



City of Westbrook

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

2 York St. Westbrook, Maine 04092 (207) 854-9105 Fax: (866) 559-0642

WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2007, 7:00 P.M. WESTBROOK HIGH SCHOOL, ROOM 114 MINUTES

Present: Ed Reidman, (Chair) (Ward 5), Rene Daniel (Vice-Chair) (Ward 1), Cory Fleming (At Large), Scott Herrick (Alternate), Michael Taylor (Alternate), Greg Blake (At Large)

Absent: Anna Wrobel (Ward 4), Dennis Isherwood (Ward 2)

Staff: Molly Just, Erik Carson, Rick Gouzie

Chairman Reidman called the Westbrook Planning Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in Room 114 of the Westbrook High School. Mr. Reidman informed the audience of the purpose for the public hearing, and asked everyone who would speak to do so at the podium, being certain to speak clearly and provide the Board with their name and address. Mr. Reidman stated that the Board would hear a presentation accept any additional Staff comments, and then receive questions and commentary from the public. Mr. Reidman noted that any questions received by the Board would be answered at the end of the public presentation. Mr. Reidman explained that any action taken at this meeting would be dependant upon time constraints.

Public Hearing – Final Subdivision Review - 360 Duck Pond Road - Terradyn Consultants LLC, on behalf of George T. Kirck, for the development of a four (4) lot subdivision on approximately 17 acres located on Old Farm Road. Tax Map: 036 Lot: 021 Zone: Residential Growth Area 3 and Prides Corner Smart Growth Area.

Jon Whitten Terradyn Consultants LLC, on behalf of George T. Kirck, explained aspects of the development of a four (4) lot single family subdivision on approximately 17 acres located on Old Farm Road. Tax Map: 036 Lot: 021 Zone: Residential Growth Area 3 and Prides Corner Smart Growth Area.

We attended the meeting on November 13, 2007 and a waiver was granted for a short dead-end road to come off an existing dead-end road; in this case Old Farm Road. The total acreage of the parcels is just under 17 acres and about two and a half (21/2) acre is a homestead, where Mr. Kirck resides with frontage on Duck Pond Road. No other portion of the property has frontage on Duck Pond

Road. The entire frontage for the four homes will be off a short dead end road with a cul-de-sac.

The lots are smaller, so we are using the cluster provision as stated in the ordinance. The substantial open space provided is an undeveloped wooded and field area with some wet areas. We have applied for a thirty (30) foot access easement that passes through lots three (3) and four (4) so all lots will have access to the open space. The thirty (30') foot right of way acts as an avenue for the storm water from the roadway to flow to the west as it does today.

There is a portion of the property, about three and one half (3 ½) acres that the applicant has proposed to convey to the abutters for buffering. The conveyance of land will have a time limit set on the portion of the parcel. The land not conveyed to the abutters will be reverted to open space.

The lots will have individual septic systems, public water, underground electricity, telephone and cable.

Street trees have been proposed near the sidewalk. The area of the development is basically a field area, and the trees have been identified that are ten (10) inches or larger.

Ed Reidman asked for comments from the staff.

Molly Just said the summary and the presentation from the last meeting is sufficient to describe the project. I would ask the Board members to please take note of the conditions for this project as mentioned on your memo.

Stanford Kenyon 25 Old Farm Road spoke in opposition of the project due to the traffic and the potential congestion at the entrance of the road which is to near the corner on Old Farm Road.

Ed Reidman explained that the variance was granted at the last meeting.

Richmond Knight 995 Bridgton Road spoke in opposition to this project due to the natural drainage from the Kirck property to Route 302 drains out at 929 – 945 Bridgton Road.

Mr. Knight also expressed concerns of what appears to be clear cutting of the trees on portions of the lot with no foliage to prevent washed out driveways after an extensive rain.

Mark Maguire 929 Bridgton Road asked the engineer if the trees identified as ten (10) inches or more would be left on the lot and not clear cut.

Mr. Maguire also expressed concerns about the drainage to the west of the development as his lot is west of the parcel. He explained that the natural drainage already goes in that direction towards the brook which has already flooded Route 302 during a significant rain storm.

I am continuing to discuss purchase options with Mr. Kirck on a portion of the parcel and can reassure the Board that no development will be on that portion of the parcel as it will remain green space.

Public Hearing Closed

Ed Reidman asked Jon Whitten about the identified trees ten (10") inches or more, is it your intention to leave those trees?

Jon Whitten said they would leave as many of the trees as possible. On the plan colored in the light green area the trees identified were marked after any of the cutting had been done. We do not have a definitive envelope where the buildings will be placed and what trees will need to be removed.

Ed Reidman asked if the whole lot has had tree cutting on it.

George Kirck said the entire lot area has been selectively cut and was part of the entire plan.

Ed Reidman asked about the drainage problem at the intersection of Old farm Road.

Jon Whitten said the plan shows the new roadway will be sloped southerly away from Old Farm Road and one catch basin will be installed, then the remaining drainage will flow to the west.

Ed Reidman asked Jon Whitten to review the drainage plan again.

Jon Whitten said the drainage in our models, given the topography of the area and given the vegetation that I have seen on the site; is called a wooded site for stormwater definitions. Given the center area of the parcel is a low area, it is considered a wetland. The actual introduction of a short road with the four (4) houses and there driveways, being introduced to that area did not have an overall increase in drainage for the western property line. The mathematical models we put together, given the topography and the vegetation (that remained after the selective tree removal actions), do not show that we have an increase in that area.

Ed Reidman asked where the point of exit for your drainage is.

Jon Whitten showed the area on the map.

Ed Reidman asked why you did not consider that area that you are going to convey.

Jon Whitten the ownership will remain in Mr. Kirck's name. At the time of this preparation, I was not aware of the conveyance of this portion of the property.

Ed Reidman said grass area to impervious area will increase the flow. By introducing the four (4) buildings, this will not affect the drainage?

Jon Whitten said that is correct. The large brown area on the map acts like a big pond, so that natural vegetated wet land area is basically allowed to take a little more water than it is receiving now, according to the mathematical models that we have processed.

Ed Reidman asked for Board if they had any additional questions.

Rene Daniel asked Jon Whitten to describe the kind of curbing in the original plan.

Jon Whitten said according to my memory, it is Cape Cod bituminous curb.

George Kirck said it is granite around the drive where the roads come together.

Jon Whitten confirmed that it is granite curbing at the intersection, then it changes to a sloped bituminous.

Rene Daniel asked what kind of curbing on the new three (3) lots.

Jon Whitten said it would be granite at the intersection, then a type one bituminous type curb.

Rene Daniel asked what type of sidewalks is in the original homestead.

Jon Whitten said the sidewalk is asphalt paved, four (4) to five (5) foot side walks.

Rene Daniel asked what type of sidewalk will be installed for the new subdivision.

Jon Whitten said five (5) foot bituminous sidewalks.

No further comments

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – November 13, 2007.

Rene Daniel moved to accept the minutes as written

2nd by Cory Fleming

The vote was unanimous in favor 6-0

Continuing Business

3. Final Subdivision Review – 360 Duck Pond Road - Terradyn Consultants LLC, on behalf of George T. Kirck, for the development of a four (4) lot

subdivision on approximately 17 acres located on Old Farm Road. Tax Map: 036 Lot: 021 Zone: Residential Growth Area 3 and Prides Corner Smart Growth Area.

Ed Reidman asked the developer if a condition limiting the time that the applicant is able to make the land depicted as “Land to be conveyed to the abutters”. The staff recommends that three months should be sufficient.

George Kirk said six months would be better, but three months is appropriate.

Ed Reidman asked about the next condition; a conditions requiring more street trees per house lot. If you look at the plan, you propose to place three trees on lot four, three trees on lot one and one tree on lot two and one tree on lot three, which totals eight trees.

Jon Whitten said he did not place them per lot, but tried to balance them along the road.

Molly Just explained her new recommendation was not street trees, but trees on the property itself.

Ed Reidman said the last condition will prevent trees and large shrubs from existing areas being depicted as open space being removed, except as a certified arborist determines that it is absolutely necessary for the health of the specific trees or the surrounding trees. The conditions to be included in the Associations documents.

Jon Whitten said it is standard language.

Rene Daniel said that two (2) trees per lot are no longer sufficient. I agree with the Planner, Molly Just that more trees than what is on the plan should be planted on the lots. If Chairman Reidman is looking for a number of trees to be conditionally required it should be four (4) trees per lot on the street side.

On letter C I would like to add the phase: three months should be sufficient to the actual time, replace it with; the condition limiting the time to three (3) months that applicant

Should be sufficient is too open ended in my opinion.

Cory Fleming asked for clarification of the implications on this.

Molly Just explained the suggested time limit placed as a condition is due to the discussion with Mr. Kirck, stating that he has already had discussions with the abutters prior to coming before the Board thence the 3 months.

Cory Fleming asked Molly “So this is providing an option to the abutters to purchase the property, and making that offer of the purchase for a time of three (3) months.”

Molly Just said that after that time, if the abutters did not exercise that option, the land would revert back to the open space as stated in the homeowners’ association documents.

Ed Reidman asked when the plan becomes official. When it is recorded in the registry or when the Board signs it.

Molly Just said when Board signs the plan and it is registered at the registry.

Ed Reidman asked to be date specific and we placed three months on the date that it is recorded in the registry.

Molly Just said the time limit could alleviate some concerns if this part of the land is part of the subdivision approval.

Ed Reidman stated that until the Board acts and the document becomes official, which is when it is recorded at the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Mr. Kirck does not have an approved subdivision; therefore can not convey the land, until the subdivision is signed and registered.

Molly Just said that Rick Gouzie suggested not issuing a building permit until this issue is resolved.

Ed Reidman asked that you would say the condition is that the applicant makes the land depicted as land to be conveyed to others; no building permit shall be authorized, until this condition is met?

Molly Just said no building permits shall be issued until the land has been conveyed to the abutters.... Or something to the effect as this plan shall not become final until such time as

Ed Reidman said that we should restrict the limited amount of time condition and when it is going to disappear.

Scott Herrick suggested the condition be; from three months from the date of the vote by the Planning Board.

Ed Reidman agreed with Scott’s suggestion and stated, three months time frame.

Board in agreement

Ed Reidman asked Rene Daniel his suggestion the number of trees being planted on each lot.

Rene Daniel suggested four trees per lot on the street side and more trees on the other piece of property, due to the selective cutting.

The tree plantings need to be planted near the sidewalk.

Jon Whitten clarified that 16 trees are to be planted within the City right of way.

Rene Daniel confirmed that was Rene Daniel's interpretation.

Cory Fleming asked to add a condition for the blind spot between the streets. Would it be appropriate to ask that a stop sign be placed on the new street?

Ed Reidman stated the developer should place a stop sign at the intersection of the new street and Old Farm Road.

Mr. Reidman reminded Molly Just to have the stop sign installation reviewed by the Police Chief as meeting the requirements of the traffic ordinance.

Molly Just said that all the curbing within the subdivision will be granite.

Ed Reidman said that all curbing will be granite as stated in condition six (6).

Jon Whitten said granite curbing was mentioned on the plan.

Cory Fleming moved the Subdivision application for 360 Duck Pond Road on Tax Map: 036, Lot: 021 is to be **approved with conditions** with the following findings of fact and conclusions.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions

POLLUTION AND SEWERAGE DISPOSAL

- The proposed development will not result in undue pollution.

WATER

- The subdivision will be served by the public water system.
- The Portland Water District confirmed its ability to serve the project.

SOIL EROSION

- The City Engineer will monitor erosion control on the site.

TRAFFIC

- The proposed subdivision would be accessed from Old Farm Road, which is a dead-end street off Duck Pond Road. The addition of four units will not affect the traffic on Old Farm Road or Duck Pond Road.

SEWERAGE

- Septic systems are proposed.

SOLID WASTE

- Solid waste will be removed by the City of Westbrook.

AESTHETICS

- (1) Relationship of project to the site – The developed portion of the site will be closest to Duck Pond Road and will leave a significant amount of open space, largely consisting of wetlands, to the rear of the site.
- (2) Relationship of project to surrounding property – The proposed subdivision would be in between two newer subdivisions with generally complementary lot sizes.
- (3) Landscape Design – See Staff Comment #2. In addition, mature trees should be maintained on the site where practicable. Only one tree per house lot is proposed to be planted along the street.
- (4) Lighting – None proposed.
- (5) Signs – A project sign may be proposed for the subdivision and would be permitted by the Section 404 of the Ordinance.

CONFORMITY WITH LOCAL PLANS AND ORDINANCES

- This project conforms to the Comprehensive Plan and Ordinance except for the waiver for the dead-end street which was approved by the Planning Board (4-3 vote) which was approved because this option (subdivision access from Old Farm Road instead of Duck Pond Road) would have fewer transportation and environmental impacts.
- The Recreation and Conservation Commission voted to support the approval of the project (3 in favor and 1 abstention). The Commission supports the proposal, which includes a dead-end street off a dead-end street (Old Farm Road) because it has the least environmental impact and the least impact on the neighbors, and results in a shorter street than if another curb-cut was made on Duck Pond Road. The Commission acknowledges that the approximately 5 acres of open space have no apparent active recreational potential, but it still has inherent value to the area as a wetland/wildlife habitat.

FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL CAPACITY

- A letter of financial capacity has been provided.

RIVER, STREAM OR BROOK IMPACTS

- No direct impacts are found.

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 **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** with a 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. If any lots in the proposed subdivision have shore frontage on a river, stream, brook, or great pond as these features are defined in Title 38,

18. The long-term cumulative effects of the proposed subdivision **will not** unreasonably increase a great pond's phosphorus concentration during the construction phase and life of the proposed subdivision.
19. For any proposed subdivision that crosses municipal boundaries, the proposed subdivision **will not** cause unreasonable traffic congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of existing public ways in an adjoining municipality in which part of the subdivision is located.
20. Timber on the parcel being subdivided **has not** been harvested in violation of rules adopted pursuant to Title 12, section 8869, subsection 14.
21. The proposed subdivision **will not** negatively impact the ability of the City to provide public safety services.

CONDITIONS

1. Approval is dependant upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated November 6, 2007, the subdivision plan dated November 7, 2007, 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 Planning Board.
2. Trees and large shrubs existing in the area depicted as "open space" shall not be removed, except where a certified arborist determines that it is absolutely necessary for the health of a specific tree or surrounding trees. This condition shall be included in all of the association documents;
3. The applicant shall put in four (4) trees per lot along the street front, behind the sidewalk.
4. The applicant shall make the land depicted as to be conveyed to abutters", available to abutters for three months from the date of the Planning Board vote, at which time it shall revert to the association.
5. The applicant will install a stop sign at the corner of the new intersection created by the subdivision.
6. All curbing shall be granite.

Ed Reidman asked if there were any comments.

Rene Daniel stated he will vote in opposition of this subdivision due to concerns about a dead end road off a dead end road, the curve and the drainage.

2nd by Greg Blake

The vote was 5-1 in favor (Rene Daniel opposed)

4. Final Subdivision, Final Site Plan and Special Exception Approval Extension – Stroudwater Landing – Daniel J. Maguire, on behalf of

Stroudwater Landing, LLC, for a one (1) year extension of the Final Subdivision, Final Site Plan and Special Exception granted on May 1, 2007 for the creation of a 103 unit condominium project on a 65.3 acre parcel located on 449 Stroudwater Street and on a vacant parcel of land between 300 and 328 Spring Street. Tax Map: 9, Lot: 20 and Tax Map: 8, Lot: 3A, Zone: Residential Growth Area 1.

Daniel Maguire representing Stroudwater Landing and Sandy River Health System explained his request for the extension due to the Real Estate market. We are expecting to start the project towards the end of 2008 or early 2009 at the latest. We will go forward with the project. Our Department of Environmental Protection permits expire in 2009. Our City of Westbrook permits expire in May of 2008. We would respectfully request to extend our permit to May of 2009.

Ed Reidman asked for comments

No further comments

Ed Reidman suggested the following motion to state: to extend the final subdivision, final site plan and special exception approved on May 1, 2007 to May 1, 2009.

Rene Daniel moved to extend the final subdivision, final site plan and special exception approval that was granted on May 1, 2007 to be extended for one (1) year to May 1, of 2009.

2nd by **Scott Herrick**

The vote was unanimous in favor 6-0

New Business

5. Village Review – 78 Pleasant Street – Michael and Alicia Boissonneau for the construction of one two-unit dwelling and the removal of a shed and garage from the existing two-unit dwelling (to remain) property located at 78 Pleasant Street. Tax Map: 33 Lot: 100 Zone: City Center District: Overlay Zone: Village Review.

Mike Boissonneau presented aspects of the construction of one two-unit dwelling and the removal of a shed and garage from the existing two-unit dwelling (to remain) property located at 78 Pleasant Street. Tax Map: 33 Lot: 100 Zone: City Center District: Overlay Zone: Village Review.

Ed Reidman asked the applicant if he had recently purchased the property.

Mike Boissonneau said one year ago. The proposal and survey shows the proposed parking in the front, we are actually going to revise the parking. The proposed parking will be revised and placed in back of the property to be consistent with other properties along that street.

Ed Reidman asked for any questions from the Board.

Ed Reidman asked Erik for any comments.

Erik Carson said the Boissonneau's have worked hard to keep the plan consistent with other properties. Erik suggested an additional condition #9 to reflect moving the house forward and the parking lot in back as just suggested.

The committee is happy with the design. Mr. Boissonneau has worked diligently to ensure that this was consistent with the house on the corner and the house to the west, which is a better architecturally example of the period.

Ed Reidman said as he understands, on the William Clarke side drive side, there is an existing garage, that you are going to take down. On the main house facing Stroudwater you are going to take down the shed. Then when you move to the next piece of property which faces onto Pleasant, you are going to move the existing building to the front of the lot and the parking facing William Clark drive.

Mike Boissonneau said correct.

Ed Reidman asked if the applicant had any issues with the conditions added by the committee.

Mike Boissonneau said no.

Rene Daniel asked the applicant about the shed he is removing. How much is the shed and which portion is the home.

Mike Boissonneau explained that the shed is between the two decks to the left on the plan.

Rene Daniel asked the applicant if the parking is on the Stroudwater side – for that particular lot. Are you going to break that lot up, or keep it as one with two (2) buildings on it?

Mike Boissonneau said for the time being one lot.

Cory Fleming asked if you would sell this lot with two (2) houses on it.

Mike Boissonneau said they are not selling at this time; potentially it will be sold as two different lots with each house on each lot.

Cory Fleming asked if the garage and shed were original structure.

Mike Boissonneau said he did not believe it was part of the original structure.

Rene Daniel asked if there is going to be any upgrades to the present structure.

Mike Boissonneau said with the removal of the shed, the outside of the building will be brought back to match the rest of the structure.

Rene Daniel asked the applicant if there would continue to be two driveways, one on Pleasant and one on Stroudwater.

Mike Boissonneau yes

Rene Daniel asked for the reason for both driveways.

Mike Boissonneau said to provide parking for the tenants to accommodate more than two vehicles.

Rene Daniel said you would propose to put a new driveway with four (4) parking spaces.

Mike Boissonneau said yes.

Erik Carson clarified the shed and the addition were not part of the original house. The removal of this will enable him to create the two (2) unit residential development.

Cory Fleming said she was looking at the historic nature of the building and whether that was something that was we wanted to preserve.

Erik Carson said in this circumstance the existing building has lost some of its architectural features. I am a little less concerned about the shed; the main building will have enough character to reflect the history.

Mike Taylor asked if the applicant was going to have three (3) entrances to this lot.

Mike Boissonneau yes

Mike Taylor asked the applicant to consider eliminating one entrance.

Mike Boissonneau said that would be ideal, but did not know how that would accommodate the parking where the existing building is.

Mike Taylor asked the applicant; are you going to have a lighted parking area?

Mike Boissonneau said that from the back entrance of the building there would be a flood light. There are no plans for a lamp post.

Mike Taylor asked the applicant if there are any plans for a buffer between the buildings.

Mike Boissonneau said there is a partial fence towards the back of the lot and shrubs on the side of the lot.

Molly Just suggested with the shed being removed a shared driveway could come between the two buildings.

Mike Boissonneau said he wanted to avoid a shared driveway. If in the future, there was a sale of one building a shared driveway could be a complication.

Erik Carson what we are trying to accomplish is discontinuing entering into the lot so close to the corner. You could create a width-and-a-half sized driveway, which could be split and have shared access with a shared easement. This could eliminate the Boards concern of having another curb cut so close to the intersection.

Rene Daniel asked staff if the abutter notifications were sent out.

Molly Just said yes.

Mike Boissonneau said Dick Eaton who did the survey, of the property and lives two (2) houses away is totally aware of the project.

Rene Daniel asked Chairman Reidman what the next step is for this project.

Ed Reidman explained that the Board needs to find this project within the standards of the Village Review Zone and approves the plan with conditions mentioned on the memo.

Rene Daniel commended the applicant for his project but wants the applicant to try to remove the multiple egresses and make a shared parking area.
Rene Daniel asked for comments from the Board and staff on this issue.

Ed Reidman asked the applicant if he would consider a shared driveway. How soon would the development commence?

Mike Boissonneau said the project will start this spring.

Ed Reidman explained that the Board could table the item; the applicant can meet with staff, and then return to the next scheduled Planning Board meeting in January.

Rene Daniel suggested approving this project, with the condition that the applicant meets with staff on the shared driveway concern.

Cory Fleming moved to table this item.

Molly Just thought the Board could go ahead and act on the Plan, so long as the applicant agreed to work with staff; a condition would be placed on the approval, where the Stroudwater Street access would be removed and replaced with a joint access and parking lot for the project.

Ed Reidman agreed to that additional condition.

Rene Daniel asked Chairman Reidman if Ms. Fleming could remove her motion.

Ed Reidman explained there was no 2nd to the motion.

Cory Fleming rescinds her motion.

Mike Taylor moved the Applicant's proposal **is consistent with the standards of the Village Review Overlay Zone**, and is recommended to be **approved**. The VROZ Committee has made the following recommendations, to which the Applicant has agreed:

1. A final, stamped set of drawings with any corrections, additions, or deletions proposed as the result of the Planning Board's review and approval of the Applicant's proposal.
2. The proposed dwelling shall be placed along Pleasant Street with the parking located behind the dwellings.
3. Specification sheets for the windows, trim, and siding;
4. The siding shall have butt height of ¾", with one color scheme for the first and second floor facades at the gable end, and a darker scheme for the attic story as described in the application;
5. The eave line height shall be consistent with the abutting properties;
6. The roof shall have a pitch no less than 8/12, with rake trim as depicted;
7. The windows shall consist of 2/2 double hung sash, as described in the application. The front (south) façade windows shall be trimmed in the 5" and 3.5" lineal, with window hood trim, as proposed by the Applicant;
8. The main entrance on the south façade shall consist of trim as proposed, with flat porch roof supported by decorative brackets. The rear (north) entrance should have the same kind of porch roof as the front, both for consistency and tenant safety; and
9. A copy of both the property survey and deed shall be provided.

10. City staff shall work with the applicant on closing off the entrance on Stroudwater Street and constructing a shared driveway off Pleasant Street.

2nd by Cory Fleming

Rene Daniel asked if the four trees scheduled to be planted are still going to be planted.

Mike Boissonneau said three trees; there is an existing broad leaf tree.

The vote was unanimous in favor 6-0

Workshop – Note: Public comment will be accepted during the workshop.

Rene Daniel moved to recess to workshop

2nd by Cory Fleming

The vote was unanimous in favor 6-0

6. Recess to Workshop

7. Sketch Site Plan – Deluca-Hoffman Associates, on behalf of Saco and Biddeford Savings Institution, for the construction of an approximately 3,800 S.F. bank with drive thru located at 2 Hannaford Drive. Tax Map: 33, Lot: 57, Zone: Hannaford Brothers Contract Zone 3.

Scott Tease with TFH Architects, on behalf of Saco and Biddeford Savings Institution, presented aspects for the construction of an approximately 3,800 square feet bank with drive thru to be located at 2 Hannaford Drive. Tax Map: 33, Lot: 57, Zone: Hannaford Brothers Contract Zone 3.

The proposed building would be located in front of Hannaford, which would be a Branch Bank.

The building has been turned around to keep the presence on William Clark Drive to a minimum.

The gable end will be an identifiable feature for Saco – Biddeford Savings Bank with pin letters on a back illuminated sign. On the aerial photo, the building has intersecting gable roofs. Headed southerly on William Clark Drive, the landscaping buffers the appendage for the drive thru. The front main entrance is from the Hannaford side. The building was designed with four (4) intersecting gables that will be an architectural attribute to the community. The outside façade of the building will consist of red brick, banding with ground faced block, glass and white wood trim.

Shelly Brunelle Deluca-Hoffman Associates explained the one acre parcel in the Contract Zone will share the main entry off of William Clark Drive at a signalized entry. All of the circulation is internal; there will be no additional curb cuts. We will be using established turn around on the Hannaford site. There is a one way drive thru for three (3) teller lanes and a bypass lane. There will be two (2) two-way entries to the parking spaces, all situated on the front side. There are eight sides to this building, but the side facing the other parking faces Hannaford.

During discussion with staff, we had an additional five (5) spaces for staff parking which have been relocated off the one-way isle staff and the three (3) angled spaces to be omitted from the plan to increase green space. One handicapped parking space will be next to the main entrance.

A decorative walkway with concrete pavers will give access to the entrance of the bank. Currently there is a sidewalk interior to the Hannaford site for pedestrian circulation and a future sidewalk is planned for William Clark Drive and both of the sidewalks will connect to Bicentennial Park to the east and around the Hannaford main entry. There is no direct connection to Hawkes Street except to the side near Hawkes near the residential properties.

Utilities - communication and power will come from a riser pole on Hawkes Street, underground to the site from that pole. There is a Portland Water District easement that goes through the site. Water service and a fire hydrant is located at the entry. A five (5) hundred gallon buried propane tank will be on the site and a GEO thermal well in front of the building, which both will be underground to service the building. The quality of storm water will be treated in accordance with the Maine DEP standard storm water regulations. A minor amendment to the Hannaford Brothers permit will need to be filed for this project. We continue negotiations with Hannaford Brothers and the client to provide a combination of open water quality treatment and buried underground infiltration beds, beneath stormwater treatment systems. Sewer will be pumped via force main to a terminus manhole on the crest of Hawkes Street. The utilities are extensions of what is in place.

Landscaping is a combination of native and adaptive materials, many of which is consistent with Hannaford site. For example the required buffer between the site and the residential property consists of Hemlocks. Additional screening of the drive thru areas from William Clark Drive will be evergreens and sugar maple and some shrub screening.

Most of the landscaping around the bank itself will consist of low ground covers, junipers, day lilies, irises and a few small trees. The screening of the parking lot will have a hedge, ornamental pears and a couple red maples. Arborvitae will be placed so not to conflict with overhead wires.

Due to the Contract Zone on the site, the signage standards continue to be discussed.

The parking lot will be asphalt paved with granite curbs and pedestrian connections.

Scott Tease added that it is the Saco Biddeford Savings wish for a free standing sign that would allow; time, temperature and interest rates to be conveyed to the public, placed perpendicular to William Clark Drive.

My client has concerns of the impact that there building will have on the environment. We are looking at the LEED rated system to analyze the systems and the materials that go into this building. Shelly mentioned the Geo thermal well and we have incorporated the Geo thermal system in another project and it has worked very well. We believe we have a highly efficient, low energy consuming way to heat the building. We have high insulation ratings, while using local materials when we can. We incorporate day lighting so most of the day internal lights can be on at a minimum since the four corners of the building will be illuminated by natural light.

While we continue to finalize the design, we will also try to minimize the impact that this structure will have on the environment.

Mike Taylor said he likes the design, but is concerned about design due to William Clark Drive (highway-like) thorough fare. I wish you could place your building in a different configuration on the lot.

The way this building is designed, it is geared more to the automobile. I would like to see it be more pedestrian friendly. The road that goes in front of the building is nearest to William Clark Drive and is geared to a drive though area. I would like to have you consider, the pedestrian that will be walking or biking to this building. If you are walking to this lot, you are impeded by a drive thru lot.

I wish the design could be more pedestrian friendly than car friendly for the neighborhood.

Cory Fleming echo's Mike concerns. I have observed pedestrians walking and biking along William Clark Drive. I see potential problems with traffic. I am also concerned with the signage. I am unsure of the speed limit along William Clark Drive, but it strikes me that by installing these big signs that look like they belong in a major suburban area concerns me.

Rene Daniel realizes how difficult the lot is, easements and power lines give a tight building envelope. I do agree with the Board Members comments.

I am not exactly sure of distance of curb on Wayside Drive and the driveway that enters your facility. I am pleased with the landscaping design, but would like to see more grasses.

I would like to see a bike rack for the bank. Also please consider making your facility more pedestrian friendly for the walking customer.

I like the terminology of a monument sign, but not the changing of interest rates or daily rates I think will be to busy.

As hard as it is to place a structure on this lot, I think you have made a great start.

I am amazed with the amount of tarmac is there and have concerns about the number of handy-capped parking spaces there are; I think you will need additional handy-capped parking spaces.

Ed Reidman said the purpose of the developer coming before the Board is to receive comments from the Planning Board.

Molly Just said when the City Council approved the Contract Zone on the parcel, they rezoned the property. The original Hannaford plan that was approved had a free standing sign. In order to amend that, it would need an amendment to the Contract Zone or another rezoning. On the application that was submitted, there is also discussion of the free standing sign.

Ed Reidman said if that is the case, the applicant would approach the Council to have an amendment to the Contract Zone, the Council would turn it over to the Planning Board, the Planning Board would hold a public hearing, then make a recommendation to the Council, then the Council would have the authority to act either positively or negatively on the amendment, to modify the ordinance.

Molly Buffering added that the staff also had concerns for drive thru. It is a tough site, even though banking is allowed in the Zone.

Ed Reidman thanked applicant

Rene Daniel moved to return to Regular session

2nd by Cory Fleming

The vote was unanimous in favor 6-0

8. Resume Regular Session

9. Adjourn

Respectfully submitted by Linda Gain PECE Secretary

MINUTES MAY NOT BE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. SECTIONS MAY BE PARAPHRASED FOR CLARITY. A COMPLETE RECORDING MAY BE OBTAINED BY CONTACTING ENGINEERING, PLANNING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT at 207-854-9105 ext. 220 and lgain@westbrook.me.us. THANK YOU