

**WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 2019
MINUTES**

Present: Ed Reidman, (Chair) (Ward 5), Rene Daniel (Vice-Chair) (At Large), Dennis Isherwood (Ward 2), Joseph Marden (Ward 3), Robyn Tannenbaum (Ward 4), Nancy Litrocapes (Alternate), Kim Fickett (Alternate)

Absent: Rebecca Dillon (Ward 1), John Turcotte (At Large)

Staff: Jennie Franceschi, Rebecca Spitella

MINUTES MAY NOT BE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. SECTIONS MAY BE PARAPHRASED FOR CLARITY. A COMPLETE RECORDING MAY BE OBTAINED BY CONTACTING PLANNING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT at 207-854-0638 ext. 1220 and lgain@westbrook.me.us

Ed Reidman explained the procedure for a Public Hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. **2019.08 – Site Plan, Subdivision, Village Review – 50 Pleasant Street – RMC Properties LLC: The applicant is proposing a lot split and a new 3-unit multi-family with associated parking and site improvements. Tax Map: 033 Lot: 097 Zone: City Center District, Village Review Overlay Zone**

Project Description

The applicant is proposing a lot split and a new 3-unit multi-family with associated parking and site improvements.

Project History

March 13, 2019- Village Review Overlay Committee

April 9, 2019 – Village Review Overlay Committee

May 1, 2019 – Neighborhood Meeting

May 7, 2019 – Planning Board Workshop

June 4, 2019 – Public Hearing

Staff Comments

1. All outstanding fees have been paid.
2. Provide a latched access gate to William Clarke Drive to discourage trespassing
3. Rear patios – extend brick pavers to be in line with the paved parking area, removing the crushed stone notching. Pavement should be extended to be in line with the edge of the westerly brick patio.
4. Letter of Capacity for Portland water district required
5. The applicant is requesting to pay the in-lieu-of fee (\$1,508) to meet the open space requirement.
6. Toter location conflicts with the vehicular driveway access. Revise plan to show toter storage on the rear patios associated with each unit (next to bulkheads)
7. Show water dissipation at the base of the roof drain to avoid erosion control
8. Notification required prior to the connection between sewer and the catch basin in Pleasant St – Condition of Approval
9. Due to the size constrictions of the site, snow removal plan required – Condition of Approval
10. Waivers stated as a plan note rather than condition of approval
11. Final edited, revised plans with conditions stated on the signature sheet provided to the planning office in both paper and mylar form by Monday June 3. (One full set of paper, one full set of mylars, one additional paper and mylar of the subdivision plant Sheet C-101)

Todd Gammon Blais Civil Engineers presented aspects of the project of a 3 unit townhomes at 50 Pleasant Street.

Since the last meeting, we have resubmitted and are hoping to get final approval tonight.

We have made a few minor changes based on Staff comments. We have sign off on the Sewer, Public Works, and Fire Department and added the full landscape plan schedule. Architecturally everything is the same as you saw last time.

We are looking for any comments the Board has on the final plans.

Jennie Franceschi I wanted to recognize the applicant's efforts on working with the Village Review Overlay Committee. I think the end product of this structure blends in nicely with the neighborhood and will be a great addition to the vicinity. All items that are in the Boards packet have been addressed.

Public Hearing Opened

Michael Foley 39 Blue Spruce Farm Road spoke in favor of the project. This project fits in the neighborhood and fits within the guidelines of the City's Zoning. I look forward to have this project built.

Public Hearing closed

2. **2019.10 – Site Plan – 2 Eisenhower Drive – 2 Eisenhower Drive, LLC: The applicant is proposing a 16,060sf expansion to an existing 30,000sf commercial building to include new walkways, loading docks and an amended parking layout. Tax Map 05B Lot: 001 Zone: Manufacturing**

Project Description

Applicant is proposing multiple expansions around the existing structure at 2 Eisenhower Drive. The 5 expansions total approximately 16,060 sq. ft. Please see application materials and plans for more details on this project. Current use is Commercial Service Business.

Project History

May 3, 2019 – Neighborhood Meeting
May 7, 2019 – Planning Board Workshop
June 4, 2019 – Public Hearing

Craig Burgess Sebago Technics presented aspects of the project on behalf of 2 Eisenhower LLC. We met with the Board in early May and not a lot has changed with regard to the site layout. The project exists of a total expansion area of 16,600 square feet over five different additions on all sides of the building.

Other site improvements include adding additional impervious area here at the loading dock area, to accommodate box trucks.

On this side we are slightly adjusting the grading of the parking and re-paving the entire area and re-striping to include 54 parking spaces which is enough to accommodate the 34 employees at this facility.

At the last meeting we discussed landscaping and we are adding landscaping along Spring Street to include spruces, and sumacs.

I will answer any questions the Board may have.

Jennie Franceschi

1. All outstanding fees have been paid.
2. Lighting Plan pending review and approval by FD

3. Sheet 3 – Include a leader line to the structure on the westerly edge of parking area indicating ‘to be removed’
4. All existing non-conforming flags will need to be removed. (feather flags on site, if any)
5. All new buildings must be fully sprinkled
6. Additional knox boxes needed – obtain from Fire Dept. – included as a plan note
7. Fire lane must be striped and include ‘no parking’ signs along building
8. Ability to serve from Portland Water District required for sprinkler system
9. Existing sewer and water lines not shown on plan and must be included with the as-built plans following construction. (Condition of Approval)
10. Sheet 11 – recommend use of chain link fence with slats vs cedar for long term maintenance
11. Stormwater comments
 - o Demonstrate that the culvert under the Spring St Driveway will handle the 100 year storm event without overtopping
 - o Provide a hydrocad watershed plan to clearly see the watershed delineations
12. Final edited, revised plans with conditions stated on the signature sheet provided to the planning office in both paper and mylar form by Monday June 3. (One set of paper, one set of mylars)

All issues are addressed and have provided you with a motion on page five.

Public Hearing opened

No comments

Public hearing closed

3. **2016.45 – Final Site Plan – Saccarappa School Expansion – 110 Huntress Avenue: The applicant is returning to the Planning Board as per their condition of approval to provide the playground plan associated with the Saccarappa Elementary School Additions and Renovations project (swings, an open sand area, mud kitchen, water pump and other natural play features). Tax Map: 007 Lots: 019 & 020A Zone: Residential Growth Area 1**

Project Description:

The applicant is returning to the Planning Board as per their condition of approval to provide the detailed playground plan associated with the Saccarappa Elementary School Additions and Renovations project (swings, an open sand area, mud kitchen, water pump and other natural play features).

Project History:

June 21, 2016 – Sketch Site Plan Review
 March 7, 2017 – Sketch Site Plan Review
 March 18, 2017 – Site Walk
 March 23, 2017 – Neighborhood Meeting
 May 2, 2017 – Final Site Plan Review
 June 4, 2019 – Playground Plan Review

Brian principal of Saccarappa School presented aspects of the natural play scape playground project.

Sashie Misner showed and explained approved site plan of the playground.

We had a lot of collaboration from Teachers, Parents and Children with the proposed design.

Showed examples of the play equipment, plant material that are play durable, shade trees and the fenced in area.

We are here if there are any questions from the Board.

Staff Comments:

At their meeting of May 2, 2017, the Westbrook Planning Board approved the site plan application for the expansion of Saccarappa Elementary School. Per condition of approval 4, the applicant is required to return to the Planning Board with the final design of the playground and courtyard spaces prior to any work commencing in those area.

Public Hearing open

No comments

**Public Hearing closed
REGULAR MEETING**

4. Call to Order.

5. Approval of Minutes.

Rene Daniel move to approve the April 2nd, 2019 minutes as presented.

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Rene Daniel move to remove 138 Hardy Road from the table

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

- a. **ITEM ON THE TABLE - 2018.59 – Subdivision Plan – 138 Hardy Road – Michael Pednault: The applicant is proposing a 7-lot subdivision located at 138 Hardy Road. Tax Map: 020 Lot: 005 Zone: Rural District**

Project Description:

The applicant is proposing a 7-lot subdivision located at 138 Hardy Road. The land is part of two-family trusts with the Gowan Family. The first plan shows the entire limits of the land and the subsequent plans show the two trust parcels separately. The two trust parcels had previously cut off 1 lot from each parcel within the last five years and are proposing to cut each of the remain trust lands into 3 parcels thus we are reviewing this project as required by state law as a subdivision.

Project History:

- January 15, 2019 – Planning Board Workshop
- February 28, 2019 – Recreation and Conservation Commission
- April 2, 2019 – Public Hearing
- May 7, 2019 – Item removed from the table; Waiver request denied; Item placed on the table

Staff Comments

Staff informed the applicant of the denied waiver request following the vote of the Planning Board at their 5/7/2019 meeting. The applicant has informed Staff they are withdrawing their subdivision application.

At the last meeting, based upon the information staff had at the time, it was recommended to table the item as it appeared the applicant would be returning to the board within a months' time. As this is no longer the case, per parliamentary procedure, if an item is not to be voted on at the next meeting after an item is tabled, it should be "postponed". Therefore, we are recommending the Board remove the item from the table, then to make a motion to indefinitely postpone the item.

1. **Motion to remove the item from the table**
2. **Motion to postpone the subdivision application for 138 Hardy Road indefinitely**

Rene Daniel I move to postpone the subdivision indefinitely

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

- b. **2018.48 – Site Plan, Subdivision & Conditional Use - Cumberland Woods – Graiver Family Holdings, LLC - The applicant is proposing to develop a 72-unit multifamily subdivision on an existing vacant lot located at 425 Cumberland Street. Tax Map: 010 Lot: 028B Zone: Residential Growth Area 1**

Project Description

The applicant is proposing to develop a 72-unit multifamily subdivision on an existing vacant lot located at 425 Cumberland Street.

Project History

November 1, 2018 – Neighborhood Meeting
November 6, 2018 – Planning Board Workshop
December 1, 2018 – Site Walk
May 7, 2019 – Public Hearing

Staff Comments:

At the request of the Board, Staff investigated the ability to provide safe pedestrian access to the project site as a crosswalk at the project site drive was not a viable option. Upon further review, staff reviewed the existing conditions of the roadway and provided an option for the Board's consideration of installing a sidewalk along the northern side of Cumberland St up to the Congin School access drive where there is a crosswalk and a pedestrian crossing light.

Staff asked for the Board's input on this option and a majority of the members were in concurrence for a sidewalk to be included in the project's offsite improvements.

In relaying this information to the applicant, we asked if they would like an opportunity to be further discuss this request of the Board, and the applicant requested that they be placed on this agenda to discuss this matter further with the Board.

Below is the email staff provided to the applicant:

Post meeting, it was asked of staff to continue to review the pedestrian concern that was raised at the meeting regarding safe pedestrian access to the Cumberland Street neighborhood.

In reviewing the area, a crosswalk in this vicinity is not a safe way to transfer pedestrians to the sidewalk across the street, however, affording safe access for pedestrians could be made on the east side of Cumberland Street by installing a sidewalk from the project site to the Congin School access drive on Cumberland, which has a crosswalk and connects to the community center. This view had not been noticed in the past but is the direction the ordinance requires on making safe pedestrian access to the neighborhoods around project sites as this project is a significantly large project to be completely isolated in its current layout.

Unlike most situations we see, the wide shoulder on Cumberland St already has subsurface drainage that a curbed sidewalk could work with.

To avoid you having to receive this information at the final meeting, we sent out an email to the Board members to ask for their input on this as they had been the ones to ask staff to look into the matter.

In polling the board members individually, the majority of the members were in favor of requesting a sidewalk from the project site to the Congin access drive to address the requirement for safe pedestrian access to the neighborhood. Staff wanted to get you this information as soon as possible to allow you time to incorporate this item into your final plans. If you wished to alter your open space plan based upon this requested change in sidewalk construction, you can revise and resubmit to the Rec & Con for their June meeting.

*If you do not agree with the direction the Board has provided, you can return to the Board for discussion on this matter at **its June 4th** meeting where we will place you under unfinished business. Please let us know if you would like to attend the June 4th meeting for the purpose of discussing the sidewalk by Noon on this FRIDAY May 17.*

If you accept the direction the Board has provided and would just like to proceed on the next meeting when you have received your DEP approval, you can just keep us posted on when that approval is issued.

Board Action:

If the Board wished to take a straw poll on whether or not a majority of the Board feel the sidewalk connection along Cumberland Street from the site driveway to the Congin School access drive should be included in the project work to address the findings of fact for safe pedestrian connections to existing neighborhoods, the Board can provide that feedback at this time.

Dustin Roma DM Roma Consulting Engineers representing Graiver Family Holdings on this project. It is my understanding at the last meeting that there was some discussion between Board members and Staff about the potential need and feasibility of a sidewalk construction at the proposed drive location at Cumberland Street that follows the southeast side of the roadway and connects into the drive that goes into the school and Community Center.

Since we were notified of that we did look at the feasibility and the potential need of this. Sidewalk projects can be a little more complicated then what they seem. You can create point stormwater discharge and have curbs that end in people's driveway, you have utilities that you need to contend with and resetting catch basins to make sure that they rain appropriately and dealing with driveway transitions. That is one side of the feasibility if we can do this within the right of way. We will have some right of way constraints to do this sidewalk project.

We have not looked at the cost and the specific items that would be hurdles that we would have to deal with. We took a step back and thought of the corridor itself. We would look at the entire corridor and the different modes of transportation and how we could accommodate all of those.

**Dustin Roma explained the corridor.

It will be a burdensome task

Ed Reidman it has been suggested that the Board can conduct a straw vote and provide the applicant with feedback at this time. A straw vote is not binding but will give you an idea of where the Board stands on this item.

Rene Daniel I think this is a good project, and I am not really concerned about what happens once you leave Congin. My focus is to increase passive walking. I want the flexibility to walk down the sidewalk that you are creating, walk to the end of the street, take a left and walk to Congin and access the Community Center. The children could walk to school and then back home with their parents.

I am not looking at people to walk to the downtown. My goal is to give the residents there the flexibility to use City funded money to give them the ability to use it without using cars or bikes. The way it is now based on the last meeting there is no way that the State will allow us to put a the sidewalk across Cumberland Street because of the dangerous alley. But if we construct a sidewalk to Congin entrance then you give the people a larger opportunity to experience passive safe exercise. And at the same time use the cross walk to continue to walk across Cumberland to Bridge Street.

I am looking for the safety. I travel that road every day and there is traffic. I think this will make it safer for people on that side. I will vote gladly when there is a sidewalk there.

Joseph Marden I heard that DOT will not all a crosswalk across Cumberland Street. Has that been investigated? If not at this project, is there a midway point between here and the school? Is there a safer place for a crosswalk on Cumberland Street halfway between here and to Congin? Has that been investigated?

Jennie Franceschi discussing this with City Staff trying to put a crosswalk anywhere between here and Congin would not necessarily be a safe situation. We want to place crosswalks where there is high visibility and that as you are coming out to Cumberland Street people are starting to pick up speed. To put a crosswalk anywhere here would not be a well-supported item.

Joseph Marden when this was discussed with City Staff, my feeling was I would like to see a connection to some other sidewalk system. I think that an extension of a sidewalk all the way to Congin may be over burdensome on to the applicant. I do not know if there is anyway there could be an in lieu of fee system towards a larger project that the City has been working on, that the applicant could put towards? I know that we have an impact fee that is not set up but something along those lines.

Jennie Franceschi right now we do not have an impact fee system or a project that is proposed for this section right now.

Joseph Marden I guess I do not have a good solution.

Nancy Litrocapas I am supporting a sidewalk as a walker, I walk all over this town and feel safer to be on a sidewalk that has a raised curb and on different plane than the actual traffic. It looks by this picture that there is enough space for both a sidewalk and bicycles.

Dennis Isherwood I am going to agree with Mr. Daniels on this. It is one opportunity for you to protect the residents of the 72 units to safely navigate Cumberland Street.

Ed Reidman the question of the Applicant, is do you want a straw vote, or do you have enough information from the Board members that have spoken?

Dustin Roma I have received enough information and it could be something we could contribute towards or is the goal just to get a sidewalk ad create safe passage from A to B or should we be part of a bigger project to enhance this area?

Ed Reidman can I have a straw vote?

Rene Daniel I move that we take a straw vote to indicate our feelings on whether a sidewalk should be created before the finishing of this project to connect to Congin School Campus.

The straw vote is 5-1 (Joseph Marden opposed)

NEW BUSINESS

6. **2019.08 – Site Plan, Subdivision, Village Review – 50 Pleasant Street – RMC Properties LLC: The applicant is proposing a lot split and a new 3-unit multi-family with associated parking and site improvements. Tax Map: 033 Lot: 097 Zone: City Center District, Village Review Overlay Zone**

Denis Isherwood moved the Subdivision - Site Plan application for RMC Properties, LLC for a lot split and a new 3-unit multi-family with associated parking and site improvements located at 50 Pleasant Street Tax Map: 033 Lot: 097 Zone: City Center District and Village Review Overlay Zone is **approved with conditions** and the following findings of fact, conclusions and conditions as stated on pages 2 through 4 of this Staff Memo dated May 31, 2019 are adopted in support of that approval.

Site Plan – Finding of Fact:

Utilization of the Site – *Adequate.*

Adequacy of Road System - *Adequate.*

Access to the Site – *Adequate.*

Internal Vehicular Circulation - *Adequate.*

Pedestrian and Other Modes of Transportation - *Adequate.*

Stormwater Management – *Adequate.*

Erosion Control - *Adequate.*

Utilities – *Adequate.*

Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials – *N/A*

Financial and Technical Capacity – *Adequate. The applicant has provided a letter of financial capacity from Total Mortgage dated May 2, 2019. Applicant has retained the services of Blais Civil Engineers which demonstrates technical capacity.*

Solid Waste – *Adequate.*

Historic, Archaeological and Botanical Resources – *Adequate*

Landscape Plan – *Adequate.*

Subdivision – Finding of Fact:

Pollution and Sewer Disposal – *Adequate. Disposal of the Sewage from the project will be via the City Public Sewer system, and therefore will not cause a pollution issue.*

Water - *Adequate.*

Soil Erosion - *Adequate.*

Traffic – *Adequate.*

Sewage - Adequate. The applicant has received an ability to serve from the Westbrook Sewer Department.

Solid Waste – Adequate.

Aesthetics

1. Project to Site – Adequate.
2. Project to Surrounding Property – Adequate.
3. Landscape Design – Adequate.
4. Lighting – Adequate.
5. Signs – Adequate.

Conformity with Local Plans and Ordinances – Adequate.

1. The proposal is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Subdivision Plan meets requirements of the Land Use Ordinance

Financial and Technical Capacity – Adequate. The applicant has provided a letter of financial capacity from **Total Mortgage dated May 2, 2019.** Applicant has retained the services of Blais Civil Engineers which demonstrates technical capacity.

River, Stream or Brook Impacts – Adequate.

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** to the 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:

1. Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated May 8, 2019 and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Planning Board, and any variation from such plans,

proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the City Planner or the Planning Board.

2. Consistent with Section 504.3, the Code Enforcement Officer shall not issue any permits until a site plan has been approved by the Planning Board and a Mylar signed by the Planning Board. *Mylars must be submitted to the City within 90 days of Planning Board approval or the approval shall be null and void.*
3. Prior to any site disturbance or building permits being issued for the project:
 - a. All Staff comments must be addressed.
 - b. Review of building elevations to be consistent with submitted documentation or testimony.
 - c. A pre-construction meeting must be held with City Staff and the site work contractor. Contact the Planning Office to coordinate.
 - d. The applicant shall provide the digital data as required by Section 504.5.B.12 and 13. – verification with GIS coordinator.
 - e. An inspection fee shall be made payable to the City of Westbrook for inspection of site improvements made by the Code Enforcement Officer and/or other appropriate City staff. This fee is required per Section 500.8 of the Land Use Ordinances in order to cover the costs of inspection of site improvements - **\$1,032**
 - f. The applicant shall file a performance guarantee with the City of Westbrook. The amount of the guarantee shall be agreed upon in advance with the City of Westbrook and shall be of an amount to ensure completion of all on- and off-site improvements necessary to support the proposed project. A performance guarantee in the amount of **\$51,640** is required.
 - g. Coordinate with the E911 Coordinator on addressing of the buildings.
 - h. Best management practices shall be adhered to during all ground disturbance operations.
4. Notification to the City required prior to making the connection between storm sewer and the catch basin in Pleasant St.
5. Prior to the first Occupancy Permit issuance:
 - a. A site inspection of the required improvements by the City to ensure public health & safety is addressed and compliance with the approval.
 - b. All site improvements must be installed, unless a performance guarantee amount is held in the amount of the remaining improvements.
 - c. Due to the size constrictions of the site, snow removal plan is required. (Plan to be provided to the City for the file.)
6. Prior to release of the performance guarantee:
 - a. The site will be in compliance with the approved plan and as-built plan provided in City approved format for the GIS system
7. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of local and state authorities for life and safety requirements.

2nd by Kim Fickett

****Editor's Note:** Ed Reidman explained what the first condition means to the developer. Oral representations.

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

7. **2019.10 – Site Plan – 2 Eisenhower Drive – 2 Eisenhower Drive, LLC: The applicant is proposing a 16,060sf expansion to an existing 30,000sf commercial building to include new walkways, loading docks and a revised parking layout. Tax Map 05B Lot: 001 Zone: Manufacturing**

Craig Burgess Sebago Technics, we have worked to address all Staff comments and looking for a final approval for this project.

Ed Reidman we have conducted a Public Hearing and had a Virtual Site Walk

Dennis Isherwood moved the Site Plan application for 2 Eisenhower Drive, LLC for a 16,060 sf expansion of an existing structure located at 2 Eisenhower Drive Tax Map: 005B Lot: 001 Zone: Manufacturing District is **approved with conditions** and the following findings of fact, conclusions and conditions as stated on pages 5 through 7 of this Staff Memo dated May 31, 2019 are adopted in support of that approval.

Site Plan – Finding of Fact:

Utilization of the Site – *Adequate.*

Adequacy of Road System - *Adequate.*

Access to the Site – *Adequate.*

Internal Vehicular Circulation - *Adequate.*

Pedestrian and Other Modes of Transportation - *Adequate.*

Stormwater Management – *Adequate.*

Erosion Control - *Adequate.*

Utilities – *Adequate.*

Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials – *N/A*

Financial and Technical Capacity – *Adequate. The applicant has provided a letter of financial capacity from Biddeford Savings dated April 5, 2019. Applicant has retained the services of Sebago Technics which demonstrates technical capacity.*

Solid Waste – *Adequate.*

Historic, Archaeological and Botanical Resources – *Adequate*

Landscape Plan – *Adequate.*

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** to the 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:

1. Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated May 8, 2019 and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Planning Board, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the City Planner or the Planning Board.
2. Consistent with Section 504.3, the Code Enforcement Officer shall not issue any permits until a site plan has been approved by the Planning Board and a Mylar signed by the Planning Board. *Mylars must be submitted to the City within 90 days of Planning Board approval or the approval shall be null and void.*
3. Prior to any site disturbance or building permits being issued for the project:
 - a. All Staff comments must be addressed.
 - b. Review of building elevations to be consistent with submitted documentation or testimony.
 - c. A pre-construction meeting must be held with City Staff and the site work contractor. Contact the Planning Office to coordinate.
 - d. The applicant shall provide the digital data as required by Section 504.5.B.12 and 13. – verification with GIS coordinator.
 - e. An inspection fee shall be made payable to the City of Westbrook for inspection of site improvements made by the Code Enforcement Officer and/or other appropriate City staff. This fee is required per Section 500.8 of the Land Use Ordinances in order to cover the costs of inspection of site improvements - **\$9,815**
 - f. The applicant shall file a performance guarantee with the City of Westbrook. The amount of the guarantee shall be agreed upon in advance with the City of Westbrook and shall be of an amount to ensure completion of all on- and off-site improvements necessary to support the proposed project. A performance guarantee in the amount of **\$490,752.50** is required.
 - g. Coordinate with the E911 Coordinator on addressing of the buildings.
 - h. Best management practices shall be adhered to during all ground disturbance operations.
 - i. Addressing/Plan of Action regarding NOV with Portland Water District
4. Prior to the first Occupancy Permit issuance:
 - a. A site inspection of the required improvements by the City to ensure public health & safety is addressed and compliance with the approval.
 - b. All site improvements must be installed, unless a performance guarantee amount is held in the amount of the remaining improvements.
5. Prior to release of the performance guarantee:
 - a. The site will be in compliance with the approved plan and as-built plan provided in City approved format for the GIS system
 - b. All utilities shown on as-built plans
6. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of local and state authorities for life and safety requirements.

2nd by Rene Daniel

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

8. 2016.45 – Final Site Plan – Saccarappa School Expansion – 110 Huntress Avenue: The applicant is returning to the Planning Board as per their condition of approval to provide the playground plan associated with the Saccarappa Elementary School Additions and Renovations project (swings, an open sand area, mud kitchen, water pump and other natural play features). Tax Map: 007 Lots: 019 & 020A Zone: Residential Growth Area 1

Sashie Misner here to present the plan and hope for the approvals this evening.

Rene Daniel moved the Site Plan application for Westbrook School Department for the final playground design as part of the expanded elementary school, at 110 Huntress Avenue, Tax Map: 7 Lot: 19 & 20A Zone: Residential Growth Area 1 is to be approved with conditions and the following finding of fact, conclusions and conditions as stated on pages 8 through 10 of this Staff Memo dated May 31, 2019 are adopted in support of that approval. All previous conditions of attached to the projects May 2, 2017 approval are still in full effect.

Site Plan – Finding of Fact:

Utilization of the Site – *Adequate. Site features meet dimensional requirements of the ordinance.*

Adequacy of Road System - *Adequate.*

Access to the Site – *Adequate. The applicant has 2 access points which allow for diffusion of traffic on to Bernadette St. and Huntress Ave. Additionally, emergency vehicles can circulate through the site.*

Internal Vehicular Circulation - *Adequate. The applicant has provided a one-way bus drop off near the main entrance, a parent drop off near the play area and two way circulation exiting on to Bernadette St.*

Pedestrian and Other Modes of Transportation - *Adequate. A school bus stop is being constructed as a part of phase 1 as well as improvements to the pedestrian sidewalk system throughout the site.*

Stormwater Management – *Adequate*

Erosion Control - *Adequate. Applicant has provided an erosion and sediment control plan for the project.*

Utilities – *Adequate.*

Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials – *N/A*

Technical and Financial Capacity - *Adequate.*

Solid Waste – *Adequate.*

Historic, Archaeological and Botanical Resources – *None Known*

Landscape Plan – *Adequate.*

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** to the 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:

1. Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated April 25, 2017 and revised May 9, 2019 and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Planning Board, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the City Planner or the Planning Board.
2. Consistent with Section 504.3, the Code Enforcement Officer shall not issue any permits until a site plan has been approved by the Planning Board and a Mylar signed by the Planning Board. *Mylars must be submitted to the City within 90 days of Planning Board approval or the approval shall be null and void.*
3. Prior to any ground disturbance or permits being issued for the project:
 - a. All Staff comments must be addressed.
 - b. The applicant shall provide the digital data as required by Section 504.5.B.12 and 13. – verification with GIS coordinator
 - c. Final Phasing Plan for construction to be reviewed by City Staff and schedule provided.
4. Due to design of filter bed system in parking, use of sand during winter operation is not allowed.
5. Prior to a final CO for the complete project:
 - a. The site will be in compliance with the approved plan
 - b. As-built plan will be provided
 - c. Provide documentation of maintenance contractor for Stormwater Best Management Practices.
 - d. Signs and E911 requirements shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Codes Department.
6. The applicant shall comply with Chapter 37, the local Post Construction Stormwater Management Ordinance. On January 15th every year, a copy of the maintenance log for the previous year for the stormwater treatment features associated with this project needs to be provided to the Planning Office.
7. The applicant shall comply with the requirements of local and state authorities for life and safety requirements.
8. This approval makes reference to the following staff letters:
 - a. Fire Department letter dated March 28, 2017
 - b. Police Department letter dated March 29, 2017
 - c. Public Service Department letter dated March 10, 2017

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

9. 2017.05 – Conditional Use & Shoreland Zoning - 907 Main Street (Theater Use) – Transformation Project: The applicant is requesting a one year extension on project completion, originally approved June 6th 2017, for a theater use to host events in a 651 +/- square foot venue space on the first floor of the building. Tax Map: 032 Lot: 111 Zone: City Center District/Village Review Overlay Zone/Shoreland Zoning – General Development.

Project Description:

The applicant is seeking a one-year extension for the project completion at this location. See attached letter from the applicant's agent.

On the first Floor, the applicant is constructing a small theater space which is a conditional use.

Staff Comments: (Previous for reference)

1. Parking on Dana St. may be eliminated due to width of street to allow for improved access.
2. Area along Dana St will be striped/signed as no parking for pedestrians.
3. Prior to the occupancy permit being issued for the theater space, a 5' hatched sidewalk area (no parking) from the existing Main Street sidewalk all along the Dana Street side of the building shall be painted by the applicant and maintained into the future.

Staff take no issues with the one-year extension of this project to allow the applicant additional time for completion.

Keenan Eaton project coordinator for the Transformation Project. We appreciate the time for the opportunity to request a one-year extension on the project, 907 Main Street for both the theater and residential space, which I believe is the next article that is up for discussion.

Just a general note, we have done most of our work up to date with craftsmen and tradesmen on a volunteer basis. That is why we are here for the one-year extension.

Ed Reidman questions from the Board?

Rene Daniel will one year be enough?

Keenan Eaton I do, we are close to completion on the larger theater space. We are about two to three hundred hours from completing that, the larger portion of the project.

Nancy Litrocapes what will happen with parking when the theater is open? Where will people be parking?

Keenan Eaton it has been recommended to use the community parking across the Street. Our occupancy is going to be limited to ninety people and using City parking for those events.

Nancy Litrocapes have you considered using a valet to make sure people get cars over to that area?

Keenan Eaton yes and we have been working with the neighbors as well to make sure make sure it will happen.

Ed Reidman Jennie, what are the parking requirements in the downtown area?

Jennie Franceschi for commercial uses the Ordinance does not require onsite parking. During the approval, we were looking at the Mechanic Street parking during function, especially during off-hours type events that will suffice for this venue.

Ed Reidman motion to grant expansion

Kim Fickett moved to grant an extension of one-year for the completion of the Conditional Use and GD Shoreland zoning application for the Transformation Project to operate a theater use at 907 Main Street, Tax Map: 32 Lot: 111 Zone: City Center District/VROZ is **approved with conditions**. All previously approved findings of fact and conclusions and conditions are still applicable.

2nd by Nancy Litrocapes

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

10. 2017.18 – Conditional Use & Shoreland Zoning – 907 Main Street (CBRF Use) – Transformation Project: The applicant is requesting a one year extension on project completion, originally approved July 18, 2017, for a residential unit on the second floor for a Community-Based Residential Facility to provide transitional housing for juvenile and adult offenders. Tax Map: 032 Lot: 111 Zone: City Center District/Village Review Overlay Zone – General Development.

Project Description:

The applicant is seeking a one-year extension for the project completion at this location. See attached letter from the applicant's agent.

The applicant is proposing a Residential Unit on the second floor of the 907 Main Street property which will provide transitional housing for juvenile and adult offenders.

Staff Comments: (Previous for reference)

1. Parking Standard waiver is requested by the applicant for the 2 space requirement.
2. Parking on Dana St. may be eliminated due to width of street to allow for improved access.
3. Area along Dana St will be striped/signed as no parking for pedestrians (As was stated in the theater use)
4. Applicant has provided a summary on the program as well as how they will address the performance standards for Community-Based Residential Facility
5. A site walk was held on June 24, 2017 which also served as a neighborhood meeting.

Staff take no issues with the one-year extension of these two projects to allow the applicant additional time for completion.

Rene Daniel are we talking about just the second floor on this item?

Jennie Franceschi just the second floor, the previous item covered the first floor Theater use only.

Kim Fickett moved grant an extension of one-year for the completion of the Conditional Use and GD Shoreland zoning application for the Transformation Project to operate a Community Based Residential Facility at 907 Main Street, Tax Map: 32 Lot: 111 Zone: City Center District/VROZ is **approved with conditions**. All previously approved findings of fact and conclusions and conditions are still applicable.

2nd by Joe Marden

Ed Reidman questions or comments?

No comments

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

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

Rene Daniel so moved

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

Ed Reidman explained workshop, to enable public speaking.

WORKSHOP

- 11. 2019.12 - 380 Main Street – Zoning Map Amendment – H.A. Mapes, Inc: The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Zoning Map to rezone the parcel located at the corner of Main Street and Lamb Street from Residential Growth Area 1 to City Center District. Tax Map: 040 Lot: 089 Zone: Residential Growth Area 1**

Ordinance Description

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Zoning Map to rezone the parcel located at the corner of Main Street and Lamb Street from Residential Growth Area 1 to City Center District

Ordinance History

June 4, 2019 – Planning Board Workshop

Staff Comments

At the meeting on December 4th, 2018 the Planning Board approved a site plan for a self-service gas station and neighborhood grocery store located at 380 Main Street. Following the approval the development was determined to be too costly and the applicant has informed Staff of a decision not to proceed in the direction of the approved plan. After reviewing the list of permitted and conditional uses within the current RGA1 Zone, the applicant is requesting an amendment to the zoning map to extend the City Center Zone to cover the 380 Main Street parcel. This amendment would allow the property additional uses which would make the property more marketable.

Attached to the applicant's letter and application are two maps of the subject area. The first map shows the area with the current zoning showing the limits of the Residential Growth Area 1 and the City Center District. The second map shows the surrounding 2 or more unit-multifamily commercial units within the vicinity of the subject parcel.

Action for the Board's Consideration

1. Consider public comments provided during the workshop
2. Schedule a public hearing

Jonathan Mapes president of HJ Mapes, the reason for the request of the Zone change, currently City Center allows for a business office and could be the next best use. It is a small parcel and is on the fringe of the Zone we are requesting. What this will do is allow other uses to the change of zone verses the current zoning. Economically it makes sense for either us or another owner or the best interest in the neighborhood itself. It allows more opportunity to redevelop that corner.

Jennie Franceschi explained zone change area. Across the street the three parcels as well as the following two parcels heading towards Portland, up to Forest Street are all City Center District parcels along Main Street.

You could from a consistency standpoint, take City Center from the current Mapes parcel and bring it to Forest Street if you were trying to end the City Center District. But at this time all we are looking at currently at this commercial property that has been commercial for as long as anyone can remember. We feel that the

true use of the property is more towards the City Center District type uses verses having this revert to an RGA 1 zoning that is low intensity. We think it is the highest and best use of the land at this location to rezone to City Center.

Ed Reidman we will ask if there is anyone in the public that wishes to speak on this item to the change the zone? Then we need to schedule a Public Hearing.

No public comments

Joe Marden has there been any thought to change the other parcels along Main Street? Have you approached the owners to see if they would be interested in the change to City Center?

Jennie Franceschi we have not pushed forward for that particular piece. It is not out of the realm of requesting that the three parcels be changes as they are all multi-family or duplex dwellings that would work within the City Center guidelines. It is a potential recommendation that the Board could offer. At this time, we had an applicant that requested the change and we wanted to move his application forward verses potentially slowing this process up. The Board can make that recommendation and we would need to notice them in that case.

Ed Reidman questions or comments? Anyone from the Public?

We will schedule a public hearing when you are ready.

12. 2019.13 - 511 Bridge Street – Site Plan & Conditional Use – Chase Custom Homes & Finance, Inc.: The applicant is proposing a 100-child daycare facility within the existing structure and associated playground and parking lots site components. Tax Map: 048 Lot: 046 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2

Project Description

The applicant is proposing a 100-child daycare facility within the existing structure and associated playground and parking lot site components.

Project History

- May 28, 2019 - Neighborhood Meeting
- June 4, 2019 – Planning Board Workshop

Staff Comments

1. Provide ADA tip down ramp at sidewalk/crosswalk on the opposite side of Bridge Street
2. Sidewalk along Bridge Street must continue within the Right-of-way to the driveway entrance
3. Fire Lane/No Parking striping/signage required along driveway and secondary parking lot
4. Provide auto-turn with final submission
5. Provide Landscaping plan with final submission
6. Outdoor covered areas may require sprinklers – more detailed required.
7. Building must be fully sprinkled and updated fire alarm system
8. Lighting/Photometric plan required with final submission
9. Electrical brought up to current standards for educational facility. Stamped electrical plans will be required prior to obtaining an electrical permit
10. Provide any signage proposed with final application
11. Ability to serve letters for water and sewer required with final submission
12. Access to the shed to the rear of the parking area may be difficult. Consider alternate locations.

Action for the Board’s Consideration

1. Consider public comments provided during the workshop
2. Schedule a public hearing

Michael Tadema-Wielandt showed the 511 Bridge Street site location that is about two acres, just about across the street from the Community Center, actually on the corner of Graham Road formally known as Rocky Hill Manner which was an assisted living home facility.

The applicant is proposing to renovate the interior of the building and create a daycare for up to one hundred children.

The majority of the existing structure will remain. The barn or garage structure will be removed. Today there are two curb-cuts there, the northern drive gets you to the main entrance and the southern entrance gets you to the garage that is proposed to be removed. We have met with staff and talked to them about site access. Clearly it would be better if we could limit it to one curb cut and the southern access would be the one that is preferable. The Fire Department wants to maintain the access as that is how they get to the building. It is proposed to remain.

The driveway location will have a partial reconstruction and will access the back of the building to a new parking lot with thirty-seven (37) spaces. This location will be where parents will park and walk their child in or pick-up. We are looking to limit the Northern access to limited staff use.

Also, in the back of the building there are a couple of outdoor play areas. The larger play area will be used for the younger children as it is expected that there will be more children of that age of one to five. The other play area will be used for the older children, ages five to twelve.

We have a proposed patio that will be covered for shade. Also, in the back is a shed to keep general maintenance equipment in. The dumpster is located in the south-east corner location.

We held a neighborhood meeting last week and had a good turnout. I see a lot of the folks here tonight. Some of the things we heard was traffic in the neighborhood is a concern, the speed of traffic along Bridge Street, buffering to abutters as a Day Care with children will generate noise. Clearly we will be paying close attention to buffering.

Stormwater runoff runs to Bridge Street and the rear of the property will drain to the east. We are planning a storm water feature here to treat run off and to manage volume and peak flows from the site. More details on that will come in the full application that we will be submitting.

The closest neighbor came to the meeting and had a conversation about existing trees that are right against their driveway and are starting to hang over their house. We will be looking closely at those and possibly limbing or removing some as they have requested. Additional buffering on northern edge and additional around the perimeter.

Lastly the sidewalk from the site to Graham Street that has an existing cross walk to get you to the public sidewalk on the west side on Bridge Street to get to the Community Center.

Tonight, we have an early plan and are looking for feedback and will incorporate into our final application.

Ed Reidman before the meeting started, Staff passed out a memo from Mark Drouin dealing with 511 Bridge Street Site Plan and Conditional Use (shown below).

E-Mail received on 06/04/19 @ 9:50 AM

Good Morning,

I apologize for the late submission for tonight's Planning Board meeting and workshop. I was planning on attending to make the below comments and suggestions regarding the proposed day care facility at 511 Bridge Street, but a work obligation is getting in the way of that plan.

I live at 548 Bridge Street and attended the neighborhood meeting regarding this proposed facility on Tuesday, May 28th. In general, I am not opposed to allowing a day care facility at this location, but I ask that the Planning staff and Planning Board consider the following suggestions and requests prior to approving this facility:

- (1) As many know, traffic on the upper end of Bridge Street between Cumberland Street and the intersection with Methodist Road and East Bridge Street has increased significantly over the past decade due to development in the northern part of the city, as well as growth in Windham, Falmouth and Gray and the commuter traffic that has created through Westbrook, particularly along Methodist Road and Bridge Street. The expansion of the Shaw Brothers' quarries near the northern part of Methodist Road has also exponentially increased truck traffic along this stretch. This has become a heavily traveled road in the City. Generally speaking, traffic tends to obey the posted speed limit on the stretch between Graham Road and Cumberland Street due to the presence of the school, community center and Little League ballfields, though that is becoming less frequent with each passing year. That certainly is not the case in the stretch from Graham Road to the intersection with Methodist Road and East Bridge Street. Cars traveling south down Methodist Road onto Bridge Street generally do not slow until the curve and slight uphill stretch about 300 feet after Lugin Street, and traffic going the opposite direction towards Methodist Road tends to increase in speed rapidly at this curve due to the visual straight-away in this stretch. 511 Bridge Street is adjacent to this curve in the road, and visibility looking up Bridge Street towards Methodist Road and the on-coming traffic from 511 Bridge Street is limited on the east side of Bridge Street by the curve in the road, as well as significant overgrowth and old furniture in the front yard of 545 Bridge Street. As such, traffic entering and exiting this facility will be at an advanced risk. I would like to suggest that the developer, Chase Custom Homes & Finance, Inc., fund the purchase and installation of a flashing school zone sign, since the school zone for Congin School begins at Graham Road. While the daycare is not a school and not eligible for expansion of the school zone, this much-needed sign for the Congin school zone will actively slow traffic in this stretch during peak drop-off and pick-up hours.*
- (2) The City is requesting upgrades to the crosswalk across Bridge Street at Graham Road. For the same reasons noted in #1 above, visibility of this crosswalk is limited. Shadows from nearby trees also tend to obscure the crosswalk, and nearby crosswalk indicator signs have been run over regularly (again, another indication of the growing traffic concerns along this stretch of road) and not replaced. I would like to suggest that the developer, Chase Custom Homes & Finance, Inc., fund the purchase and installation of a signalized crosswalk sign for this crosswalk, to improve safety and also slow traffic along this stretch of road.*
- (3) According to section 18.4.1 of the State's Rules for the Licensing of Child Care Facilities (10-148 CMR Chapter 32), the facility must provide a minimum net area of thirty-five (35) square feet of usable space per child. This building, once renovated, could potentially house more than 100 children under that guideline. I recommend that the Planning Board set a hard cap at 100 children as part of its approval, that way any increase in capacity must come back before the Planning Board and be subject to public input. Otherwise, once approved, neighbors will likely not know until after the fact if the State daycare license is ever expanded beyond 100 children and not have the ability to provide timely input for that increase prior to approval.*
- (4) Significant consideration needs to be placed on drainage from this property, especially with the removal of trees in the rear for a paved parking area. The property drains both to the front towards the low part of Bridge Street near the aforementioned curve and also to the rear of 527 Bridge Street onto land that is currently for sale. Ponding on the low section of Bridge Street in front is common when the drainage catch basin clogs. Drainage towards the rear eventually pushes to a small stream*

that crosses under Lugin near the cul-de-sac and downhill before running under Alberta Drive. More water being pushed into this system could lead to water issues for neighbors on Lugin Street and Alberta Drive. I recommend the Planning Board ensures the developer has a solid engineering plan in place to deal with this water, especially in the land behind 527 Bridge Street is sold and developed. Whatever run-off system is built needs to be adaptable to account for potential changes to the build environment around this proposed facility.

Thank you for your attention to these requests.

Thanks

Marc Drouin

548 Bridge Street

Westbrook, ME 04092

(207) 749-1181

Ed Reidman does the Board have any comments at this time?

Joe Marden first I would like to say that I have a three-year-old and there is a huge need for additional daycares. Overall the project is great, and many parents are looking for daycare openings. Beside that, I do have a question regarding the comments from Staff is fire lane, no parking, striping along driveway and secondary parking lot. Is that the southernmost one? My comment was to have more of a parallel parking along the entrance drive. The parking, then backing up with a lot of the children there, it would be better to pull in and pull out. Is there any consideration to that?

Michael Tadema-Wielandt we did discuss where parents and children can access this building and we did look at which door works best for the internal flow. The thing that made is decide not to do a drop off or parallel parking area is if you did that on the way in, you would have people crossing this area and we wanted to prevent that. We can look at that again but clearly we do not have a lot of space to have many parallel parking spaces there. You could create a wait for parents to get to those spaces, then they are crossing the main driveway and we wanted to prevent that.

Joe Marden I was thinking of the northern side, but the Fire Department needs access there.

Michael Tadema-Wielandt yes

Ed Reidman question or comments?

Rene Daniel keep in mind what I call a vacant lot, make sure you build up the buffer. I would like to see those who have residential homes there need their privacy. The only home I see that may be a problem I see is the abutter going up Bridge Street is because it is so close. Also, if you can keep in mind if you can plant more trees in the wooded area please do. Keep in mind I will also ask you how many trees you are going to take down you are taking down and consider planting two for everyone you take down.

I concur with Mr. Marden that there are not enough good day care centers around, and I think that is a good area so the children can see where the schools are. Always keep the focus that it has been a residential area for as long as I have been in the area. I think you will do a good job and keep the neighbors in the loop and do not surprise them.

Ed Reidman any other questions or comments from the Board?

Nancy Litrocapes I have a comment this is for one hundred (100) children and the noise level for one hundred (100) children is really high, so the idea of planting two trees for everyone taken down, there should be two trees for every child. The sound buffer is going to be critical. Children are so loud.

I love the daycare idea, they are needed. When my son was younger, I had to drive miles away for a place to go, so it is great to have this so close to the Community Center. But whatever can be done to mitigate noise will really help that neighborhood.

Ed Reidman general public are there any questions or comments?

Maria Lundy 17 Graham Road and I went to the meeting last week and I will say I am not really happy about having one hundred (100) child Daycare in my back yard. I am retired and I do not want to listen to one hundred children. I can hear Congin School from my condo and that is off in the distance. I can not even imagine what one hundred children will be in my back yard. I am very upset about that.

I have a site map for this area, and I am not sure when their proposal to do the driveway, I do not know exactly how far back towards me?

**Editors Note Maria Lundy showed her back yard on the map.

A lot of the people are going to be impacted by the noise level here but the condo I live in is exactly right in their back yard. Even with the storm run-off, I do not know if you are aware but the condos were originally built on clay and there is nothing but clay there and we have had water issues because that property actually slopes back into my back yard and this year I was completely flooded.

I am worried about storm runoff and extremely worried about noise as they are roughly fifty feet from my yard.

I do not know where the end of the proposed parking lot is to my back yard. So that means that the dumpster will be emptied once a week exactly straight across from me. So, I am not happy about that.

The traffic on Graham Road is a cut through already and has traffic congestion. That street barely has enough room for two-way traffic. There is a fair amount of parking on that street, so it limits traffic flow as the street is not that wide. In the winter we are basically down to one lane. I cannot imagine with the extra increased traffic what will happen on the street.

With the extra traffic to the driveway during arrival and pick-up times between 7:30 am to 8:30 am then 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm how many people will be in that driveway; I am worried about exhaust fumes.

I am the abutter that is impacted the most. I do not think there is a way they can buffer the noise from even fifty (50) children as I hear the children from Congin School during recess.

I am strongly opposed to this project due to the noise and the disruption of the neighborhood.

Robert Crandon 516 Bridge Street across the street from the building. Why are they having children from six to twelve, aren't they supposed to be in school? Is this going to be some sort of a school?

Then there is a question of the traffic. During 7:00 am to 8:00 am it takes about 15 to 20 minutes to get from there through the light at Cumberland and Bridge Street. The traffic is really bad. They are claiming that most of the traffic will be first thing in the morning and the last thing at night but during the day the traffic travels much too fast in that area also. I can just imagine what the additional forty (40) cars will do to the traffic delays. As the previous speaker said, many cars use Park Road and Graham as a cut through to bypass the light at Cumberland and Bridge Street. I strongly advise a traffic survey before approving this.

Since I am right across the street the noise from these kids will be a lot and naturally I am not in favor of the project.

Penny Pulsoni 45 Lugin Street, my concern is traffic. In the morning taking a left off of Lugin to Bridge can take a little bit of time. Also, no one goes 25 miles an hour. The number of cars that will be added will increase the traffic issues. I cannot fathom it. It takes me a good 10 minutes to get from Lugin Street to get to the rotary at Cumberland Mills. I hope the traffic is looked at closely before you add additional cars to the neighborhood.

The noise in the summer will be unbearable. I do not know how you can buffer the noise from one hundred (100) children. It has been a wonderful quiet residential neighborhood and I hope we can still retain that.

Ed Reidman thank you for the comments and once you are ready we will come back and have a Public Hearing.

Jennie Franceschi does the Board wish to have a site walk on this application?

**Board affirmed the need of a site walk

Jennie Franceschi July 13th at 9:00 am?

Rene Daniel moved to schedule the site walk for July 13th at 9:00 am.

2nd by Kim Fickett

The vote is unanimous in favor 6-0

Adjourn

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