



City of Westbrook

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD TUESDAY, May 1st, 2012, 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), Greg Blake (At Large), Rebecca Dillon (Alternate), Robin Tannenbaum (Alternate), Michael Taylor (At Large)

Absent: Cory Fleming (Ward 4),

Staff: Brooks More, Richard Gouzie, Natalie Burns

Chairman Ed Reidman 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**
2. **Approval of Minutes: April 17th, 2012**

Rene Daniel I move to approve the minutes, April 17th, 2012 as presented.

2nd by Rebecca Dillon

The vote was unanimous in favor 5-0

New Business

3. **Special Exception Application– Portland Spiritualist Church – Portland Spiritualist Church for the establishment of a church on the second floor of the Stephen W. Manchester Post 62 American Legion building at 21 Dunn Street. Tax Map: 33, Lot: 192, Zone: City Center District, Overlay Zone: General Development Shoreland Zone.**

Susan Talbot I am the treasurer for the Portland Spiritualist Church. When you say a presentation, I will need some guidance as to what the expectation is.

Ed Reidman what they tell me is what the Special Exception is triggered by the proposed location of a church in the City Center District. The church is requesting to locate in an existing building and there is no new construction. Are you going to make any internal improvements or are you just going to occupy?

Susan Talbot maybe I should back up a little. We have already occupied. It was not unfortunately until I went to get a sign made for the outside that the sign company encouraged me to go to the Code Enforcement Office in Westbrook, which I did. At that time I was made aware of the fact that in order for us to be there legally this application had to take place. So that is where we are in the process. We are on the second floor of that building; we have the entire second floor that is being leased to us. It is a 50 x 100 space that does not have any walls basically. It is a wide open space and the lease that we currently have is until June 30th and I am expecting that lease to be renewed for another year and it will be a yearly lease

Ed Reidman I assume everyone knows the building that we are talking about. Does anyone want to take a site walk?

*Editors Note – No interest from the Board

Ed Reidman does anyone want to hold a Public Hearing?

*Editors Note – No interest from the Board

Ed Reidman does anyone have any questions?

Rene Daniel Susan you mentioned to us that you have already been occupying that space...

Susan Talbot yes we moved in February and to be quite honest we were unaware that we had to go to the town and go through this process. We have been in Westbrook for sixteen (16) plus years. We were renting from the Unitarian Universalist Church on Main Street and then once that folded we rented from Mission Possible Teen Center which used to be the Methodist Church and when they did not renew our lease we found this other property to lease at the American Legion.

Rene Daniel I do not remember, is there any handicapped parking spaces?

Susan Talbot as far as I know there is...they have a handicap ramp around the back of the building.

Rene Daniel but that takes you to the first floor.

Susan Talbot that is correct.

Rene Daniel you indicated that you are on the second floor.

Susan Talbot that is correct. There is no handicapped accessible way of getting to the second floor. The Historical Society that rented that property prior to us had a chair lift and when they left in February they took that chairlift with them.

Rene Daniel how large of a congregation?

Susan Talbot we currently have about thirty-eight (38) members. On any given Sunday we may have form fifteen (15) to thirty (30) something.

Robin Tannenbaum we are good on zoning as far as a religious institution?

Ed Reidman the only problem is the building did not have a church there before.

Susan Talbot I understand there was a church there before but I am not sure if at that point a change of use had happened for that space. And I guess out of curiosity, if this is approved and we do not renew this lease because this application has gone through this process would there be the ability for other churches to go into that space without doing an application?

Eric Dudley for a period of a year a different church could occupy that space. If it went vacant without a church use in that space they would need a change of use permit again and come before the Planning Board for a Special Exception.

Ed Reidman is there any other questions? Is there a motion?

Michael Taylor I move the Special Exception application for Portland Spiritualist Church on Tax Map: 33, Lot: 192 is to be **approved with conditions** based upon the following conclusions:

- A. Certain Requirements Met. That the use requested meets the dimension, parking, loading, and sign requirements of this Ordinance. Otherwise, the applicant must also request an appropriate variance.
 - The requested use meets the requirements of the Land Use Ordinance.

- B. Value. That the use requested will not significantly devalue abutting property or property across public or private way. In making its determination, the Board shall take into consideration the type of structure proposed, the topography of the area, the market value of the surrounding real estate, the availability of utilities, traffic conditions, and other relevant factors.
 - The requested use will not significantly devalue abutting property or property across a public or private way.

- C. Effects of Land Use. That the use granted will:
 - (1) Maintain safe and healthful conditions,
 - Not Applicable.
 - (2) Not cause water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation
 - Not Applicable.

- (3) Not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird or other wildlife habitat,
 - Not Applicable.
- (4) Conserve shared tree cover and visual, as well as actual, access to water bodies,
 - Not Applicable.
- (5) Not burden on-site septic or off-site waste disposal,
 - Not Applicable.
- (6) Not burden existing public ways.
 - The proposed use will not burden existing public ways.

D. Performance Standards. That the use granted is compatible with adjacent land uses and that it meets the following performance standards:

- (1) Landscape Environment and Enhancement. The landscape must be preserved in its natural state insofar as practicable. It must be designed so as to stabilize the slopes and buffer the site, where necessary,
 - Not Applicable.
- (2) Surface Water Drainage. Surface water drainage must not have an adverse effect on surrounding properties, downstream water quality, soil stability, or the storm drainage system,
 - Not Applicable.
- (3) Water, Air, Soil Pollution. The development will not cause unreasonable water, air, or soil pollution,
 - Not Applicable.
- (4) Soil Integrity. The development will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or reduction in the capacity of the soil to hold water,
 - Not Applicable.
- (5) Natural Environment. The development must not have an unreasonably adverse effect on a historic site or irreplaceable natural areas,
 - Not Applicable.
- (6) Nuisance Factor. The development must not cause unreasonable noise, odors, dust, gas, fumes, smoke, light or other annoying or dangerous emissions,
 - Not Applicable.
- (7) Special Features. Exposed storage areas, machinery installation, service and loading areas, and similar facilities must be set back, screened, or buffered so as to minimize any possible adverse effect on the surrounding uses,
 - Not Applicable.
- (8) Vehicular Access. The site layout must provide for safe vehicular access and egress, including that for emergency vehicles,

- The building has safe vehicular access from both Riverbank Park and Dunn Street.
- (9) Parking and Circulation. The layout of vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns must provide for safe interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and storage of plowed snow,
- The Church use is not required to provide off-street parking in the City Center District. There is a parking lot adjacent to the building that can be accessed via Riverbank Park or Dunn Street.
 - If the parking lot cannot accommodate all of the patrons during services, the applicant is encouraged to direct overflow parking to the roadways in Riverbank Park rather than Cloudman Street.
- (10) Public Services. The development must not impose an unreasonable burden on the water supply and sewage disposal systems, fire or police services, public ways, schools, recreational facilities, and other public services or facilities.
- Not Applicable.

CONDITIONS

Approval is dependant upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated April 9, 2012, 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.

2nd by Greg Blake

The vote is 6-1 in favor (Rene Daniel opposed)

4. **Amended Final Site Plan Application – 396 County Road – Deluca Hoffman Associates, LLC, on behalf of The Best Company, LLC, for the creation of an additional 1.94 acres of impervious surface and associated stormwater management infrastructure. The property is located at 396 County Road. Tax Map: 2, Lots: 22A, 48B, 49, Zone: Industrial Park District.**

Rob Whitman with Deluca Hoffman as described this project is a development expansion on 396 County Road which has a tenant by the name of Nortrax who are a sales and service company for heavy equipment, excavators and the like. The closest major intersection is County Road and Spring Street.

This site was developed in 1982 and built the first part of the building and some paved, gravel display area. Throughout the eighties there were two building expansions which brought the current building area to 15,600 square feet and some open gravel area and paved parking whatnot.

In 2005 it came to the attention of the Best Company that they did not have a site location permit and over the years the little increases on the building area and gravel area tripped the need to seek a site location and development application permit with the DEP. In 2005 a site location

permit was sought with the DEP and was granted that basically gave them coverage for the existing building; 15,600 square feet, the gravel area and existing pavement but to meet the current DEP standard they did build a small under drain soil filter in the back corner of the site.

In 2005 they received an additional permit to build in the future a commercial facility to be built at some point in the future. At that point it was going to be a building with some open gravel area and maybe some paved parking and water quality and storm water quantity control was going to be provided by a new soil filter similar to the one that was built to cover the existing facility.

Since that time needs of the current tenant have changed and the desire from Nortrax (the current tenant) in order to stay in Westbrook to seek some additional display area and to maintain the operations as they grow, so instead of the Commercial Facility that the Best Company was considering back in 2005 that plan has been put aside and a new plan to expand the existing Nortrax facility is what I am here for tonight.

On the board here the yellow area illustrates the .74 increase of gravel area basically for the first phase of this development. That will allow Nortrax to grow and display vehicles out there and continue their operations. As well in phase one is a construction of an under drain soil filter in the back corner. That will be very similar to the one designed in 2005 but has been updated to meet the current DEP standard. That water quality filter built in phase one will be oversized to handle the additional development for phase two which adds another 1.2 acres of gravel area in the orange area, sometime in the future as needs dictate.

There is an existing single family home on the parcel here in this area and will actually be burned this coming week end by Gorham Fire Department as part of a training exercise and Don from the Best Company has met with the City of Westbrook and met the needs of the Gorham Fire Department to have that ready to go this weekend. So part of this project will be to do the clean up for the burning of that building.

We are here tonight to seek an amendment to the Site Plan approval. Other permits that we will be seeking for this project are in process right now are three with the DEP, a minor amendment to the Site Plan Location Permit that was originally granted in 2005, a permit by rule for the proximity to the stream and also a wetland fill permit for some wetland fill that will occur as part of the expanded development. That permit is being sought for the full build out also not just phase one.

The property is also in the Long Creek water shed which is of high interest these days. The documentation which has been submitted to both the City and DEP. They have reviewed the material and are comfortable with the materials as presented. We will be making an amendment to the participating land owner's agreement for this parcel to increase the impervious area within the Long Creek Water shed Management Plan.

In terms of the surface we are looking at a compacted gravel surface and the reason for that is because of the type of equipment that is used here, if you were to pave that the equipment would crunch it up in no time that is the preferred surface, gravel.

Trying to screen that some from County Road we have provided landscaping along County Road that has a mix of trees and smaller shrubs that will have a consistent theme throughout.

That is all I have for the presentation and welcome any comments that you may have.

Ed Reidman does anyone want to take a Site Walk, Public Hearing?

*Editors Note no interest from the Board.

Ed Reidman any questions?

Rene Daniel could you turn to the third page of the site plan where the landscaping is shown? Can I have a description of the plantings?

Rob Whitman what we are looking at is a series of ten (10) balsam firs, 4 red maples, two (2) blue spruces and a series of Viburnum in the shrubs and ground cover section. Surrounding that will be a bark mulch material.

Rene Daniel anything closer to the building?

Rob Whitman we are not proposing anything right now, the focus is out at County Road.

Ed Reidman any questions or comments? If there are none do I here a motion?

Michael Taylor I move the Site Plan application for 396 County Road on Tax Map: 2, Lots: 22A, 48B, and 49 is to be **approved with conditions** with the following findings of fact and conclusions:

FINDINGS OF FACT

Utilization of the Site

- The site is occupied by a 15,600 s.f. commercial building and associated paved and gravel parking areas.
- The project reflects the natural capabilities of the site to support development.
- The project proposes to add 1.94 acres of impervious surface over two phases. The stormwater system is designed to accommodate the full build-out of the project.

Adequacy of Road System

- The project will not increase the amount of traffic entering and exiting County Road.

Access to the Site

- There are no proposed changes to the entrance on County Road.

Internal Vehicular Circulation

- The layout provides for safe movement of passenger, service and emergency vehicles within the site.

Pedestrian and Other Modes of Transportation

- The site is designed for industrial use. Provisions for pedestrian access are not proposed at this time.

Stormwater Management

- The project is located in the Long Creek Watershed. The project is regulated by a Maine Department of Environmental Protection Site Location of Development Permit, an NRPA Permit by Rule, and an NRPA Tier 1 Wetland Permit.

Erosion Control

- An erosion and sediment control plan has been provided on plan sheet 4.0.

Utilities

- The proposed project does not propose to alter the utility services on the site.

Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials

- Any hazardous materials generated by the proposed office building will be disposed of as required by law.

Technical and Financial Capacity

- The applicant has provided a statement of financial capacity from UBS.
- The applicant is proposing to self-finance the project.

Solid Waste

- Solid waste pick up will be the responsibility of the landowner.

Historic, Archaeological and Botanical Resources

- No historic, archaeological or botanical resources have been identified on the site.

Landscape Plan

- A landscaping plan has been provided on Sheet 2.0.
- The plan proposes to focus landscaping on the County Road frontage. The proposed landscaping will improve the appearance of the property and industrial park.

Others

- No issues.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The proposed site plan **will not** result in undue water or air pollution.
2. The proposed site plan **has sufficient** water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the site plan.
3. The proposed site plan **will not** cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply.
4. The proposed site plan **will not** cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results.
5. The proposed site plan **will not** cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed.
6. The proposed site plan **will provide** for adequate sewage waste disposal.
7. The proposed site plan **will not** cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste.
8. The proposed site plan **will not** have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat identified by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife or the municipality, or rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline.
9. The proposed site plan **conforms 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. The proposed plan **will not** negatively impact the ability of the City to provide public safety services.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Approval is dependant upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated April 10, 2012 and plans dated April 10, 2012 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.

2nd by Greg Blake

The vote was unanimous in favor 7-0

5. **Sketch Plan Review – Hyacinth Place - Deluca Hoffman Associates, LLC, on behalf of the Developers Collaborative Predevelopment, LLC, for the creation of 37 multi-family housing units at the former St. Hyacinth’s School and Parish Center. The property is located at 2 Walker Street. Tax Map: 32, Lots: 185, 185B, 186.**

Ed Reidman may I have a motion to go into workshop?

Rene Daniel so moved

2nd by Denis Isherwood

The vote was unanimous in favor

Ed Reidman we can not vote in workshop session but we can allow the Public to speak. The purpose of the workshop is to give the developers what the Board or the Public has a feeling for.

Kevin Bunker I am with Developers Collaborative representing the owner. On this project I am acting as the authorized agent for Avesta Housing Development Corporation.

We are here today as we are working on a thirty-seven unit family housing project with Avesta that will own and operate the building after constructed.

This property has been vacant for a number of years and has been on the market for a number of years. We thought our development scheme will work there and put the property under contract.

The financing for the project is with affordable housing tax credits combined with historic tax credits. They are administered by the Maine State Housing and the National Park Service. The historic credits have a federal component, so the financing is fairly complicated but Housing credits are awarded through a competitive process. We will apply in the fall and if selected we will have the tax credits to allow us to build out the project.

I am going to talk about the overall development and then turn it over to Steve Bushey with DeLuca Hoffman to talk about the site itself and David Lloyd the architect to talk about the design. The project is three buildings plus Walker Field for a total of about 4.6 acres. It is everything except for the rectory, the white building.

Here are the two buildings on the site; this is the school that was built about 1890. The building in the parish center and was built in about 1920. This is a new building that we propose to build. There is currently a garage behind the parish center that we propose to take down and this is the rectory that is not part of the project.

This is Walker Field and we propose to use that for parking to meet the Ordinance and for density to meet the zoning. We are proposing an agreement with the City to seek an easement with the City that no one will develop Walker Field and will be available for the Pubic to use.

Both of the buildings are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places that is why we can get the historic tax credits for them. Both buildings are in fairly good condition for as old as they are but both buildings need an extensive amount of work.

We are talking about 37 units of housing for families. There are a couple of efficiencies then a mixture of ones, twos and three bedroom units.

I will turn this over to Steve now, but will highlight a few issues being this is sketch plan and we do not have everything figured out yet and we are looking for input this evening.

There are three things about this plan that are not completely vetted yet. The first one as pointed out by your planner that is you only have enough land for thirty-six 36 units. Based on the tax maps we had enough but based on the survey we do not. What we propose to do is to redraw the Boundary Lot Line near the Rectory and 15,000 square feet of land with the Rectory.

The second thing is what you know of as Pike Street. Pike Street is only a street up to here then it turns into something here and was not built on City Property. We have been in conversation with the City Engineer, Eric Dudley and the City attorney and have come up with a concept to make this portion a driveway. We do propose to connect through what is Pike Street. We note there are three abutters here that we need to reach out to and requested by the City Administrator. The City does not need Pike Street and the trucks do not go down there but we will reach out the abutters to see what they would like to do.

The final thing that is not figured out yet is the bottom of the parking lot here. To obtain tax credits, we need to pay attention to what you can see from the street, then the way the outside of the building looks, then inside the building, the common areas, the hallways, lobbies and stairways and then interior partitions. To bring that back to the parking spaces, this is a nice terraced lawn and the main entry for the church. The park service may frown upon putting parking here. However we have some grade issues that Steve will talk about. We feel we need handicapped parking down there. This parking is not figured out completely yet.

Unless anyone has questions on these issues I will turn this part of the presentation over to Steve Bushey.

Steve Bushey with Deluca Hoffman Associates, Kevin has hit upon many of the big features relative to the site layout. I will go through more of the technical ones, utilities being the first one. We have water and sewer, natural gas along Walker Street as well as along Brown Street. Interesting the sewer and water are interconnected between the two buildings so we are contemplating new water and sewer connections for this building. An old sewer line that used to come from 20 Pike Street; that building is no longer there, but the sewer line from that old location goes underneath the parish building and ties over to Walker Street. That is a private sewer crossing over private property without benefit of an easement, so we are continuing dialog with the City, particularly Eric Dudley and Steve MacDonald to figure out the issue here and try to provide sewer service to each of these buildings. One of the things we are contemplating is installing a new sewer service here, sized appropriately and take these two lines, put in a manhole perhaps in the front of the building then over to Walker Street. Yes there would need to have a utility easement, but think we could do all of that.

Water service; we have a six inch line along Walker Street and then an eight inch line installed by Portland Water District on what they thought was a public way to provide service to these three buildings and it will benefit our building here and the pressures and flows are good enough in this area to support sprinkler systems. We are open to talk to the Fire Department to provide a hydrant on the site.

Natural gas is something that we would like to extend to these buildings to replace the old oil fired burners for a new natural gas heating system for these buildings.

Electrical power will be upgraded in the existing building and brought new into the new building.

The key piece for this site is the grading and topography, it is a tough site and has a lot of grade and the entrance off of Brown into this parking lot... there is an existing driveway along here to the garage near the rectory building is very steep and Public Services has mentioned that they have issues to getting access with a public services vehicle, or a Fire truck that bottoms out here and can see it when you come off the street. We are looking at the grading to provide a smoother transition to allow an emergency vehicle to get up to this driveway.

The parking area is here and has a grade break between the parking areas here. We are looking at thirteen (13) spaces here, twenty-four (24) here and twenty-two (22) spaces along this side. What is identified here currently has a seventeen foot access point we would like to widen to twenty-two (22) feet and stay to that in order to avoid impacting a couple of the trees here. There is a nice array of trees here and we will only impact a single tree there and we will offset that with some plantings. This drive will drive function as a one way drive into these parking spaces here that will be 90 degree parking spaces that has access to Pike Street for patrons of the facility.

We will handle stormwater and drainage in the typical fashion, we are not triggering any new thresholds to any new impervious surface above one acre so we do not need a storm water permit but will capture the storm water and are going through the analysis for the treatment of stormwater. We are contemplating a rain garden off this parking lot area.

I want to point out a play we are contemplating. We have Tony Munch who is doing our landscape architecture and will be providing a landscape plan that hopefully will meet the City expectations.

The residential property has 4.6 acres here and just less than 2 acres here and here is the creation of lot for rectory building.

This building here is a slab on grade and will let David speak to this, but it appears to be able to support this type of building without any issue.

This is the current sketch plan submission and I welcome any comments from the Board tonight.

Dave Lloyd I am the architect and I want to make mention on one of Steve's comments when he said how we want to landscape to the satisfaction to the town. I have done a number of historic restorations and they do not want the buildings to look like a suburban site with all kinds of shrubs, they like it to look at a historical significant time. If we put too many plantings in there they will tell us no, no, you can not do that we want it to look more like the 1890's when it was a school.

Kevin explained the site well. All we will do here is repair and restore. The windows will more then likely just be taken out and refurbished and the original windows will be put back in once repaired. There are no additions going on either one of these buildings, so basically going to be restored to the historical significance of what they originally were.

This building that is called the parish hall but what was the convent gets restored. There are no additions going on and will be restored to the historical significance of what they originally were. We will be restoring the windows but are having issues with the caulking around the windows so that is an issue.

Then back in the corner our new building will look as workers housing and have a simple New England vernacular, a clap boarded building that will look over the park. We will have a community space here. We will design a traditional over hanging cornice here with a water table

base, wide corner boards here. This will be simple background architecture that hopefully will fit in with the neighborhood.

Kevin Bunker one more point about the park, I under emphasized the use of the park. Avesta and us see this park as a huge asset with the neighborhood. What we are told is that it does not get a lot of use. There is a lot of density with hundreds of houses around it but you do not see anyone playing there, once in awhile you see people crossing it and is not the asset it could be. We are thinking this park will knit this neighborhood together and become a gathering place.

What we propose to do is have some neighborhood meetings to see what people want. We want to make this park an asset that people can use. We need to have a dialog on how to make the park the best thing for the neighborhood and for the City. This is being developed more fully as we go.

Ed Reidman as we started the purpose of the workshop is to have input from the Planning Board and potential comments from the public.

Are there any comments from the Board?

Michael Taylor I go to church and do not know if you can do it or not... is there a reason why you have to have the driveway stay on Brown Street? Could you get rid of it all together and redesign it? Also get rid of the parking lot down further, maybe creating a grassy knoll or hill area? You will get rid of the driveway and get rid of the parking area but connect the two parking lots together. Instead of cutting that in half you could actually eliminate that by reconstructing the grade. You can get rid of the parking area and draw a line right where the school used to be.

Kevin Bunker I think the primary thing that this was chosen was because of the grade. Obviously we can not land lock the rectory without any parking. I believe the reason we can not take out that driveway and make larger parking area has to do with the grade.

Dave Lloyd the fact that the driveway is there is also going to be an issue with the national park service. There is an entry here to access the building is here and we need to have parking down at this level. There is a serious grade changes with a retaining wall here and from a geographical view point it is almost impossible to do what you just asked.

Mike Taylor why can you not go off Walker Street then?

Dave Lloyd that I can honestly say will never pass muster with the national park service.

Kevin Bunker also there is a historical retaining wall that we need to maintain.

Mike Taylor I was trying to save you by not having it look so parking lot look when you drive by there with a major entrance. I am trying to say is there a way to reconnect or put the parking somewhere else in the plan? I hate parking lots and you are putting more impervious and especially run off coming down that big hill. I am trying ...

Dave Lloyd you are saying to eliminate that?

Mike Taylor eliminate that and put it somewhere else.

Dave Lloyd I think that is going to take some study. That will eliminate handicapped parking.

Mike Taylor you are just eliminating seven spots.

Dave Lloyd seven there

Mike Taylor that is what I am saying, eliminate seven regular spots.

Dave Lloyd those we can get rid of.

Mike that is what I am saying; not remove the handicapped spaces. It does not look like a swath of parking lot up the middle of your project.

Kevin Bunker here is another point; this parking count is to meet your Ordinance. It is more than we would otherwise build, your Ordinance is making us build more spaces than we need.

Mike Taylor I am sure of you work with the City Engineer, maybe as a condition or something like that. I would much rather see grass and landscaping than parking lots.

Kevin Bunker we are on the same page.

Ed Reidman other comments

Kevin Bunker is parking a waiverable condition?

Ed Reidman yes but we do not like to though.

Rene Daniel I have a laundry list and I agree with Mike. I do not like the Brown Street parking lot and disagree as to what was said, that driveway is not used that is why the upper driveway was put in there. A number of parishioners ended at the bottom and could have ended in the river. I can not imagine putting a Public Safety vehicle going up there because with my "tank" I can not go up or down that parking lot.

Where you are saying to put this parking lot is where the original Church was and the garage was part of the Church that was a sanctuary that was used, the second floor was used for equipment and the bottom floor was used for a congregating place before worshipping at the altar.

If you look at pictures and go back far enough you will notice in front of the school that landscaping plot closest to the school was a long wooden staircase there and on either side of it had flowers on either side and on the Brown Street side we had flowers on either side of walkway.

I do not have a problem with the original school or convent. I have a problem with the ingress from Walker Street that now we find out is not a street. I personally agree that it should have been nothing for years as every time I saw a snowplow go by, they were trying to fix the bricks as they went on as it was so close to the building.

As far as the field it has been designated since the field early teens, 1900's as an open space or informal play area.

The one-way parking lot I see as people using it as a two-way short cut. I see traffic being a problem. It bothers me that we are going for more family affordable housing when there is already two hundred and twenty (220) units within one thousand (1000) feet.

I have a problem with the lack of character with the new building. I am torn because I really want to see the site used that is a valuable site to the City if Westbrook.

I have grave concerns with the four parking spaces in front of the rectory which is not part of the project. I am not sure where the boundary line is. The last thing I want to see is a beautiful building sit for empty for thirty (30) years and not be used.

Rebecca Dillon I have a few comments, I would support a waiver for the reduction of parking and then I have a question, Eric what does our Ordinance say about isle widths?

Ed Reidman we require 26 feet for isles.

Rebecca Dillon I think it is nice that you have avoided the trees on the entrance from Walker Street and saved the trees, all but one.

I understand why the new building will be kept simple so the historical buildings can take center stage but I am wondering if site wise the building can be treated as formally as the other two building are. Can thought be put for a direct entrance from this parking lot? Again I agree that if the parking lot down in the currently grassy area could be relooked at it would be nice to keep that open.

Robin Tannenbaum big picture I am really thrilled to see having these buildings taken an interest in. I am on board with what my colleagues have said about the lower parking area. It feels like a big blight on a field. I too would support some kind of waiver... I do not know what the percentage of cars would be but maybe an incentive for car pooling or zip cars and I know there is a bus stop on the corner, there already is public transportation coming past that is used.

I also appreciate keeping the mature trees. I live nearby and have not walked that area in awhile and would be curious to hear from some neighbors here about the use of the park. It seems abandoned. Looking forward to hearing more on the amenities this park could have. I am not opposed to cutting into this for parking as we have asked to reduce the parking below but hopefully the transition between parking and park will be handled nicely.

I could not see the renderings of the new building from here but concur with Rebecca, I get not making it a star building but I would like to see more.

Assuming the road has to stay, I am wondering if there should be sidewalks for folks because Brown Street is heavily walked. That would be nice to see.

Ed Reidman any other comments?

Greg Blake I will echo what Board has said, my comments are similar and am excited to see someone is taking on this project.

I have lived in Westbrook for twenty-two (22) years and have always wondered why no one out playing in that park. Maybe it is an educational communication... Am I allowed to play out there? My impression because of the way the housing surrounds it that it was maybe an

association type property that is private so to speak. Maybe it is an educational, promotional thing that needs to happen. Just let people know.

Ed Reidman thirty or forty years in the late 70's early 80's there were soft ball leagues played in that park, I know because my son played in them. So it was active for awhile. Maybe as the City has other fields in better shape, maybe that is why it is not used.

Anything more? Anyone from the public?

Rowena it is kind of overwhelming for me to hear about these plans because I live at 24 Pike Street for thirty-two (32) years and I like my neighborhood. I like the quiet and am glad that I do not have a parking lot in front of me which this will certainly be there. My property is next to the Church.

I came here to talk about a sewer line but I am going to talk about this whole plan. It is just overwhelming to me, to think that having Pike Street no longer a street and having it a driveway or a Pike Way or whatever. I do not mind having the parish and the school developed because I think that is important. I do not like seeing those building just sitting there. This has bothered me along time since they are no longer being used. But thinking of these plans is very difficult for me to think about. How would you feel if this happened in your neighborhood? It has been my home and I have enjoyed living there.

The sewer line is something I was going to bring up today; just that I am on the end of the line and I have has problems with back up in my basement of sewerage. The Church and I worked together and the pipe was dug up and there were roots there and we took care of it together. I was thinking of a thirty-seven (37) unit project there I will really have some problems. But the way it sounds is you will make that all over and have the sewer system not go out to Walker Street. It sounds like it will be hooked up to a new sewer system, I guess on Pike Street, I do not know. But I just need to express my thoughts and feelings about this change as it is overwhelming for me, the change.

James Tranchemontagne 26 Cole Street one block from the right of the Church. I was surprised when I learned about this project as well. I try to keep myself informed as to what is going on. I thought I might find some relief seeing this project presented and I will take it with a grain assault the it is in its preliminary plans that is seems that they have come here tonight with more questions answers for the people.

One thing I will say to you about the park that you say is not utilized in the day; you should go there at night and see some of the horrible, horrible things that go on there. A lot of it stems from Avesta's project in the back lot.

When they sell the tax credits, the companies do not necessarily have Westbrook's' best interest in mind. When the flyers go out to people they go to a targeted group of neighborhoods. They are not flashing them out throughout the whole City but yet it is going to be the whole City that is going to take this burden on.

Some of the Maine State Housing, when the group was shifting members and Board Directors... I would hope that this Board would hold off until the Comprehensive Plan that the City of Westbrook is working on is approved which should be within the next two months and see if this project actually meets the Comprehensive Plan. It would be unfortunate to push such a huge project through without reviewing the Comp project that is setting the direction for the City of Westbrook that people have been working on for close to three years now.

I have been wordy before and I understand there are time limits, so I want to do my best... Also I would like to see the full study released to the citizens to make sure what exactly the criteria are that says we need more affordable housing in Westbrook. From my understanding I was told that we have an art building downtown that sat vacant and we were told that we need affordable housing that we need for our Seniors and built one behind post office that is 50% full and it seems like everyone cares about these buildings and so do I but it does not seem that the future should be to affordable housing.

I know they say affordable housing, (a nice label) but we know that it is people that do not pay taxes and they utilize police, rescue, dispatch and other problems in the neighborhood that is already saturated with problems and low income housing.

When you look at low income housing it truly is economic discriminating to allow certain groups of people to live in a community at a lower level then working class people who are working hard to save up for their own retirement, their own kids futures and other people are given a free ride.

It also undermines the landlords who rent out to people. I am a landlord in that area and this can be devastating to what I am able to charge for my rents when a potential renter can qualify for a different location down the street when my tax dollars are also used to fund that.

I would also like the Board to look at credential requirements for people living there. Once it is all built, who is going to end up paying the water, sewer and electricity and any other utilities.

I know we are all in tough economic times now and it is nice to put a picture up here, but it does not show a picture of the location within the City. It is really close to downtown that also affects business owner's downtown. The Dana Warp Mill with all the parking problems that we have there. I do not think we can support more cars.

If there are thirty-six or thirty-seven units, how many parking spaces are allowed per unit? A family of three could have up to three cars. If anyone has gone to worship at St. Hyacinth you can see that it is packed on any day of services.

We are asking a lot of people in the neighborhood to make sacrifices and this gives us very few benefits at this time.

Thank you for your time and I hope I hit the three minute mark.

Mark Cole I live at 143 King Street I own a multi unit on Bracket Street and School Street as well. I live on upper King Street.

My biggest gripe I would say to the project and they did a good job explaining some of the issues with sidewalks and roadways and the details on the architecture which is nice hearing on those buildings but you skipped over the financing part. That was simply put to us is that is a complicated item but that is one of our major concerns. If you read the newspaper saying how LePage is cutting programs that could be linked to this project.

Again as when James talked about the field, no one is on the field during the day and I can attest to that as my wife and I walk that during the day, it is a ghost town and at night you actually start smelling strange things at about 7:00 pm during the summer when the sun goes down. That is probably when the field is used the most.

I am around the section eight housing a lot and I see the abuse and read about the abuse all the way from the State Houses all the way down to see a Mom smoking a butt, pregnant pushing two kids in a carriage, then going to the ATM machine to use the EBT to pull out cards to get cash back at the store.

My wife complains about it at Hannaford, when they are dressed better than her and my wife is a Nurse at Maine Med and she sees the abuse there also. It is very frustrating when we live a street over from this project and I agree that the buildings need to be utilized, but for this manner, no, there maybe a better use of money that could be put into those buildings. Frankly I could just move to South Portland but I like Westbrook because of the location to Sebago.

Sarah 257 Brown Street, I also have a unit that I am renting and have met nice people on Brown Street. I knew it had a representation when I moved in and I am fine with that and continue to be fine with that.

One of the things that I love about it is it is very diverse. You have people who are clearly in poverty and I feel that I need to say I am a little bit upset that some of those people are being slightly vilified. I do not think it is with mean intention at all, but I think when we are talking about our neighborhoods we need to look at people and not keep putting them in a box.

Back to the diversity piece we have a little bit of everything. I am wondering if there is such a thing as mixed income development and I think that would go to the diversity piece. It is a great Street that has a lot of history and a lot of neat people. It definitely has its problems but having more people there and creating a community bringing some of the darker areas to light.

I am glad to be a homeowner in the City of Westbrook and able to participate in these types of things.

Rowena I wanted to say the playground is used during the day, I live next door and I see children swinging and play baseball and soccer occasionally, especially in the weekends.

Ed Reidman the reason for the workshop is so we can have conversations like what we have had this evening. If we are in a Public Hearing situation, we run by a set of rules and you might have time to say something, then after the rest of the public has spoken, you may be given another chance to speak.

Rene Daniel normally in this process the developer and the individuals have a series of neighborhood meetings. I am saddened that these have not happened yet and I encourage more communication between the neighborhood and the developers. I am sure that will occur.

Ed Reidman do I hear a motion?

Rene Daniel I move to return to regular session.

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote was unanimous in favor 7-0

6. Adjourn

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