



City of Westbrook

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND
CODE ENFORCEMENT

2 York Street

Westbrook, Maine 04092

(207) 854-0638

Fax: (866) 559-0642

**WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD
TUESDAY, July 10th, 2007, 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), Cory Fleming (At Large), Michael
Taylor (Alternate)

Absent: Anna Wrobel (Ward 4), Scott Herrick (Alternate)

Staff: Rick Gouzie, Eric Dudley, Erik Carson

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

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – June 5th, 2007

Rene Daniel moved to approve the minutes as written

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote was unanimous in favor 4-0

Continuing Business

3. Final Subdivision, Site Plan and Village Review – Profenno’s Apartment Building – Terradyn Consultants L.L.C., on behalf of Peter P. Profenno, Jr., for the construction of a 3,240 S.F. building that includes six dwelling units and a street level commercial/retail space on the property located at 918 Main Street. Tax Map: 32, Lot: 42, Zone: CC, Overlay Zones: Village Review, Downtown Housing.

Rene Daniel moved to remove item from table

2nd by Dennis Isherwood

The vote was unanimous in favor 4-0

Overview – This site was occupied by a restaurant/apartment building before it burned in 2005. The enclosed proposal seeks to replace this structure with a mixed use commercial/apartment building. The proposal meets the City’s goal to promote ground floor commercial space with housing above. The project utilizes the density increase in the Downtown Housing Overlay District.

Jon Whitten Terradyn Consultants L.L.C., on behalf of Peter P. Profenno, Jr., explained that the Village Overlay Committee has reviewed the plans for the construction of a 3,240 S.F. building that includes six dwelling units and a street level commercial/retail space on the property located at 918 Main Street. Tax Map: 32, Lot: 42, Zone: CC, Overlay Zones: Village Review, Downtown Housing.

SUBDIVISION REVIEW

Staff Comments:

1. Since the last meeting, the applicant has submitted the final elevation plans which have been reviewed and recommended by the Village Review Overlay Committee.
2. The Recreation and Conservation Commission has reviewed and recommended a fee in lieu of land for open space.

Greg Blake moved the Subdivision application for Profenno’s Apartment Building on Tax Map: 32, Lot: 42 is to be **approved with conditions** with the following findings of fact and conclusions.

A. POLLUTION AND SEWERAGE DISPOSAL

- The project will utilize the public sanitary sewer system.

B. WATER

- The Portland Water District has confirmed its ability to serve the project.

C. SOIL EROSION

- The City Engineer approves the erosion control plans.

D. TRAFFIC

- The project will not burden the existing roadways.

E. SEWERAGE

- The City Engineer has confirmed the City's ability to accommodate this project.

F. SOLID WASTE

- For the commercial portion of the building, solid waste removal shall be the property owner's responsibility.

G. AESTHETICS

- A statement from the Maine Department of Conservation is not necessary for this site.
- A statement that no significant wildlife habitat exists from the Maine IF&W is not necessary for this site.
- Appearance Assessment:
 - (1) Project to Site – The use of a recessed doorway would enable the building to be built next to the sidewalk and eliminate the need for a ramp.
 - (2) Project to Surrounding Property – The project is appropriate for the City Center District.
 - (3) Landscape Design – Not applicable.
 - (4) Lighting – Any exterior lighting must consist of cut-off fixtures.
 - (5) Signs – A sign has not been proposed at this time.

H. CONFORMITY WITH LOCAL PLANS AND ORDINANCES

- Comprehensive Plan:
 - The project meets the comprehensive plan goal of street level commercial space.
- Land Use Ordinances – The project meets the performance standards of the City Center District. The project also meets the density standards of the Downtown Housing Overlay District. The applicant must describe how the project will meet the parking requirements of the Downtown Housing Overlay District. Six dedicated parking spaces must be provided within 1,000 linear feet of the building.
- Recreation & Open Space – The Commission will review the application at its June meeting.

- Community facilities impact analysis – The Board may request an analysis.
- Fire Code
 - Any signage should include the building number and street name.
- Others:

I. FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL CAPACITY

- The applicant has submitted a letter of financial capacity from TD Banknorth.
- The applicant has assembled a team of designers and builders that demonstrate the technical ability to complete the project.

J. RIVER, STREAM OR BROOK IMPACTS

- None.

CONCLUSIONS

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

10. The developer **has** adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section.
11. The proposed site plan **is not** situated entirely or partially within the watershed of any pond or lake or within 250 feet of any wetland, great pond or river as defined in Title 38, Chapter 3, subchapter I, article 2-B M.R.S.A.
12. The proposed site plan **will not** alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water.
13. The proposed site **is not** situated entirely or partially within a floodplain.
14. All freshwater wetlands **have** been shown on the site plan.
15. Any river, stream, or brook within or abutting the site plan **has** been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application.
16. The proposed site plan **will** provide for adequate storm water management.
17. If any lots in the proposed subdivision have shore frontage on a river, stream, brook, or great pond as these features are defined in Title 38, section 480-B, none of the lots created within the subdivision **have** a lot depth to shore frontage ratio greater than 5 to 1.
18. The long-term cumulative effects of the proposed subdivision **will not** unreasonably increase a great pond's phosphorus concentration during the construction phase and life of the proposed subdivision.
19. For any proposed subdivision that crosses municipal boundaries, the proposed subdivision **will not** cause unreasonable traffic congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of existing public ways in an adjoining municipality in which part of the subdivision is located.
20. Timber on the parcel being subdivided **has not** been harvested in violation of rules adopted pursuant to Title 12, section 8869, subsection 14.
21. The proposed subdivision **will not** negatively impact the ability of the City to provide public safety services.

CONDITIONS

1. Approval is dependant upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated April 17, 2007, as amended May 15, 2007 and June 5, 2007 and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Planning Board, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the Planning Board.
2. Any signage shall include the building number and street name.
3. Prior to a building permit being issued, the applicant shall pay a fee in lieu of land in the amount of \$2,458.68 as recommended by the Recreation and Conservation Commission at their June 18, 2007 meeting in accordance with Section 502.6.A(1) of the Land Use Ordinance.

2nd by Cory Fleming

The vote was 4-0 in favor (Michael Taylor recused)

SITE PLAN REVIEW

STAFF COMMENTS

1. Waiting for updated building elevations for Village Review Overlay approval.

Findings of Fact and conclusions for the

Westbrook Planning Board,

Greg Blake moved the Site Plan application for Profenno's Apartment Building on Tax Map: 32, Lot: 42 is to be **approved with conditions** with the following findings of fact and conclusions.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Utilization of the Site

- The site was previously occupied by a multi-story building.

Adequacy of Road System

- The project will not burden the existing road system.

Access to the Site

- Not applicable.

Internal Vehicular Circulation

- Not applicable.

Pedestrian and Other Modes of Transportation

- The project provides access from Main Street.

Storm water Management

- The City Engineer approves of the storm water management plans.

Erosion Control

- The City Engineer approves of the erosion control plans.

Utilities

- Underground Utilities including communications and electrical will be used for this project.

Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials

- None.

Technical and Financial Capacity

- The applicant has submitted a letter of financial capacity from TD Banknorth.
- The applicant has assembled a team of designers and builders that demonstrate the technical ability to complete the project.

Solid Waste

- Solid waste for the commercial portion of the property will be the responsibility of the property owner.

Historic, Archaeological and Botanical Resources

- None.

Landscape Plan

- Not applicable.

Others

- Parking: See Subdivision Review.

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

1. Approval is dependant upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated April 17, 2007, as amended May 15, 2007 and June 5, 2007, and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Planning Board, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the Planning Board.

2nd by Cory Fleming

The vote was unanimous in favor 5-0

VILLAGE REVIEW

Greg Blake moved the Village Review application for Profenno's Apartment Building on Tax Map: 32, Lot: 42 is to be **approved with conditions** with the following findings of fact:

- (1) Scale of the Building. The scale of the building depends on its overall size, it's mass in relationship to the open space around it, and the size of its doors, windows, porches and balconies. The scale of a building must be compatible with its site and neighborhood.
 - The scale of the building is compatible with the other buildings on Main Street.
- (2) Height. Change in the building height can have a negative impact on how a street appears. While maintaining a particular height is not required, changes in height must be visually compatible with the streetscape and the neighborhood.
 - The height of the building is appropriate for Main Street.
- (3) Rhythm of Front Facades. In reviewing any facade, the pattern of doors, windows and wall surface, their height and width, should be visually compatible with the neighboring structures.
 - Staff recommends that the front façade be moved to the edge of the sidewalk and the handicapped ramp be removed through the use of a recessed doorway.
- (4) Relationship of Facade Shapes and Materials. The relationship of facade shapes and materials should be considered in relation to the surrounding neighborhood. In particular, the rhythm of shapes, pitch, and orientation to the street on which the structure fronts should be maintained.
 - Overall, the façade shapes and materials are appropriate for the area. As with number 3, Staff would prefer that the handicapped ramp be removed through the use of a ramp leading to a recessed doorway. This would give the project a more consistent, "Main Street" design.

CONDITIONS

1. Approval is dependant upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated April 17, 2007, as amended May 15, 2007 and June 5, 2007, and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the City Planner, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the City Planner and/or Planning Board.

2nd by Michael Taylor

The vote was unanimous in favor 5-0

New Business

4. Special Exception, Tasha Rinaldi, for the review of a Daycare located at 254 Stroudwater Street. Tax Map: 030, Lot 016, Zone: RGA 1.

Tasha Rinaldi 254 Stroudwater Street requested the Planning Board review of a Daycare located at 254 Stroudwater Street. Tax Map: 030, Lot 016, Zone: RGA 1.

Eric Dudley explained the parking and the drop off area for this daycare.

Staff Comments:
None

Cory Fleming moved the Special Exception application for Tasha Rinaldi on Tax Map: 030, Lot 16 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 proposed use has provided an adequate number of parking spaces to meet the ordinance. The proposed use must provide an adequate fenced playground.
- 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 project consists of a daycare in an existing single family home. The house is located at the edge of a residential neighborhood with the high school athletic fields on the opposite side of the street and the Woodlawn Cemetery and St. Hyacinth Cemetery to the south of the property. A fenced play area will be added to the property for up to 12 children. No other modifications to the exterior of the property will be needed.
- Neighboring uses are single-family residential, cemeteries, and a school. The proposed use will increase traffic during the morning and evening hours as children are picked-up and dropped-off.

C. Effects of Land Use. That the use granted will:

- (1) Maintain safe and healthful conditions,
 - The playground will be fenced.
- (2) Not cause water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation
 - No Issues.
- (3) Not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird or other wildlife habitat,
 - No Issues.
- (4) Conserve shared tree cover and visual, as well as actual, access to water bodies,
 - No Issues.
- (5) Not burden on-site septic or off-site waste disposal,
 - No Issues.
- (6) Not burden existing public ways.
 - Stroudwater Street will be able to accommodate the number of morning and evening trips generated by this project.

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,
 - No Issues.
- (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,
 - No issues.

- (3) Water, Air, Soil Pollution. The development will not cause unreasonable water, air, or soil pollution,
 - No Issues.
- (4) Soil Integrity. The development will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or reduction in the capacity of the soil to hold water,
 - No Issues.
- (5) Natural Environment. The development must not have an unreasonably adverse effect on a historic site or irreplaceable natural areas,
 - No Issues.
- (6) Nuisance Factor. The development must not cause unreasonable noise, odors, dust, gas, fumes, smoke, light or other annoying or dangerous emissions,
 - The children playing outdoors will create noise in the neighborhood. The playground should be placed to minimize this impact on the neighbors. The house is located at the edge of the neighborhood. The playground should be located on the portion of the property that will allow the existing home to screen the noise from the residential properties across Forest Street.
- (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,
 - The playground must be screened from abutters.
- (8) Vehicular Access. The site layout must provide for safe vehicular access and egress, including that for emergency vehicles,
 - Parents dropping off or picking up their children will have adequate space to turn around within the lot so that no backing into Stroudwater Street will be necessary. The driveway is adequate to allow for safe passage of public safety equipment.
- (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,
 - No issues.
- (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.

- No Issues.

CONDITIONS

1. Approval is dependant upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated May 31, 2007, and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Planning Board, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the Planning Board.
2. The applicant shall install a fenced-in playground area on the property that is buffered from the neighborhood to the maximum extent possible.

2nd by Michael Taylor

The vote was unanimous in favor 5-0

5. Special Exception, Jennifer Logan, for the review of a Daycare located at 87 Puritan Drive. Tax Map: 052, Lot 059, Zone: RGA 2.

Jennifer Logan 87 Puritan Drive requested the Planning Board review of a Daycare located at 87 Puritan Drive. Tax Map: 052, Lot 059, Zone: RGA 2.

Eric Dudley explained the traffic, parking and drop off areas on this lot.

Staff Comments:

None

Cory Fleming moved the Special Exception application for Jennifer Logan on Tax Map: 052 Lot: 059 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 applicant has a fenced in back yard which is adequate for a play area.
- 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.

- Neighboring uses are predominately single-family residential. The proposed use will increase traffic during the morning and evening hours as children are picked-up and dropped-off.

C. Effects of Land Use. That the use granted will:

- (1) Maintain safe and healthful conditions,
 - The playground is fenced.
- (2) Not cause water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation
 - No Issues.
- (3) Not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird or other wildlife habitat,
 - No Issues.
- (4) Conserve shared tree cover and visual, as well as actual, access to water bodies,
 - No Issues.
- (5) Not burden on-site septic or off-site waste disposal,
 - No Issues.
- (6) Not burden existing public ways.
 - The road will be able to accommodate the number of morning and evening trips generated by this project.

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

- (11) 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,
 - No Issues.
- (12) 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,
 - No issues.
- (13) Water, Air, Soil Pollution. The development will not cause unreasonable water, air, or soil pollution,
 - No Issues.
- (14) Soil Integrity. The development will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or reduction in the capacity of the soil to hold water,
 - No Issues.

- (15) Natural Environment. The development must not have an unreasonably adverse effect on a historic site or irreplaceable natural areas,
- No Issues.
- (16) Nuisance Factor. The development must not cause unreasonable noise, odors, dust, gas, fumes, smoke, light or other annoying or dangerous emissions,
- The children playing outdoors will create noise in the neighborhood. The playground will be placed in the rear of the building. The playground abuts a large lot which is mostly undeveloped and heavily wooded.
- (17) 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,
- The playground will be screened from abutters.
- (18) Vehicular Access. The site layout must provide for safe vehicular access and egress, including that for emergency vehicles,
- No Issues
- (19) 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,
- No Issues
- (20) 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.
- No Issues.

CONDITIONS

1. Approval is dependant upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated May 29, 2007, and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Planning Board, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the Planning Board.

2nd by Michael Taylor

The vote was unanimous in favor 5-0

6. Sketch Plan, Subdivision Review – Begin Lane Subdivision, Sebago Technics on behalf of BB & J, LLC for the development of an extension of Begin Lane to provide access to an additional ten single family house lots on Begin Lane. Tax Map: 010, Lots: 5, 6, 9, 10, Zone: RGA2.

Shawn Frank Sebago Technics on behalf of BB & J, LLC presented to the Planning Board aspects of the development of an extension of Begin Lane to provide access to an additional ten single family house lots on Begin Lane. Tax Map: 010, Lots: 5, 6, 9, 10, Zone: RGA2.

Corey Fleming asked staff about the flow of traffic on Cumberland Street.

Eric Dudley one intersection at Park and Cumberland need a traffic study that may warrant a traffic light. Begin Lane would be a low volume roadway.

Ed Reidman asked to have a traffic study at the intersection of Begin Lane and Cumberland Street, with the approval of the Planning Board.

Rene Daniel requested sidewalks for safety reasons.

Eric Dudley explained the road standards for Private Ways

Ed Reidman will oppose this project, should the road not be paved.

7. Sketch Plan, Subdivision Review – 26 Knight Street, Terradyn Consultants, LLC on behalf of Chris Wilson for the creation of a three lot subdivision on Knight Street including two single family house lots and one three family house lot. Tax Map: 039, Lot 053, Zone: Brown Street Contract Zone.

Jon Whitten Terradyn Consultants, LLC on behalf of Chris Wilson presented aspects for the creation of a three lot subdivision on Knight Street including two single family house lots and one three family house lot. Tax Map: 039, Lot 053, Zone: Brown Street Contract Zone.

Mr. Whitten explained that the staff has requested additional parking on Lot #3 which creates issues with the parking and asked for the Planning Boards review from the plan to meet the City Ordinance.

Michael Taylor asked what the set-backs are.

Jon Whitten said there are no setbacks in this contract zone.

Ed Reidman read Captain Jarrett's memo into the record, regarding the parking issue.

Eric Dudley explained the need for additional parking requirements in the Contract Zone, due to Public Safety issues.

Rene Daniel agrees with the parking requirements requested by the staff.

8. Village Review, 863 Main Street Chris Grimm, DBA Waves Edge, LLC, for the renovation of the exterior façade. Tax Map: 032, Lot 229, Zone: City Center District.

Overview – Chris Grimm, DBA Waves Edge, LLC is seeking approval to perform façade improvements to 863 Main Street. This property is locally known as Valle Square and currently houses the businesses of Aquatic Concepts and Edward Jones Investments. The applicant has worked with staff and the Village Review Overlay Committee who endorse the proposed improvements.

Chris Grimm, DBA Waves Edge, LLC, introduced the project for the renovation of the exterior façade. Tax Map: 032, Lot 229, Zone: City Center District.

Erik Carson presented aspects of the renovation of the exterior façade. Tax Map: 032, Lot 229, Zone: City Center District.

Rene Daniel expressed concerns that 70% of the building will be renovated for the exterior façade as Edward Jones unit is not going to be included with this project.

Mr. Daniel asked when the sidewalk problems would be addressed.

Eric Dudley said a portion of the sidewalk was completed as part of the Boardwalk project. The Edwards Block project was completed by T&T Development. The City of Westbrook does not have any immediate plans to repair the sidewalk in that area of Main Street.

VILLAGE REVIEW

Corey Fleming moved the Village Review application for 863 Main Street on Tax Map: 32, Lot: 229 is to be **approved with conditions** with the following findings of fact:

(1) Scale of the Building. The scale of the building depends on its overall size, it's mass in relationship to the open space around it, and the size of its doors, windows, porches and balconies. The scale of a building must be compatible with its site and neighborhood.

- The scale of the building is compatible with the other buildings on Main Street.

- (2) Height. Change in the building height can have a negative impact on how a street appears. While maintaining a particular height is not required, changes in height must be visually compatible with the streetscape and the neighborhood.
- The height of the building is appropriate for Main Street.
- (3) Rhythm of Front Facades. In reviewing any facade, the pattern of doors, windows and wall surface, their height and width, should be visually compatible with the neighboring structures.
- Staff recommends that the front façade be approved as submitted since it is consistent with how the building has looked historically and is compatible with neighboring buildings.
- (4) Relationship of Facade Shapes and Materials. The relationship of facade shapes and materials should be considered in relation to the surrounding neighborhood. In particular, the rhythm of shapes, pitch, and orientation to the street on which the structure fronts should be maintained.
- Overall, the façade shapes and materials are appropriate for the area. The applicant has worked to provide a design that will revive the historical significance of this building.

CONDITIONS

1. Approval is dependant upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated June 25, 2007 and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the City Planner, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the City Planner and/or Planning Board.
2. The applicant works closely with the Site Plan review Committee to select appropriate colors for the building.

2nd by Rene Daniel

The vote was unanimous in favor 5-0

9. Adjourn

*Respectfully submitted by Linda Gain PECE Secretary
MINUTES MAY NOT BE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. SECTIONS MAY BE PARAPHRASED FOR CLARITY. A COMPLETE RECORDING MAY BE OBTAINED BY CONTACTING THE ENGINEERING, PLANNING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT DEPARTMENT. THANK YOU*