust, gas, fumes, smoke, light, or other annoying or dangerous emissions.
7. Exposed storage areas, machinery installation, service and loading areas and similar facilities **are** set back, screened, or buffered so as to minimize any possible adverse effect on the surrounding uses.
8. The site layout **does** provide for safe vehicular access and egress, including that for emergency vehicles.
9. The layout of vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns **does** provide for safe interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic and storage of plowed snow. Parking **does** comply with the parking requirements set forth in the Ordinance.
10. The development **does 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.

Conditions:

1. Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated May 21, 2021, 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. Site entrance and 4-5 parking spaces shall be paved and appropriately striped prior to an increase in boarding of more than 12 animals/day or 6 animals/night or by Fall 2021 whichever comes first.

3. Animal waste will be stored in appropriate containers to avoid unreasonable odors. Trash removal required at an adequate frequency to avoid attraction of animals or pests.

2nd by Robin Tannenbaum

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

Rebecca Spitella introduced item:

4. **2021.11 – Site Plan, Subdivision – 21 Saco Street - Storage Realty Corporation – Public Hearing: The applicant is proposing a mixed-use development with first floor commercial and 29-residential units on the second, third and fourth floors. Tax Map: 028 Lot: 075 and 077 Zone: City Center District, Residential Growth Area 1 Use: Dwelling, Multiple-Family - TABLED AT APPLICANT'S REQUEST**

Rene Daniel explained the item is tabled at the applicant's request to review legal documentation. All abutters were received notification in the mail post card notification in advance of the next meeting. In addition Agendas are posted to the City website approximately two weeks in advance of any of our meetings. You may sign up to receive an e-mail notification when a new agenda is posted to the City website. Please contact the Planning Department for assistance of signing up of the notifications. May I have a motion to move forward?

Robin Tannenbaum move the Site Plan, Subdivision for Storage Realty Corporation for a mixed use development with first floor commercial and 29-residential units located at 21 Saco Street be tabled.

2nd by Karen Axelsen

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

Rebecca Spitella introduced item:

5. **2021.16 – Referral from City Council – Amendment to the Land Use Ordinance - §335-1.8 Definitions; New Section §335-2.29.1 – Solar Energy System; Article V – Zoning Districts; §335 Attachment 1, Table 1 Land Use Table – Public Hearing: The proposed amendment establishes a Solar Energy System Ordinance. The intent of the Ordinance is to define Residential, Commercial and Accessory Solar Energy System Uses, establish performance standards and determine appropriate districts for each use throughout the community.**

Jennie Franceschi provided overview use;

Presentation on file at the Westbrook Planning Department and on the Westbrook Website link shown below:

<https://westbrooktv.viebit.com/player.php?hash=mnmSyo1iNrXQ>

Ordinance Description:

A referral from the City Council through the Administration: The proposed amendment establishes a Solar Energy System Ordinance. The intent of the Ordinance is to define Residential, Commercial and Accessory Solar Energy System Uses, establish performance standards, and determine appropriate districts for each use throughout the community.

Ordinance History

May 4, 2021 – Planning Board Workshop
June 15, 2021 – Public Hearing

Staff Comments

Updated Solar Ordinance has been provided to the Board based on feedback provided during the 5/4/2021 Planning Board Workshop: (Document is highlighted in yellow where changes were made from the 5/4/21 workshop document.

- 1) Concern on Height limitations for Solar components
 - a. We have altered the language to be consistent with how we address Chimneys and antennas and pulled the proposed language from existing ordinance sections.
 - b. In summary, solar components are not considered part of the roof system as it pertains to height limitation, but there is a 10' max over the roof height which is a limit already utilized in our ordinance for Chimneys/Antennas.
- 2) Concern on Commercial SES operations in the Rural District
 - a. The board has been provided additional standards for Commercial SESs in the rural district in response to the concerns raised on clearing in the Rural areas.
 - b. There is a bit of a balancing act we are proposing where we see the value in Solar's carbon reduction in relationship to the type of vegetation that is being cleared for these systems.
 - c. We have included parameters for the City to review the value of the land from a habitat perspective to restrict or prevent a CSES from clearing out a high value habitat area.
 - d. We have also been informed that in Clearing an area of overgrowth, a meadow can be planted to provide an ecosystem that is needed for the pollinators. These are the components of "balancing" that Staff is trying to achieve in the edits provided for the Boards consideration.
 - e. If the Board does not agree that CSES's should be in the Rural district at all, then the text in red would be deleted, which would then prohibit CSES in the RD.
 - i. Staff would request the Board to review this item and determine if you wish to take a vote to amend the language as proposed to prohibit CSES's in Rural District. (Remove all red text from the Document to then send to the City Council.)

Summary from the 5/4/2021 Staff Memo for reference: The City has wanted to look at modern uses that need to evolve with the times to include in our zoning land use tables. Recent advances in Solar Energy have pushed staff to look at how to afford this use to our citizens, with performance standards. Currently, we can only place Solar Arrays in the Manufacturing District as without a specific definition, we have had to define Solar Arrays, from a land use perspective, as "light manufacturing". This has been extremely limiting is not reflective of good planning practices regarding land value and the most appropriate locations to place commercial solar arrays.

After receiving several requests from landowners inquiring about solar arrays on their properties, the Administration tasked Staff with drafting a Solar Ordinance. As is typical when developing new Ordinances, Staff first reviewed the region to research how other municipalities regulate solar energy systems as well as several model ordinances to determine a regulatory structure that is appropriate to this community. Many communities regulate solar energy systems by size; however, Staff found this methodology difficult to translate between communities (for example, a "small" solar array would look very different in a community with a 1 – 2-acre minimum lot size vs a more urban setting) and this did not seem to accomplish the local need of allowing solar harvesting in areas where commercial development is not appropriate (residential nature of the zone, lack of utility infrastructure, etc.) while preserving the commercial districts for growth that will support industry, taxation and employment. Staff is recommending that, rather than regulating by size or production, the City adopt an Ordinance that regulates by use category.

The goal of this Ordinance is to 1.) Define and establish standards for commercial solar arrays, where the array may be the primary use on the site and the energy produced may be sold back to the grid; 2.) Permitting

commercial arrays at locations that does not utilize the high value lands that could otherwise be used for commercial operations that build a greater tax base, while also not prohibiting a principal commercial use from having a smaller array to offset on site energy production; and 3.) Defining such commercial use(s) in a manner that does not unintentionally prohibit or create an overburdensome process for residents to install solar panels on their homes/properties.

To achieve this, the proposed Ordinance before the Board defines a Solar Energy System and creates three uses to be incorporated into the land use table:

- Solar Energy System, Commercial (CSES)
 - Used to harvest solar energy beyond the needs of any other uses located on the parcel (if any) and for the purpose of selling back to the grid.
 - May be the principal use on a property.
 - Permitted in the RGA1, RGA2, RGA3 and Rural Districts only
 - Subject to setbacks from major corridors to limit visual impact.

- Solar Energy System, Accessory Commercial (ACSES)
 - Used to harvest solar energy to offset the energy consumption of a commercial use on the same property.
 - Permitted in all districts.
 - Must be located behind principal structure to limit visual impact.

- Solar Energy System, Residential (RSES)
 - Used to harvest solar energy to offset the energy consumption of a residential use on the same property.
 - Permitted in all districts.

As proposed in the draft Ordinance, all Solar Energy Systems would be subject to the provisions and standards of Site Plan review and would therefore require Planning Board review if the disturbance is greater than 3,000 sf or will be reviewed by the Code Enforcement Officer if less than 3,000 sf. The intent of these provisions is to ensure the larger arrays, which will likely comprise of most “CSES” operations, receive a comprehensive review to ensure all land use standards and life safety measures are met and the operation does not create issues for abutting properties with respect to erosion, drainage etc. Solar Arrays that are smaller in scale and therefore less likely to create an impact on surrounding properties, such as a “ACSES” or “RSES”, can be processed through the Code Enforcement Office which allows for a more expeditious review process while still requiring surface drainage is addressed through the building permit process. It is still the intent that if an “ACSES” or “RSES” creates as disturbance greater than 3,000 sf, it is subject to the standards of Site Plan review.

The draft language does not conflict with State law and has been reviewed by the City solicitor.

Rene Daniel open Public Hearing

No comments

Rene Daniel close Public Hearing

Rene Daniel Board comments and discussion?

John Turcotte I understand that this is a passive commercial use in the sense you install the solar array and other than maintenance, you do not have to do anything else, but what other commercial uses are permitted in the Rural District?

Jennie Franceschi read the commercial uses in the Rural Zone into the record as follows:

Adult Day Care
Accessory Use
Bed-and-Breakfast Class 1
Cemetery
Church
Day-Care Center
Extractive Industry
Dwelling, Single-Family
Dwelling, Two-Family
Farm
Golf Course
Home Occupation
Horticulture
Municipal Facility
Neighborhood Grocery
Telecommunications Facility
Telecommunications Tower
Veterinary Clinic
Campgrounds

Rene Daniel are you all set John?

John Turcotte my concern is someone would buy a sizable piece of rural property, level it and cover it with solar arrays, that is the concern that some people might not like that. Having said that anyone could buy the same property and level it themselves and they do not have to have permission to do that. In terms of other uses it is not as disruptive for lack of better words as an extraction or anything like that. I guess since we do not have anyone objecting, as long as we have the protections that are stated I am okay with it.

Larry McWilliams I agree with John, I was concerned about clear cutting the trees on the farm lands but I think with the protections as written and as they have to come before the Board, we have the opportunity to object or allow commercial business. For the record, I am not in favor of clear cutting to place solar arrays on a rural property.

Rene Daniel anyone else?

Jennie Franceschi just to cover the last couple of statements, the maximum gross density factor is 40%, and understanding that solar array does not have complete gravel coverage we have afforded a little flexibility to that particular statement. We could make a statement like: "the perimeter of the solar array fenced area cannot be more than 40% of the lot coverage." We could say that is the concern is too much in the Rural District.

John Turcotte if the language went in as is and an applicant comes before you and they have a meadow and they are covering 60%, how is density treated? Would it be allowed or not allowed?

Rebecca Spitella that standard was written and is a little confusing. There were other examples of many different ways to determine lot coverage in other communities and how they handle their solar ordinances. Some did handle it with the aggregate of the entire array and others used the footprint of the impervious area and others went even less than that and took into consideration of the angle of the panel itself. Instead of picking one of those standards it was left in that manner to take a look at the site and look at the ground treatment underneath to determine how to handle that lot coverage. It would ultimately be the Boards decision on how the lot coverage is handled.

John Turcotte as you said previously, that was reviewed by the City Solicitor and as Larry said as long as we have the ability for everyone that comes before us that has different situations, we have the ability to make a decision that it may be too much or something like that, as long as we have that ability I feel better about that.

Robin Tannenbaum the statement in red “3. In the Rural District, a CSES shall create a pollinator friendly habitat with meadow native grasses, where feasible, within the solar complex.” Is that too subjective? Do we need to require a certain percentage? It seems that could be taken a lot of different ways.

Jennie Franceschi looking at what we recently approved, the City landfills, we could not have put a true meadow on the particular site because it has to be a gravel top for that type of system to work. Typically of they are anchored into the ground, you have flexibility with the ground treatment. If they are looking to keep their cost down they are not going to bring gravels and gravel the area. It would be in their best interest to be a meadow.

Robin Tannenbaum that helps me, I thought it was more subjective. You are thinking more logistically. You cannot grow stuff on the landfill, I am comfortable with that then.

Rene Daniel may I have a motion to move this item forward?

Robin Tannenbaum move to recommend the proposed amendment to the Land Use Ordinance §335-1.8 Definitions; New Section §335-2.29.1 – Solar Energy System; Article V – Zoning Districts; §335 Attachment 1, Table 1 Land Use Table, to City Council for adoption.

2nd by Karen Axelsen

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

Rene Daniel may I have a motion to go to workshop?

Jason Frazier move to go to workshop

2nd by Larry McWilliams

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

WORKSHOP

Rebecca Spitella introduced item:

6. **2021.20 – Site Plan, Subdivision – 500 Spring Street – Westbrook Housing Group, LLC: The applicant is requesting a 59 single-family residential lot subdivision with 4-commercial lots along Spring Street located at the former Twin Falls Golf Course. Tax Map: 008 Lot: 008B Zone: Residential Growth Area 1, Shoreland Overlay Zone, Limited Residential and Resource Protection Use: Dwelling, Single-Family**

Shawn Frank Civil Engineer Sebago Technics presented aspects of the request for a 59 single-family residential lot subdivision with 4-commercial lots along Spring Street located at the former Twin Falls Golf Course.

Presentation on file at the Westbrook Planning Department and on the Westbrook Website link shown below:

<https://westbrooktv.viebit.com/player.php?hash=mnmSyoliNrXQ>

- Provided overview of 2018 approval which did not come to fruition.
- RGA1 district
- Could have 169 units but we are proposing 59 SF homes. Smaller lots and 4 commercial lots.
- Public Road system on sewer & water, curbing and sidewalks, with stormwater management and treatment pond. Sanitary sewer is available by pump station at Miles Lanes. Relocating the Pump Station into this project to allow gravity to flow from Miles Lane through the project and be pumped back up through Miles lane into Spring St.
- Preliminary discussion with Presumpscot Regional Land Trust. Open space plan to go to Recreation & Conservation Committee with land across Stroudwater to be provided to Presumpscot Regional Land Trust and creation of a trail system through project to the Presumpscot Regional Land Trust land.
- We have not uses for the commercial lots at this time.
- We are thinking more neighborhood like uses, medical office, etc. Would need to come back to board for review and approval.
- Army Corp review – no additional wetland impacts.
- The Maine Department Environmental Protection amendment is in process.
- We are just getting into the real design, and received Staff comments. Do not have any issues with the comments. Building will be removed from easement area. Cluster mailbox will be provided. Nice mix of single family homes in this neighborhood. I am here for any questions.

Rene Daniel Staff comments?

Jennie Franceschi presented comments from memo:

The letter of 6-11-21 from Presumpscot Regional Land Trust on initial comments related to the Open Space proposal is on file in the Planning Department.

1. Noticing: \$63.92
2. Provide documentation of neighborhood meeting to Planning Dept (attendance and minutes)
3. Trail access from pump station parking lot is shown through the “no disturb buffer” – may need to relocate pump station/trail access to another location as site is currently showing the drainageway complete filled by the pump station.
4. Connect with Presumpscot Regional Land Trust to discuss open space easement and land conveyance

5. Easement from Spring Street blocked by structure that crosses property line. Relocate easement (either from Spring Street but around structure or along northerly edge of Commercial Lot 1)
6. Twin Falls Drive name not available – Provide new proposed street name for E-911 verification.
7. Road naming will need to be reviewed as the layout does not follow traditional road naming flow. The first access to Spring St will be one name through to the T intersection point. The Second access from Spring St will need to have a different name that would continue all the way to the back lots (#10-21) as this would be the natural flow of the road. You could keep Bunker Way starting from the eastern Spring St access point and continue it all the way to Lot 9/48. Another named road will start at the Western access with Spring St and continue through to Lots 47/54 which would intersect with Bunker Way. Eagle Drive is fine.
8. Final plan set should show boundaries of sewer easement over this projects land and the abutting property to Miles Lane pump house.
9. Further collaboration needed regarding Spring Street pedestrian improvements – sidewalk, crosswalks and RRFBs at Jacqueline Way. Coordinate with 364 Spring Street project.
10. Redesign/reconnection of 364 Spring St project's sewer is the responsibility of this project.
11. Final plan design will need to collect runoff from northeasterly portion of project to prevent flooding issues in/over Spring Street
12. Mailbox – Provide location for cluster box and pull off area for mail deliver/pickup (Bus stop for school busses along Eagle Lane – Coordinate with School Transportation Department.)
13. Sidewalk along the entire frontage will be required and connection to the bus stop system at Landing Way in coordination with the 364 Spring St project.
14. Access to any of the commercial lots will be off of the internal street system of the project and not off of Spring St.
15. For next stage call out RP vs LR on plan for Shoreland Zoning.
16. SLOD amendment required & ACOE re-submittal required

Board Action

Provide feedback to applicant on this sketch plan application.

Rene Daniel opened Public comment period

Maris Bickford 535 Spring Street I think this is a wonderful project but am dismayed that there will be more traffic speeding by on Spring Street in front of my house. I wonder if there is some consideration of better traffic control that will be exacerbated by the addition of these single family houses.

Jared ? *(last name not legible) 17 Miles Lane expressed concerns about privacy to the existing neighborhoods, light pollution and noise pollution as these are in our back yards. Miles Lane residents live on a cul-de-sac and we are blocked in during high traffic times. We need some sort of traffic control to allow us to get out to Spring Street.

No further comments

Rene Daniel closed Public comment period.

Shawn Frank obviously we will update the traffic study and as I recall with the number of lots before we are looking at improvements at our intersection. As the Board is aware, the City is doing improvements on Spring Street, the signalized intersection with Eisenhower Drive and my understanding is the other end of Eisenhower on Saco Street will have a light as well and improvements along William Clarke Drive to allow better flow of traffic at the Saco and William Clarke Drive intersection.

From our project we will not require a traffic movement permit from Maine Department of Transportation, it will be through the City. Our anticipation is we will be looking at improvements at the intersection at Jacqueline Way. We feel that the new traffic light will provide gaps in the traffic to allow people to get in and out of the side streets. The traffic study will be provided to City Staff.

In terms of impacts to the lots on Miles Lane that perhaps the abutting project that has been recently approved is more an abutter to them. We have one lot that is along Miles Lane and our anticipation for single family homes that lot will be pretty much what it is today.

We will have the street lights along the streets that are no different to the houses on Miles Lane. It will be in keeping with the neighborhood.

Noise pollution, I do not think this will be out of the ordinary, it is a residential neighborhood. There will be noise with the initial construction, there are requirements with the City of when you can begin and end construction. Once the construction is complete, this will be a single family neighborhood, in keeping with the Miles Lane neighborhood.

Rene Daniel Board discussion or comments?

Jason Frazier Trail activity, happy to see the land trust being a part of this and can accommodate Presumpscot Regional Land Trust request.

Will there be sidewalks on both sides of the street within the development?

Shawn Frank the development will have a sidewalk on one side for the neighborhood pedestrian access and limits the overall increase to the impervious areas within the development.

Jason Frazier I like seeing the commercial components on Spring Street.

Shawn Frank we do think there will be some nice uses of the commercial lots down the road.

Larry McWilliams I like the coordination with Presumpscot Regional Land Trust connecting the trails and work with the neighborhood.

One other comment on this project is I like single family homes. I am curious to see the level and type of homes in the future meeting. The type of price range, will there be garages, setbacks, where they are located on the lots.

With light sin the neighborhood I am curious of any buffering, whether it is tree line, landscaping or natural buffers. I do not like fences. Different variation for the houses, not just the cookie cutter style houses that I see. Looking forward to seeing the designs of the homes that will be coming into that neighborhood.

Shawn Frank working with the design team they did had 5-6 house packages and design. It depends on width and style on the lots but at the next submission will provide you with the different styles of house types proposed.

Robin Tannenbaum it is a challenge with long narrow lots to place garages and not have the garages out front that this Board has established that they do not love. The Shoreland Zone area takes a large section of lots to build on – are lots viable?

Shawn Frank we are looking at many of the houses having walk out basements that provides another level of detail of houses we can have. We did get specific numbers from the designer on width.

Robin Tannenbaum I appreciate the comments from Presumpscot Regional Land Trust. The second to the last bullet point talks about a trail easement to allow for connectivity to the school trails and the ones that cross Landing Road. Between lot 16 and lot 17 refers to a stormwater area.

Shawn Frank I do think we can accommodate both, a trail on top of the berm and add another stormwater feature there.

Karen Axelsen the four commercial lots, do anticipate tenants?

Shawn Frank we do not have any specific tenants at this point. This proposal allows just the divisions of lots. We have included the impervious area with in our Stormwater feature, the wet pond. Each one of those lots, prior to getting developed will need to come back to board for site plan approval.

Karen Axelsen is any of this in the Flood Zone area?

Shawn Frank nearest to the river with no building of lots in the flood plain area.

Karen Axelsen when the grass started to grow when it was no longer a golf course, it seems that there was a lot of water on the road, then Spring Street got broken up. It seemed odd that when the land was not being taken care of it had more drainage onto Spring Street. It was odd as Spring Street was never wet before.

Jennie Franceschi that has been a concern of our Public Services Department that we are looking to have this project address as part of its project. Right now the water that is coming off of the properties on the easterly side of Spring Street continues to drain into the street and whether it was during the tree clearing activity that occurred during first project that may have blocked drainage, we are not exactly sure. Once the proper drainage is addressed off the road there should not be any issues.

John Turcotte I am happy to see sidewalk on Spring Street. Everyone knows we will hear concern on traffic on Spring Street, it is a nightmare in the morning and the evening. That is something you will have an earful, so be prepared. Very happy with the conservation areas, the trails and hope to see parking and signage so people will know it is there. All in all I like the project.

Rene Daniel on the last project go around, how many homes were proposed?

Shawn Frank 36

Rene Daniel and now 59 and I think it is a much better use of the property. Just for clarity, you will be working with the adjacent project?

Shawn Frank that is my understanding, we will tie into their sidewalk on Spring Street and continue that along our frontage along Spring Street that gets us to an existing easement that Presumpscot Regional Land Trust already has to go back of our project to the river to allow that connection between the trails.

Rene Daniel parking provided for trail use on site?

Shawn Frank the parking area is at the pump station area with a connection to the trail system with a sign to the proposed trails. Presumpscot Regional Land Trust will execute the trails.

Rene Daniel I appreciate the two City roads. I like the concept of City streets.

When you coming back?

Shawn Frank I am in the process of making a submission to Maine Department Environmental Protection and we are looking to report back to the Planning Board in the next 3 or 4 months. We will be back with topography, house lots, and house styles to get feedback while we wait for the MDEP permit.

Rene Daniel I would entertain a motion to adjourn from the workshop.

**Unidentified person wants to speak

Rene Daniel the Public comment period is closed

John Turcotte move to adjourn

2nd by Robin Tannenbaum

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

ADJOURN

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