



# City of Westbrook

## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

### WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD TUESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2011, 7:00 P.M. WESTBROOK HIGH SCHOOL, ROOM 114 MINUTES

Present: Ed Reidman, (Chair) (Ward 5), Rene Daniel (Vice-Chair) (Ward 1), Dennis Isherwood (Ward 2), Cory Fleming (Ward 4), Robin Tannenbaum (Alternate)

Absent: Scott Herrick (Ward 3), Michael Taylor (At Large), Greg Blake (At Large), Rebecca Dillon (Alternate)

Staff: Molly Just, Richard Gouzie

Vice-Chairman Daniel called the Westbrook Planning Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in Room 114 of the Westbrook High School.

*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.*

#### 1. Call to Order

#### CONTINUING BUSINESS

2. **SITE PLAN - IDEXX Laboratories – One IDEXX Drive – DeLuca-Hoffman, Assoc., on behalf of IDEXX Laboratories for review of a 107,000 square foot administrative office building. The project is proposed to be located along with the existing buildings at One IDEXX Drive. Tax Map: 5B, Lot 5.**

**Chris Osterider** DeLuca-Hoffman, Assoc., on behalf of IDEXX Laboratories. We appeared before you back in July and have met with City Staff in early June and the plan we have before you is no different then what we presented before. We have made some minor edits to pedestrian circulation and landscaping.

Really what we have is the final site plan application. We have filed out application with Maine DEP and filed a scoping application with Maine DOT for a traffic movement permit, so we are well along in that process. Our intentions are to work through this process and begin construction this fall.

We have gone through all the comments with Staff and I hope we have satisfied all of those comments. There are some minor outstanding issues but I do not see that it is critical for approval to the nature of this project. I can go through in great detail or as minimal that you would like of what we are trying to do here, but the Chair introduced it perfectly.

It is a two phase project, 107,000 square feet and the plan to my left is an aerial of the overall campus. What we have in the yellow areas are the future elements of construction. Primarily what we are looking to do is build a parking lot, south of the stream, closest to the building, there will be an access road with a drive off Calpine and all the existing parking lots there today will effectively be re-built.

The building is going to be attached to the existing building that you see in the brighter yellow anything to the right that is on the eastern side of the campus is going to be completely reconstructed and will have all new pavement, new curbs... everything will be new. There will be enhancements for signage on circulation, so it will be just like a brand new property. That work is envisioned to commence this fall and continue right through to summer of 2013.

Westbrook Planning Board Minutes  
August 16, 2011

We had made a request for three waivers and tried to substantiate how this is applicable to this project as it is a very unique project.

I refer to this as a campus and there are over thirteen hundred people at that campus today. As we progress through this we hope to reach over two thousand people. So the uniqueness of the campus I think applies in certain aspects that make it somewhat different from the Ordinance itself so we can discuss that as well. I will take a minute to ask the Board if they have any questions.

**Ed Reidman** the last time they were here, we decided that we did not need a site walk, but we did discuss whether we were going to have a Public Hearing. Is that still the wish of the Board?

No Public Hearing requested by the Board

**Ed Reidman** the first issues we need to discuss are the requests for the waivers, then go into the individual items because the waivers affect their decision to what they have to do in regard with parking.

If you would explain the waivers to the Board, then we can take what appropriate action we feel is necessary.

**Chris Osterider** there are three waivers we have requested. The first waiver is in regards to the off street parking requirements. What we have given you are what are parking requirements are as to what the Ordinance requires. It is a very unique campus. What is different about this is not only the fact that there are three different uses, warehousing, office space and research and development but the size of it.

This building traces its roots to the 1970's. The construction at that time was quite a bit different then it is today and it was mostly a warehouse, manufacturing type of facility over the years so the uses that are built into it in terms of it in terms of the quarter spaces really generate an extensive amount of square footage. One of the things we did through our various summaries is identify the existing square footage today and tried to apply that to what the parking units would dictate for us to provide. If you look at what those numbers are it is quite a bit in excess of what we actually need. Our goal as we started this process was to look at it and to make it simple for the Board to grasp the need for providing adequate parking for this type of facility. This is a facility that is driven by the employees, that it is something that the company/business can control. This is not like a retail use where customers come in and out. They can control the shifts like with telecommuting. They have been very active by promoting car pooling, bus service and those types of things.

The real driver on this is the number of employees they have on campus. It is our objective to increase that number of employees and provide adequate parking for that. Today we have a surplus of parking. We have just under sixteen hundred parking spaces and today under fourteen hundred employees. There is a lot of flexibility with what happens. What is historically seen is roughly 85% of either the employees or the required spaces for employees are only at the usage needed. Is it appropriate for us to go through and build additional three or four hundred extra parking spaces? As we have presented the plan today, we have permitted it at capacity as much as we reasonably can with our environmental restraint. We are trying not to impact the wetland. In terms of what reasonably permits an environmental perspective we are maxing out our parking spaces we have there today. With that approach we can basically get to .96 spaces per employee. It is in excess of what we need but we would like to have some comfort level built into that as well.

The bad news if you were to hold us to that standard of the parking ordinance there would be a significant deficit. I think it is prudent on our behalf to seek this waiver. What we do have and will give some comfort to the Board is we will approach this in two phases.

The first phase of construction is the one hundred seven thousand square foot building and we will grow into that. The same thing with the second phase, we are going to build the parking as necessary for that construction but they are going to grow into that facility. That growth can be controlled, be scheduled, we have some avenues to make this work for us. I would like to say we are at a one to one ratio but even that would be more than what we need today. I hope this has provided you with enough information and this is the first waiver request we have.

**Ed Reidman** you might go right into the second one.

Westbrook Planning Board Minutes  
August 16, 2011

**Chris Osterider** the second waiver request we have has to do with the off street parking requirement in terms of the drive isle width that we are looking for a specific waiver request for because they have that reduced down to twenty-four feet. This is something we had discussed with staff early on and that is not throughout the campus. It is only in the areas where we know it is specific to employee parking.

Currently the rest of the campus is designed with a twenty-six foot drive isle. All the area in front of the campus, where we do get visitors we would maintain the twenty-six foot drive isle. As we get near the back of the lot along the building we are requesting to reduce that down to the twenty-four foot drive isle. The emphasis behind that is that it is more of a traditional standard but it also allows us to utilize that space where we can incorporate some if the pedestrian amenities. The extra ten feet allows for almost a twelve foot pedestrian island. It is not like we are just building and giving up some of this area, we are trying to make the area more useful. I think the City has supported that waiver request.

Then if it is appropriate, I will move to the last waiver request that has to do with the loading facilities. This campus today has thirteen loading docks in the rear, a loading facility on the east side of the building; some are located on the south west. This facility here on the proposed building will be a small loading facility, just be for very limited service, a small box truck and that sort of things, not big stuff. That seems to be based on the use of the building really appropriate here for us to go in and build another loading dock, the buildings use does not dictate that requirement.

Collectively there is ability to do that throughout the campus itself so is really where we come with that request.

**Ed Reidman** it is my understanding that Staff supports the waivers.

**Molly Just** that is correct

**Ed Reidman** let me ask one question, do you have shift work?

**Chris Osterider** yes

**Ed Reidman** did you consider the technique of using traffic engineers to study it and figure in the shift work?

**Chris Osterider** yes, part of the issue we have with some of the shift work is... we have had some dialog with DOT and that is something they have talked about as we work through that traffic movement process, evaluating that and whether we stagger the shifts and do different things along those lines. That is definitely in play and that is what we are looking at as part of our Traffic mitigation.

**Ed Reidman** as I recall, the last time you were in you said there would be bus service available on Eisenhower Drive?

**Dick Daigle** with Idexx Laboratories. We do have a program that supports public transportation. We also just rolled out a relationship with Go Maine, so we are putting in a car pooling program to try to promote more efficient use of vehicles and I think our current plan right now is car pooling parking for about sixty vehicles. We anticipate that will help with the parking situation as well.

**Ed Reidman** any questions?

No questions

**Ed Reidman** the easiest motion to make would be starting with number three that loading facility. The motion would say that the Board will grant waiver of a reduction from three loadings spaces to one. Would someone care to make that motion?

**Cory Fleming** so moved

**2<sup>nd</sup> by Rene Daniel**

**The vote was 5-0 in favor**

**Ed Reidman** design standards with regard to the travel way between parking spaces vary from area to area. Twenty-six is our norm; I have seen in other places twenty-five and have also seen twenty-four for perpendicular parking. I would suggest that the motion be to grant the waiver to reduce the driveway isle size from twenty-six (26) feet down to twenty-four (24) feet.

**Cory Fleming so moved**

**2<sup>nd</sup> by Rene Daniel**

**The vote was 5-0 in favor**

**Ed Reidman** why I left the off street parking one as I am not opposed to it I am struggling on how to form the suggested motion. I will ask our Planner, Ms. Just.

**Molly Just** I think an appropriate motion would be, to approve the waiver in the reduction of the off street parking requirement.

**Ed Reidman** with numbers attached, from 1 to .78

**Molly Just** that is correct.

**Ed Reidman** so the motion would be to grant the waiver for off street parking and the ratio for employee to space would be lowered from 1 to .78.

**Rene Daniel so moved**

**2<sup>nd</sup> by Cory Fleming**

**The vote was unanimous in favor 5-0**

**Ed Reidman** could reduce the parking stalls size for compact cars?

**Molly Just** yes the Planning Board can approve that.

**Ed Reidman** that gives you another option if you decide to do that but only a certain percentage can be that way.

**Molly Just** I would certainly ask for a proposal from the applicant before you would support that.

**Ed Reidman** I am saying that is something they might want to think about and they will come to you in the interim.  
Any questions or comments from the Board?

**Rene Daniel** can you give a brief explanation of a wet pool?

**Chris Osterider** on this project we are proposing one new wet pond that is shown in the light blue area on the right, essentially it is a pond. It will not provide storm water treatment it will always have water in it.

**Rene Daniel** is that wet pond going to have a fence around it?

Westbrook Planning Board Minutes  
August 16, 2011

**Chris Osterider** there will be a guard rail along the road side of it and do not believe we are anticipating a fence at this point. We are hoping not to draw people to it.

**Rene Daniel** how deep is it going to be?

**Chris Osterider** nine feet at the deepest spot.

**Rene Daniel** earlier you mentioned minor things that were changed. The landscaping in the island has been changed; can you tell me what has been changed? Have you decreased or increased?

**Chris Osterider** all we have done is we have added a few more pedestrian circulation routes to the building and have added a couple of interior islands in the back lots, two in each lot that will have trees in it and eliminated eight spaces in total where we would make marked islands and mark like a cross walk, this happens on the west side of it trying to increase the pedestrian accessibility to the back lot and thought that was the best way to make it work.

**Rene Daniel** I noticed the plants and the quantity of what you are using and it really impressed me. The landscaped area like this does not give the air of an industrial park.

**Cory Fleming** I do not have any question but would like to get a few things on record. I am really thrilled that you are going for LEED certification. I really want to encourage that in our community. It occurs to me that a few years back; I was pushing for some LEED certification on a project and had someone in the audience tell me that the cost would raise 70 to 80% by doing the LEED certification. For a matter of record if you could talk to me about the added building costs that are associated with going for LEED certification and then secondly what are the expected returns on investments? I am not expecting a long explanation, just a brief statement, so we have that on record if this should come up in a future project.

**Brian Rand** with Idexx Laboratories, it is kind of a difficult one to answer because our approach is to provide a very energy efficient building. Where do you set that baseline and what do you compare it to? Currently administration costs associated with it on the contractor side and engineering side that one approach would be to build this building and track sort of what points you get if you did apply but we are choosing to actually go to certification. There are definitely fees associated with that. The costs to be a LEED certified building have certainly come down. There are a lot more products out there to pick from to be LEED certified. There are things that the contractor does for recycling and whatnot that perhaps you would not do unless you were going for LEED certification. I am confident that it is less than 10% additional costs. I am not necessarily comparing it to a spec building either because that is not what we want to build. I do not know if that answered your question.

**Cory Fleming** your expected return on investment on the life cycle of the project say twenty or thirty years , what are you thinking this is going to save you in energy costs and the rest?

**Brian Rand** again in depends on where your baseline is. We are selecting some fairly unique HVAC systems built in tower system. A typical building would not have a pay back which are probably within the eight to ten year time frame. We have had some direction from our CEO and his perspective is that energy costs are only going up and if it is less than ten to fifteen years we should be pursuing it.

**Robin Tannenbaum** on the LEED piece I am also really happy to see that and thank you for whoever provided the check list that I asked for last time. I noticed that education point in LEED and C and just a comment that I would love it if there were some open houses for the community to come and see all the features. I do LEED houses a lot and it is optional actually, but it is a wonderful thing to do and this is a great service to the community and a way to get other businesses... your model for other businesses to encourage them to do LEED buildings as well.

Westbrook Planning Board Minutes  
August 16, 2011

Another comment, did I see a green roof on part of the plan? I can not find it on the drawings. Can you talk a little bit about that and I am curious if that changed any stormwater calculations?

**Chris Osterider** it did not change our calculations and part of the reason why is often times we go through the permitting process well in advance of the building design and those things can get deleted. We designed it as if it is a regular roof, so we have not taken advantage of that for a permitting perspective, it just means the pond functions better. The area you are talking about is the lower appendage above the wellness center and that is what is targeted for the green roof.

**Robin Tannenbaum** I think it is a terrific thing and is a service to the people who sit above it and again, I think it will be the first green roof in Westbrook.

Another question is the emergency call stations that I was happy to see. Is there a formula used in how often and where to place them? I noticed they are in the outlying areas and not adjacent to the building. Is your thinking that if there is an emergency you can just run to the building?

**Chris Osterider** it occurred to us to add them in that area as well.

**Robin Tannenbaum** I noticed the pedestrian pathways and I do not know if you put any thought into security rides for employees at night? Those are just my comments.

**Ed Reidman** we have a proposed motion and before I ask for the motion I have a technical question for Staff. There is an attached letter from the Fire department. I have no problem adding them as conditions but my question is how many of them do they have to do anyway? Are they part of the Fire Code? If so they do not need to be recorded because they are part of the Fire Code already and are law.

**Molly Just** I want to thank the applicant for a thoughtful and thorough application and I am pleased to have the applicant seek LEED certification for this project. As you know the City is still looking at stormwater management and erosion control and therefore can not support approval of the project at this time. That is something that has not been completely flushed out particularly to City reviews.

These is a large project and adds a significant area of parking and adds a lot of impervious area and think we should give the public the opportunity to speak on this application given that it is so big and is so positive. I would like to recommend that just a public hearing that is not meant to hold up the project but to give the public due consideration and the usual process for such a large project.

I will let the Code Officer to speak to the Fire Code items.

**Richard Gouzie** from what I have seen from the letter, most of the items are Code requirements anyway.

**Ed Reidman** the only thing I would like to see is that if it is a requirement and they are going to have to do it anyway because it is part of the Westbrook Code or the State Code; it can appear in his letter but does not need to appear in the motion because if they have not done some of those things because of the Fire Codes, they are not going to be able to get an occupancy permit anyway. If it is in here it puts it on you and not be able to issue the occupancy.

**Richard Gouzie** I think at this point I am not the authority having jurisdiction for this. I could for you next meeting, go through these with the Fire Chief and the Deputy and at that point eliminate them.

**Ed Reidman** I have no problem putting them in this one. The applicants have seen them and are aware of them. What I am saying is in the future I would prefer... I have had this battle before...

I think we have two choices use the motion as shown in the memo or table to the next meeting.

**Cory Fleming** the waivers stand regardless of whether we choose vote the overall project.

**Ed Reidman** we have accomplished something tonight either way.

**Cory Fleming** I move given the advice of our City Planner that we table until the next meeting.

2<sup>nd</sup> by **Dennis Isherwood**

**Robin Tannenbaum** I am not sure what we are tabling, to have a public hearing?

**Ed Reidman** yes

The vote was 3 in favor 2 opposed (**Rene Daniel and Ed Reidman** opposed)

**Ed Reidman** if I can hear a motion to schedule a public hearing on, can I have a date?

**Molly Just** September 6<sup>th</sup>.

**Dennis Isherwood** I move to set a public hearing on September 6<sup>th</sup>.

2<sup>nd</sup> by **Cory Fleming**

The vote was 4 in favor 1 opposed (**Rene Daniel** opposed)

### 3. Adjourn

*Respectfully submitted by Linda Gain PECE Administrative Assistant  
THANK YOU*