



Planning & Code Enforcement

2 York Street
Westbrook, Maine 04092
Phone: 207-854-0638
Fax: 866-559-0642

PLANNING & CODE ENFORCEMENT

WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD

Tuesday, June 6, 2023, 7:00 P.M.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Rebecca Dillon I would like to call to order the Westbrook planning board meeting for Tuesday, June 6th, 2023. This meeting will be offered as a hybrid meeting, accommodating both in-person and remote participation. The link and phone number to join the meeting via Zoom is located on the Planning Board agenda, which can be found on the City of Westbrook website westbrookmaine.com/agenda.center.

Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81700741385>

Dial-in (audio only): 1-646-558-8656

Webinar ID: 817 0074 1385

Where public comment is permitted, members of the public attending remotely will have the opportunity to provide remote testimony. If you wish to speak during a Public Hearing or Public Comment, use the “Raise Hand” function through Zoom (or dial *9 on your phone) when instructed by the Planning Board chair. Comments will only be accepted during a Public Hearing or Public Comment period and should remain specific to the application that is being discussed.

Roll Call – Attendance

Karen Axelsen	Present
Robin Tannenbaum	Present
Vice Chair - Larry McWilliams	Present
Nancy Litrocapes	Present
John Turcotte	Present
Jason Frazier	Absent
Kevin Price	Absent
Susan Roma	Present
Chair - Rebecca Dillon	Present

Staff: Jennie Franceschi, Planning Director, Rebecca Spitella, Associate Planner; Linda Gain, Office Coordinator

2. Approval of Minutes

Karen Axelsen move to approve May 2, 2023, minutes.

2nd by **John Turcotte**

Roll Call Vote

Karen Axelsen	Yes
Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Vice Chair - Larry McWilliams	Yes
Nancy Litrocapes	Yes
John Turcotte	Yes
Jason Frazier	Absent
Kevin Price	Absent
Susan Roma	Yes
Chair - Rebecca Dillon	Yes

The vote is unanimous in favor 7-0

Rebecca Dillon let the record show it is unanimous in favor.

REGULAR BUSINESS

- Rebecca Spitella reads item into the record** 2020.41 – Site Plan Approval Extension – Brooks Edge Farm Subdivision – Wormell Farm, LLC: The applicant is requesting a one-year extension to the Site Plan approval for a 118-unit subdivision along Brook Street approved January 18, 2022, and amended June 7, 2022. Tax Map: 019 Lots: 029 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2 Use: Dwelling, Two-Family

Presentation on file at the Westbrook Planning Department and on the Westbrook Website link shown below:

<https://vimeo.com/showcase/3075539/video/778681994>

Shawn Frank presented aspects of the Site Plan Approval Extension.

Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the board. My name is Sean Frank, I am a civil engineer with Sebago Technics out of South Portland. Basically, as you know with the bank situation and the interest rates, financing has just become a little bit more complicated.

We think we are dangerously close. We have actually issued an initial bond to staff. They have had their comments. We are very hopeful that construction will actually start within the next few weeks.

We are here tonight to make sure from an extension standpoint that, we do not have a lapse within the approval, so we would request the extension to allow, to keep the approvals current and like I say, the anticipation is that we will be actually doing the construction very soon.

With that, I would be happy to answer any questions. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Rebecca Dillon thank you, Staff Comments?

Jennie Franceschi presented Staff Comments:
Staff has no further comments.

REGULAR BUSINESS

Tax Map: 019 Lot: 029
 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2
 Use: Dwelling, Two-Family

Project Description

The applicant is requesting a one-year extension to the Site Plan approval for a 118-unit subdivision along Brook Street approved January 18, 2022, and amended June 7, 2022. Please see applicant's letter of request.

Project History

November 30, 2020 – Neighborhood Meeting

December 1, 2020 – Planning Board Workshop

August 3, 2021 – Public Hearing

October 5, 2021 – Regular Meeting

January 18, 2022 – Regular Meeting – Request for final approval

June 7, 2022 – Amendment to the Conditions of Approval

June 6, 2023 – Request for an extension on the site plan approval

Staff Comments

At this time, no changes to the Ordinance have occurred that would have altered the 2022 approval. Staff are in support of the applicant's request for a 1-year extension to the Site Plan approval for Brooks Edge Farm Subdivision as the development team finalizes their financing of the project.

Rebecca Dillon Do we have any Board comments or questions?

Board Comment/Discussion

a. In-Person

Larry McWilliams Glad to hear just a couple of weeks because I saw the for sale signs up. I drive in that neighborhood all the time, so I see that they are up for sale.

So do you have an idea on, you say a couple of weeks to start. But is there a waiting on how many are sold to date?

Shawn Frank No. No, it is not. I appreciate the comment and those were sold is a strong word. It was really more reservations, if you will, because the sales could not occur. There is, some legalities associated with that. Oh yes. The bond, of course, we need to have that finalized with staff. Then we will have a pre-construction meeting with staff.

We do have a third-party inspector on board. Uh, and I would think pretty quickly after that pre-construction meeting with the city.

So, when I say weeks, I would certainly think within the three-to-four-week time, assuming that the pre-construction meeting and those types of things can be worked out. But I certainly see it in the very short term.

Rebecca Dillon any other Board comments or questions?

No comments

Rebecca Dillon we have a motion on page one of the memo.

John Turcotte move That the Planning Board approves a 1-year extension on the Site Plan approval granted January 18, 2022, and amended June 7, 2022, for a 118-unit subdivision along Brook Street Tax Map: 019 Lot: 029 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2. All previously approved findings of fact, conclusions and conditions of approval are still applicable.

2nd by Nancy Litrocapes

Roll Call Vote

Karen Axelsen	Yes
Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Vice Chair - Larry McWilliams	Yes
Nancy Litrocapes	Yes
John Turcotte	Yes
Jason Frazier	Absent
Kevin Price	Absent
Susan Roma	Yes
Chair - Rebecca Dillon	Yes

The vote is unanimous in favor 7-0

Rebecca Dillon Let the record show it was unanimous.

NEW BUSINESS

4. **Rebecca Spitella reads item into the record** 2023.08 – Site Plan, Subdivision, Village Review - 16 Spring St – Robie Holdings, LLC: The applicant is requesting a 7-unit townhouse style multifamily structure located at the corner of Spring Street and William Clarke Drive. Tax Map: 033 Lot: 114 Zone: City Center District – Downtown District, Village Review Overlay Zone Use: Dwelling, Multiple-Family.

Presentation on file at the Westbrook Planning Department and on the Westbrook Website link shown below:

<https://vimeo.com/showcase/3075539/video/778681994>

Dustin Roma presented aspects of the Site Plan, Subdivision and Village Review 16 Spring Street for a 7-unit Townhouse style multifamily.

My name is Dustin Roma, Civil Engineer with DM Roma Consulting Engineers. I am here tonight representing Robie Holdings, who is the new applicant here for this project.

That was really kind of a significant change from the last time that you've seen this project here. The applicant has actually changed hands at this point. So, there is a new developer that has stepped in that is going to be completing and finishing this project. I am happy to say that there really have not been any substantive changes proposed by this new applicant.

I have had the opportunity to go through and look at or review the discussion that had been discussed at the previous sketch plan meeting with the board, as well as the village review overlay district committee. I know there was quite a bit of discussion for the project at that time, so I will

just go through and just kind of highlight a few of the items that have changed just for the board's consideration.

One of the items not shown here in the graphic, but we have updated the plans to reflect a black aluminum fence that is going to be installed. Just a kind of decorative picket fence along the frontage of the property. So that will be at the property line, it will help differentiate the land that's part of the condominium development and the land that is inside of the public right way with the sidewalk there. It will just help kind of create some boundaries there and be an aesthetic feature. Um, so that has been added to the plans.

We have a single-story flat roof above the sprinkler room that you see here just on the end of the building. The flat roof was something that I think was commented on and revised in this plan set.

We have gone through all of the staff review comments, and kind of worked through those final few items. There's just a couple of small outstanding ones where they have asked us to remove a couple of trees near the project entrance just to help with some turning movements of fire apparatus. And also asked us to install some flush granite curbing on the sidewalk reconstruction that is going to occur near the project entrance.

So those are both agreeable to us and we will certainly make those changes on the final plan set that gets submitted. If approved, I think at this point here is another view of the side facing away from William Clark Drive.

This is the entrance to Spring Street. So, as you can see, there will be one garage and a parking space for each of the unit owners, as well as there is five additional outside parking spaces that are also available on the site. Three of them are at the end of the parking lot and two of the driveways are deep enough to park in front of the garage doors for those first two units as you come in off of Spring Street.

We have been coordinating with staff as far as construction goes. We are pretty eager to get started on construction very quickly here.

One of the items being that the city is still trying to work with DOT to have Spring Street awarded as a repaving project for this season. So, we've got some work to do to just bring utilities into the site and replace some curbing and rebuild sidewalks to move the driveway entrance further away from William Clark Drive, that's a critical path item that we're going to have to get done sooner than later so that if the city and DOT are successful in being able to advertise and award that repaving project that we're not stuck in a bind for construction scheduling. So, for that main reason, we are looking to get started on construction quickly as soon as we can work through the pre-construction activities with the city and make sure performance guarantees and all that stuff are in place.

I think, with that I would like to leave plenty of time here for questions and answers if there are questions.

I think there was one item to just address in the motion that was crafted up here in the agenda. We are requesting a waiver from the standards for 70% penetration on the face of the building. I think it is something that is common for exclusively residential projects that do not implement that first floor commercial.

I think that is something in talking with city staff that where they are seeing a pattern here for these types of developments and needing to request that waiver that maybe be something that in the future gets changed in the overall ordinance. But in this case, it is still a rule, and we are requesting that waiver to be approved as part of the motion for the project.

With that, I will turn it back over to the Board and am happy to answer any questions.

Rebecca Dillon thank you, Staff Comments?

Jennie Franceschi presented Staff Comments:

At this time, um, we feel the applicant has provided answers to the questions that we had that were outstanding.

As it pertains to the waiver in the motion we would just ask at the end where you get to the point of conditions as stated in X of the staff memo. We just need to add in and the waiver of provision k, and that is the provision of 70% of elements of Windows, signs, and corners. It is really meant more for a commercial type building when you do have that first-floor commercial space to try to make sure you have not a blank wall.

This particular parcel is in our downtown district, but we do not require that this parcel have the commercial components where it is. We sort of look at the utilization of the village review standards in this instance as a plus for us, is that we can utilize the higher-level standards that we otherwise are requiring of all of our Main Street fronting buildings to get better projects even on the backside and William Clark Drive side.

So even though there is a waiver being requested, we feel we are probably getting one of the best projects that we could get out at this site.

In looking to the future, we would like to discuss this particular provision of the Village Review standards in that it does not appear that it works in all applications, and we would like to try to come back to the board to talk about maybe a variation of this particular standard as it pertains to residential structures.

PUBLIC HEARING

Tax Map: 033 Lot: 114

Zone: City Center District – Downtown District; Village Review Overlay Zone

Use: Dwelling, Multiple-Family

Project Description

The applicant is proposing a 7-unit townhouse style multifamily structure located at the corner of Spring Street and William Clarke Drive with associated site improvements.

Project History

February 22, 2023 – Village Review Committee

March 2, 2023 – Neighborhood Meeting

March 7, 2023 – Planning Board Workshop

March 29, 2023 – Village Review – Revised Elevations

June 6, 2023 – Public Hearing

Village Review:

The Village Review Committee met to discuss revisions to the elevations in response to the 2/22 meeting with the committee and the 3/7 workshop with the Planning Board.

Summary of changes:

- Realignment of the WCD façade facing windows to balance with first floor windows.
- Relocation of mechanical room from WCD façade to Spring Street façade
- Flat roof chosen for mechanical room.

In general, the VROZ committee was favorable to the revisions as compared with the original presentation. In response to the waiver request on the requirement to provide architectural variation on a minimum of 70% of street facing facades (§335-7.1. G(1)(k)), the Committee voted 1-1. The opposing member stated their opposition was not specific to this project, but that they do not support the waiver of a downtown standard.

Staff supports the waiver as requested by the applicant. This standard has been waived in other projects where larger scale buildings are proposed (22 Cumberland Street; Maple Grove Subdivision (waiver requested & granted)). The waiver of the 70% standard appears to be more applicable in smaller scale buildings where commercial first floor would be required, but in this instance is not. To meet the 70% standard on larger scale buildings and/or entirely residential structures could actually result in a façade that is awkward or is not functional for the residential needs (ex: provides false windows just for the purpose of meeting the requirement). Staff would like feedback from the Board and ultimately support to review this standard and explore alternatives that would be more appropriate for larger buildings with residential units above while still maintaining the intent of avoiding large blank walls along the public street/sidewalk system.

Staff Comments:

1. Noticing Fees: Pd
2. Provide flush granite curbing between 16 and 12 Spring St driveways to provide a delineation of the sidewalk between the two driveways.
3. Landscape Plan - Remove lilac and Crabapple from driveway entrance for FD truck turning access.
4. A proposed driveway name of "Penny Lane" has been approved by E-911 and will be shown on the final plan set. A driveway sign is required (White letters on Blue background – per private road standards)
5. Cost Estimate has been updated to address the following:
 - a. Updated SMH quantity, electric conduit/wiring, and a review of quantities for parking lot gravels and sidewalk paving
 - b. Remove Building Demolition
6. Individual mailbox units subject to USPS approval
7. Final plan set includes building color and siding materials with building elevations in compliance with VROZ review.
8. Detail needed for "Deep Root" root barrier (or approved equivalent) for two street trees located adjacent to the WCD public sidewalk.
9. Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval
 - a. Open Space Fees due prior to project commencement: \$3,519.28
 - b. Building requires sprinkler and full fire alarm systems.
 - c. No parking permitted along Penny Lane driveway to maintain emergency access.
 - d. Toter storage or collection prohibited within/along the Spring St/WCD rights of way.
 - e. Recorded association documents required prior to project commencement.
 - f. Erosion Control:
 - i. No tracking into Spring Street right of way – Full length construction entrance required to be maintained at all times.
 - ii. Ensure curb inlets and storm drains in City Streets are protected at all times.

- iii. Plan calls out Silt Fence – will this be used vs erosion control mix?
- g. Construction within the Spring St right of way may require nighttime work due to volume of traffic.

Rebecca Dillon Open Public Hearing

If there is anyone here who would like to speak? Come up and speak and ask questions, please make your way to the podium, speak into the microphone, state your name and address.

Each person will have one opportunity to provide a comment. All comments should be addressed to the planning board, who will then address the applicant and staff following the public hearing, and each person will have three minutes to do so.

- a. In-person

No Comments

- b. Zoom participation.

Rebecca Spitella If anyone attending via Zoom would like to provide comment on this application, please raise your hand now.

No Comments

Rebecca Dillon Close Public Hearing

Do we have any Board comments or questions?

Board Comment/Discussion

- b. In-Person

Larry McWilliams I am glad I am seeing everything still the same. My one question now is, as a new owner, all the other things that have gone through as far as the neighborhood meeting, as far as it is going to be, condominiums are going to be sold, everything else in the provisions are still the same as what they were on the previous meeting?

Dustin Roma from what we reviewed what has been discussed and at this point, we are not deviating from anything that had been previously reviewed.

Larry McWilliams I am just curious to make sure that they're still going to be sold out as condominium units and if that's all still the same unless anything like that has changed.

Cause I will be honest, I did not do my homework because I thought it was the same owner going through. I did not realize it had changed.

Dustin Roma we are setting it up as a condominium development with the intent that the units would be sold. But as you said if maybe some of them are retained initially, that that may be the case, but it is being set up as a condominium for individual unit ownership.

Rebecca Dillon any other Board questions?

Robin Tannenbaum I think it is looking great, so thank you. It progressed really nicely, and I think it is a terrific little infill project.

You mentioned a black metal picket fence, and I am just curious about that. It feels important to me, and we are not seeing it here and I am not sure that the Village Review Committee saw it. Did they see it? Because it is not in their comments and I am not opposed to it, but I sort of recall that when we met last, there was discussion about what would be along the street and it is a tricky one, right?

Because it is residential and you want privacy, and you want delineation. So, I just wanted to try to remember what our discussion was and if the Village Review committee has had a chance to weigh in on that.

So, I guess it is more to staff.

Rebecca Spitella They did not see the specific fence, but they were aware of the kind of fence that it was.

Jennie Franceschi the final plan set does include a detail for it. I do not believe that it is in this one. I believe that that was one of the revisions that came after the initial plans were submitted. So, the signature set will have a detail in it, but it is not in this one.

If you would like, we could pull up a, just a general black fence.

Robin Tannenbaum I'd like to see it. I think that is important. Are there, or will there be gates along the way, even if they are simply ornamental? I would like to understand it more because of the big impact.

Dustin Roma I will just kind of describe it again. We did provide details, but it was after that initial submission. So just in general, the detail we provided, it is a 42-inch-tall fence that has a deck railing type spacing. So, four-inch open areas in between the individual spindles. There will be narrower, black aluminum spindles, probably an inch square with the larger four-inch opening.

So, the idea is that you would be able to see through it. It would not be any kind of restriction of space, it is just more a delineation between the two spaces so that you can see that they are separate. But we did not want something that had thick pickets on there.

Robin Tannenbaum You know, we have a few of those on William Clark and they are very solid. No, no. This is something that would be more like what you would see on a deck. The narrower spindles with the four-inch spacing in between them and maybe there is a detail at the top. I am just curious.

So, I think we have interest over there. Do you want to see an image? If I can just ask Dustin, from what I can see on the site plan, it looks like, if I understand there is still a fair amount of lawn for between the fence and the sidewalk.

I guess I can sort of tell that is the property line essentially. So, it is the city's right of way between that, that green area the planted area between that and the side and the sidewalk.

Dustin Roma yes, you can see the fence is actually going to be a lot closer to the building than it is to the sidewalks. It is back here on unit six and seven are right up against it.

Jennie Franceschi During, I think it was the Village Review process, when they were talking initially about a solid fence to try to create some level privacy for the residents there. It mentioned some concern about how that would feel like a wall and that that might not be the best addition to everything else that they have going on.

****Editor's Note** Rebecca Spitella showed a fence type on the screen.

Dustin Roma described the measurements of the fence.

Rebecca Dillon Any other board questions or comments?

Nancy Litrocapes I am glad you brought in the fence. It seems like it could really change the nature of the whole look of the building. And it is hard to get a sense of this without having, without having an image that's not just that type of an image to see how it will look relative to the building.

So, we have nothing like that to look at because I feel like that does make a big difference in the whole building.

I love the building. I like the fact that it is contemporary. I like the colors; I like the use of the space. I think the whole thing is great. And then the fence is really going to make a difference for, for better or for worse. It is so hard to tell from just that drawing.

So, one of the things about the fence being black is that that helps to kind of blend in with, especially with the gray siding.

Thank you.

Dustin Roma black blend is seen through, wood or white mat finish walking on sidewalk will not stand out like a black one would.

Larry McWilliams I do like that type of style fence as well. I like raw iron better than aluminum because it holds up better. So as long as it is something that is a sturdy fence as well. Cause it is going to be hopefully a public walkway that is going to be used quite often. I know it is going to be set back a little bit, but we are setting boundaries basically. But I do like the separation where it's not a wall and it's only 42 inches high so when you're walking by, even though it's elevated a little bit there when you're walking by, it's probably going to be almost at head height, walking down wayside drive cause of the elevation that's up a little bit. Yep.

I like the colors and I like the way the contemporary look is for the remodeling of how we are setting up the city. It is, it looks good.

Dustin Roma hen the other thought with the dark fences, if you, see all the different charcoal accents throughout the building where we have the banding and we've got the corner pieces and we've got the trim around the windows that are all that, that black or charcoal color, we felt the black picket fence with wide spacing in between would just kind of compliment that overall look.

Larry McWilliams I agree. Thank you.

Rebecca Dillon Any other board questions or comments?

Karen Axelsen so does the fence loop to Spring Street too?

Dustin Roma I do not believe so. Let me just double check.

Karen Axelsen so the fence would definitely be nice to keep that separation. So that was all I had. Thanks.

Rebecca Dillon Anyone else?

Nancy Litrocapes I have another comment. Understanding that the fence does not go around the corner to Spring Street. It would be nice if it did. I think it would be less likely for passersby to pass right through the backyards. I do not know if they necessarily would, but it would really deter anybody that might want to do that.

Dustin Roma I do not see any reason why we could not do that. So, if the board felt they wanted the fence to wrap around the corner to the driveway, we could do that.

Robin Tannenbaum if I can add a comment. If these are condominiums, your tenants may appreciate that if they have small animals that they are taking out for relief to have something that comes around the corner either returns to the mechanical room or somehow encompasses the side.

I see this as a stormwater area. Mm-hmm. But you know, my hope is that somebody would take some ownership and plant along that side, but that is totally up to them., I certainly think that makes sense.

It also just makes a fence look less token-eques when it turns the corner and starts to contain some space even if it does not create a hard boundary for a dog.

I would certainly support that.

Dustin Roma Have it come up here almost and then up here and have a gate access over there.

I mean, I definitely see it coming around the corner up to the driveway. Um, as far as trying to loop it back into the building and, putting a gate on it and stuff like that. I do not know if we would necessarily want to do that. I wouldn't want to enclose it without a gate it would be a maintenance nightmare.

Rebecca Spitella I think the concern is if you loop it around and bring it up you will need to provide some level of break for fire access.

Jennie Franceschi that was, we cannot get the largest rig, the ladder truck into the site really from a functionality standpoint. So, they would set up on William Clark Drive, and so we just need to make sure that we have some level of access to the property.

Robin Tannenbaum Jenny, would you suggest that we make add as a condition of approval to look at a, return on each side and maybe return is the wrong word, but some added element in consultation with staff?

Dustin Roma I think the idea is that we would continue the fence along Spring Street, but that there may need to be a break in the fence for, for access. We can work that out.

Nancy Litrocapes I have a question. Could, if there is a break in the fence for access, could that be filled with any kind of shrubs or something?

Or is that still something that a firetruck would not be able to pass?

Jennie Franceschi We would want, we would want clear access if we are, it is the firefighters that would need to have access towards that mechanical room corner.

That is really the concern that has been provided to us in trying to utilize a site that is tight in this urban area.

We did need to make some level of concessions with other departments on their access to it and so they felt as long as they had access to that corner of the building, that they could still provide safe access to it.

Rebecca Dillon any other questions or comments? If not we have a motion page. 3 and add language.

Robin Tanenbaum move That the Planning Board approves the Site Plan-Subdivision-Village Review application for Robie Holdings, LLC for a 7-unit townhouse style multifamily structures located at the corner of Spring Street and William Clarke Drive. Tax Map: 033 Lot: 114 Zone: Dwelling, Multiple-Family. Approval includes the following findings of fact, conclusions, and conditions as stated on pages **3 through 7** of this Staff Memo dated June 1, 2023, which are adopted in support of this approval. Included with this approval is the waiver of Village Review Standard §335-7.1. G(1)(k)

Site Plan – Finding of Fact

Standard	Finding
----------	---------

Utilization of the site	The proposed development does not overburden the site and is within the allowable standards of the base zone in which it is located. Tree removal is limited to what is necessary for the development.
Handicap Access	A sidewalk tip down is shown at the southerly driveway entrance. Northerly driveway is at grade due to the proximity of the abutting driveway. Site is compliant with ADA standards.
Appearance Assessment	Meets the intent of the Ordinance.
Landscape Plan	A landscape plan is provided demonstrating additional street trees along William Clarke Drive and supplemental landscaping throughout the development.
Odors	The residential use is consistent with the downtown district. All waste will be privately managed and toter storage is not permitted along or within the Spring Street or William Clarke Drive rights of way. No adverse impact is known or anticipated.
Noise	The residential use is consistent with the downtown district. No adverse impact is known or anticipated.
Technical and Financial Capacity	The applicant has provided a letter from Gorham Savings Bank dated May 8, 2023, to demonstrate financial capacity. The applicant has retained the services of Land Design Solutions, Atlantic Resource Consultants and DM Roma Consulting Engineers which demonstrates technical capacity.
Solid Waste	Solid waste will be privately managed and toter storage is not permitted along or within the Spring Street or William Clarke Drive rights of way.
Historic, Archaeological and Botanical Resources or Unique Features	No historic, archaeological/botanical resources have been identified on the site.
Hazardous Matter	Project does not propose the handling, storage, or use of hazardous materials. No adverse impact known or anticipated.
Vibrations	The residential use is consistent with the downtown district. No adverse impact is known or anticipated.
Parking & Loading Design and Site Circulation	Onsite parking is provided for 14 spaces, which exceeds the 1 space to 1 unit standard. No parking is permitted along Penny Lane to maintain emergency access and vehicular circulation.
Adequacy of Road System	Spring Street has adequate capacity to accept the additional traffic generated by the project.
Vehicular Access	The development shifts the existing curb cut for the project northerly to increase the distance from the Spring Street-William Clarke Drive intersection. A curb cut on William Clarke Drive is prohibited as William Clarke Drive is a control of access roadway. The City engineer has reviewed and approved the location of the new driveway.
Pedestrian and Other Modes of Transportation	Public pedestrian amenities exist along the William Clarke Drive and Spring Street frontages to connect with the public infrastructure. As part of the development, the project is relocating the driveway and will reconstruct the Spring Street sidewalk to ADA standards.
Utility Capacity	Utility services are available within the Spring Street right of way.
Stormwater Management, Groundwater Pollution	Stormwater management is provided at the front of the site to collect drainage and connect with the public system in the Spring Street right of way.
Erosion and sedimentation Control	Adequate erosion control measures are provided on the plan.

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 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.

Subdivision – Finding of Fact

Standard	Finding
Pollution	Sewer services are available within Spring Street right of way. The ability to serve letter from wastewater services has been provided as part of the application.
Sufficient Water	Water services are available within Spring Street right of way. An ability to serve letter from Portland Water District has been provided as part of the application.
Municipal Water Supply	Water services are available within Spring Street right of way. An ability to serve letter from Portland Water District has been provided as part of the application.
Erosion	Adequate erosion control measures are shown on the plan.
Traffic	Spring Street has adequate capacity to accept the additional traffic generated by the project.
Sewage Disposal	Sewer services are available within Spring Street right of way. The ability to serve letter from wastewater services has been provided as part of the application.
Municipal Solid Waste Disposal	Solid waste will be privately managed and toter storage is not permitted along or within the Spring Street or William Clarke Drive rights of way.
Aesthetic, Cultural and Natural Values	The proposed development is located within a growth area as identified in the City’s comprehensive plan and is not encumbered by any

	easements or restrictions on tree removal or development. The project meets the standards of the district in which it is located. Site disturbance is limited to what is required for the construction. The project does not have an undue adverse impact on the aesthetic, cultural and natural values of the site.
Conformity with City Ordinances and Plans	The proposed development conforms with City Ordinances and the Comprehensive Plan.
Financial and Technical Capacity	The applicant has provided a letter from Gorham Savings Bank dated May 8, 2023, to demonstrate financial capacity. The applicant has retained the services of Land Design Solutions, Atlantic Resource Consultants and DM Roma Consulting Engineers which demonstrates technical capacity.
Surface Waters; Outstanding River Segments	Not applicable
Ground Water	Groundwater will not be adversely impacted.
Flood Areas	The site is not located within a flood zone.
Freshwater Wetlands	No wetlands have been identified on the site.
Farmland	No farmlands have been identified on the site.
River, Stream or Brook	No waterways have been identified on the site.
Stormwater	Stormwater management is provided at the front of the site to collect drainage and connect with the public system in the Spring Street right of way.
Spaghetti Lots Prohibited	The lot does not have shore frontage.
Lake Phosphorus Concentration	The subdivision is not located near or along a great pond.
Impact on Adjoining Municipality	The subdivision does not cross a municipal boundary.
Lands subject to Liquidation Harvesting	Not applicable.

Conclusions:

1. The proposed subdivision **will not** result in undue water or air pollution.
2. The proposed subdivision **has** sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the subdivision.
3. The proposed subdivision **will not** cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply.
4. The proposed subdivision **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 subdivision **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 subdivision **will** provide for adequate sewage waste disposal and **will not** cause an unreasonable burden on municipal services.
7. The proposed subdivision **will not** cause an unreasonable burden on the City's ability to dispose of solid waste.
8. The proposed subdivision **will not** have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat or rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline.
9. The proposed subdivision **conforms** with a duly adopted subdivision regulation or Ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan or land use plan.
10. The subdivider **has** adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section.
11. The proposed subdivision **will not** adversely affect the quality of any pond, lake, wetland, great pond, or river, or unreasonably affect the shoreline of that body of water.
12. The proposed subdivision **will not**, alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water.

13. The subdivision **is not** located in a flood-prone area, as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps.
14. All freshwater wetlands within the proposed subdivision **have** been identified.
15. All farmland within the proposed subdivision **has not** been identified. – Not applicable
16. Any river, stream, or brook within or abutting the proposed subdivision **has** been identified.
17. The proposed subdivision **will** provide for adequate stormwater management.
18. Lots in the proposed subdivision **do not have** shore frontage on a river, stream, brook, great pond, or coastal wetland as defined in 38 M.R.S.A. Section 480-B.
19. 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.
20. 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.
21. Timber on the parcel being subdivided **has not** been harvested in violation of rules adopted pursuant to 12 M.R.S.A. Section 8869, subsection 14.

Conditions:

1. Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application packet dated May 10, 2023 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 §335-13.5. D, the Code Enforcement Officer shall not issue any permits until a site-subdivision plan has been approved by the Planning Board and a Mylar signed by the Planning Board. The signed Subdivision Plan must be recorded 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. Copy of the Recorded subdivision plan must be provided to the Planning Office.
 - c. A pre-construction meeting must be held with City Staff and the site work contractor. Contact the Planning Office to coordinate. Additional Pre-construction meetings may be necessary if phased construction is not continuous.
 - d. Review of building elevations to be consistent with submitted documentation or testimony.
 - e. The applicant shall provide the digital data as required by §335-13 – verification with GIS coordinator.
 - f. Payment of Open Space Fee provided to Planning Dept: **\$3,519.28**
 - g. 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. The inspection fee shall be 2% of the total amount of the performance guarantee. **\$3,744.32**
 - h. 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. - **\$187,216.30**
 - i. Coordinate with the E911 Coordinator on addressing the building/units.
4. **Prior to commencing any work in the City Right-of-Way**, the applicant must obtain a road-opening permit from the Public Services Department.
5. **Prior to the sale of the first unit:**
 - a. Copy of recorded association documents to Planning Department.
 - b. All conditions under Item 3 must be met.
6. **Prior to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit:**
 - a. All conditions of the first unit sold have been met.
 - b. A site inspection of the required improvements by the City to ensure public health & safety is addressed and compliance with the approval (to include but not limited to lighting (installed & lit), striping, dumpster, signage, stormwater features, etc.)

- c. All Sewer & Water lines fully tested and approved. (Off-site work must be completed and signed off by the Sewer Dept.)
 - d. All other site improvements, as shown or stated on plans or in conditions, must be installed unless a performance guarantee amount is held for the full amount of any remaining improvements to be completed after issuance of an Occupancy Permit.
 - e. Documentation (signed contracts), for private trash removal & snow plowing provided to the Planning Department.
 - f. All areas shown as pavement shall be final paved & striped, as necessary.
7. **Prior to release of the performance guarantee:**
- a. Copy of Stormwater feature maintenance agreement (i.e., part of a landscaping contract)
 - b. The site will be inspected and deemed by City staff to be in compliance with the approved plans, monuments placed, and as-built plan provided in City approved format for the GIS system. Applicant to provide as-builts to City in paper copy, dwg file and pdf.
8. No parking permitted along Penny Lane other than spaces designated on the subdivision plan.
9. Toter storage and collection is prohibited along or within the Spring Street or William Clarke Drive rights-of-way.
10. Best management practices shall be adhered to during all ground disturbance operations. All Street Catch basins in the vicinity of earthwork operations shall have silt sacks installed & maintained for the duration of the work. Additional BMPs may be required to address erosion and sediment control during construction. Determination of the need for additional measures is at the sole discretion of City Staff.
11. The fence shall be extended to create a sense of enclosure within the yard and shall be reviewed and approved by Staff.

2nd by John Turcotte

Roll Call Vote

Karen Axelsen	Yes
Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Vice Chair - Larry McWilliams	Yes
Nancy Litrocapes	Yes
John Turcotte	Yes
Jason Frazier	Absent
Kevin Price	Absent
Susan Roma	Yes
Chair - Rebecca Dillon	Yes

The vote is unanimous in favor 7-0

Rebecca Dillon let the record show it is unanimous in favor.

5. **Rebecca Spitella reads item into the record** 2022.23 – Site Plan, Subdivision, Village Review – Maple Grove Subdivision - Avesta Housing & New Ventures, LLC: The applicant is proposing a 123-unit multifamily residential complex with site access from Main Street and Seavey Street. Tax Map: 040 Lot: 135 Zone: City Center District – Downtown District, Village Review Overlay Zone Use: Dwelling, Multiple Family.

Presentation on file at the Westbrook Planning Department and on the Westbrook Website link shown below:

<https://vimeo.com/showcase/3075539/video/778681994>

Nate Howes presented aspects Site Plan, Subdivision, Village Review – Maple Grove Subdivision, proposing a 123 unit multifamily.

I am with Avesta Housing. I am alone here tonight. Just me. It is a much larger team, but they know I have a passion for public meetings so let us get started. If I can figure this out.

So New Ventures is Jack. I am the rep for Avesta, but I am working closely with our director of construction services, Todd Rothstein, who could not be here tonight. A brief project update New Ventures is moving towards construction. Starting hopefully when this application receives the approvals and after we get the DEP permit, after the Planning Board approval, hopefully late summer, early fall.

I believe they have secured constructions financing through, Norway Savings Bank. Uh, Avesta schedule is a longer timeline because our funding relies on Maine Housing. Main Housing's programs are typically cyclical. There is one that is this fall. Then in the State budget, if you have been following that debate, there is actually going to be some additional State money coming to Maine Housing for a different type of program and we are hopeful to apply under that one as well. So, we do hope to be under construction next summer, May, or June.

We received some feedback from the Planning Board. We met with the open space folks and there were some site layout changes. Here is a brief summary of where we are, where we began, and where we are to date. As you will see, we had hoped for the final DEP license to be in hand tonight. It is not. If it was, you'd see a lot more people here with me, but at last just me. So, we are hopeful that we will have it by July.

This is the site if you recall. We went through a zone change to include three lots along the old railroad corridor, the downtown overlay district, where most we are part of Avesta building now sits. This is the tax map. Tonight, and next month when we go for final approvals, we are really just talking about phase one, which is 123 units. A portion of which is 61 units, 60% of area median income. The ventures portion is about 60 units.

So new ventures, phase 1 is 62 units of workforce housing. Workforce housing is 120% AMI or below area median income. For everyone who was unfamiliar with that term, the new limits just came out. So really Avesta's portion is 55 plus. What we are looking for is folks who are downsizing before retirement. Typically, they will start, they will keep working when they move in, and they may age out of the workforce, and they will stay with us longer.

New Ventures is truly workforce housing with some market rate units. We are only seeking approval for phase one now.

Now the future of Avesta building and New Ventures building. We have consolidated, this is one of the big changes. If you recall from last time there were four buildings. There is a lot of concern about there being four buildings on the site, green space, storm water, and parking. Avesta and New Ventures are going to combine into a single building. We are going to do that via a vertical condominium association. You can essentially create two large condominium units, which within them actually can have other condominium units. That is pretty much all the details I have about it.

For now, it will be approximately 60 units, but we want to see how the site performs first to see what the actual size of the project should be. So, for tonight and for next time, it is 123 units.

I know that was one of the concerns of the Board was do you have enough parking. Our compact parking space is really going to work well.

Now we can see phase one, as I said, New Ventures gets to start earlier than us, because their funding is conventional. So, with phase one though, there will be a lot of joint work going on. Everything that you see in tan or orange is part of the joint work, blue is phase two for Avesta, and green is phase three open space until we do phase three. So that will just be landscaped, probably just loam seed until we come up with a final financing structure and design for phase three.

We have the meeting recreation and conservation on May 18th. They have a favorable review of the open space. We have approximately 40,000 square feet of open space, and we do understand that we will have to finish it, in order to get our certificate of occupancy, with ADA picnic tables, bike racks, benches raised community garden beds, stuff we usually do at our properties.

The landscaping plan as you can see, is actually a bit simpler than last time. It looks quite busy, but it is a bit simpler because these planter beds are not actually part of the storm water system anymore. That was one of the big changes we made.

So, to recap, we made a huge change in re reducing from four buildings to three buildings, and the second big change was we went from a rain garden approach to storm water management to an underground approach to storm water management. You will see a large stormwater underground storage tank right next to New Ventures where it says 69 and you will see a stormwater B subsurface, stormwater BNP next to 35 near the building. So rather than direct everything through those rain gardens that were in the curbing, we are doing it via the catch basins, which are in the pavement of the parking areas and in the street and it is being directed into the subsurface stormwater BMPs.

The utilities, we are close to a final design on those. I believe water is now coming in off of, I believe it is off of Seavey now. The electricity we are still working with CMP on that, also coming off of Seavey. Most likely brought in underground in. The lighting is finalized with dark sky compliant features. We know that the residents next door to us had concerns about the light. You will see via the lighting plan in your packets that there is very, very low lights that will even cross that boundary. I think it is like 0.1 on the I think it is the candlestick rating. I believe that is what it is called. And the driveway's name is Clover Lane, which there was a Clover Farm grocery store on the corner of Seavey and Main.

I will open up to feedback and I will just remind you, I believe Robin had asked for some houses in context. So here you can kind of see the existing houses on the streets with our behind them.

So, comments, or questions?

Rebecca Dillon thank you, Staff Comments?

Jennie Franceschi presented Staff Comments:

Staff have been working with the applicant's team. We are still in the review process of the current plan that has been submitted to the Board. We are tweaking some of the elements as it relates to storm water and utilities, and we have our meeting with the City Engineer and the Wastewater Director this week. So, we are continuing to work on the plan. Although the layout of it is substantially consistent with the last time that the board saw this plan, in that the parking arrangements have been significantly improved over the original plan. Just the overall flow of the site, we just see huge improvements. I do not think we have much more to say other than what the applicant has provided that we are really waiting on DEP for their final approval so that we can look to go towards the July meeting for our final approval. You will see in your motion that after the public hearing portion of this meeting and you move into board deliberation we would ask that the board motion to continue the application, for the site plan subdivision and village review application to finalize the site design elements and receipt of all state permits.

PUBLIC HEARING

Tax Map: 040 Lot: 135

Zone: City Center District – Downtown District; Village Review Overlay Zone

Use: Dwelling, Multiple-Family

Project Description

The applicant is proposing a 123-unit multifamily residential complex with site access from Main Street and Seavey Street.

As provided below, there are several items that are still under Staff review and the project is pending DEP approval. Therefore, as of the writing of this memo the project is not eligible for Planning Board approval. However, given that the majority of the remaining comments are specific to utility/stormwater design that would not likely have a significant impact on site layout, the applicant is requesting to hold a public hearing with the Planning Board based on revisions to the site following the February 7th public hearing to collect feedback from the Board to incorporate into a final plan for review at a future meeting. Following the public hearing, Staff is recommending a motion of continuance of the Board's deliberation to allow for final review with Staff and obtainment of State permits.

Project History

June 23, 2022 – Neighborhood Meeting

July 5, 2022 – Planning Board Workshop

August 2, 2022 – Site Walk

January 10, 2023 – Village Review Committee

February 7, 2023 – Public Hearing (Final Approval Not Requested)

June 6, 2023 – Public Hearing

Staff Comments (These items were previously sent to Applicant which are currently being incorporated into their final plans.)

1. Noticing Fees: \$312.44
2. Open space review by the Recreation and Conservation Commission occurred on 5/18 with a positive recommendation to the Planning Board on the open space plan.
 - a. All site amenities associated with phase 1a open space to be installed prior to issuance of c/o for New Ventures building.
3. Sewer
 - a. Ability to Serve letter has been requested for sewer and is pending final sign off from wastewater services.
 - b. Sewer pretreatment required prior to sewer entering public system (provide link to Ordinance)

- c. Show storm and sewer table on overall utility plan.
 - d. Smh-2 is 4.75 deep – this meets standard but Staff concern for frost. Recommend insulation for SMH with < 5' cover.
 - e. Plan does not clearly show SMH inverts at connection into Seavey Street
 - i. Coordination needed with Wastewater Services on connection to existing Seavey Street structures.
4. Drainage
- a. Review of catch basin elevations require - catch basins appear shallow throughout development with most CBs showing < 4' from invert to rim which creates a frost/heaving concern and several CBs would result in pipes entering into the cone of the structure (ex: CB130 shows 1.75' to invert – does not appear feasible with 18" pipe)
 - b. Some cbs may need flat top and insulation if not able to increase depth – provide detail, if utilizing
 - c. Provide Catch Basin detail with 2' sump.
 - d. Provide CB at low corner point of intersection Clover/Seavey St.
 - e. Structure needed at connection into Seavey Street storm drain – insert-a-tee not allowed.
 - f. Provide more spot grades along Clover Lane westerly of New Ventures building.
 - g. Foundation drain – reconsider relocating and going into existing structure.
 - h. Concern related to CBs in New Ventures parking lot. Quantity of water appears to exceed capacity of grate. Structure may require double grate system – please review.
 - i. Portion of existing cross-country line to be abandoned – Will this be filled with flowable fill?
 - j. Stormwater Management Report is missing 25-year post condition analysis.
 - k. Provide discharge license for stormwater to pass through the project site.
 - l. C-107 & 108 – roof drain notes reference connection to focal points – update.
 - m. C-505
 - i. Jelly Fish detail appears blurry – provide clear line detail.
 - ii. Provide section view for water quality storage tanks.
5. Grading & Utility Plans do not reference the correct plan see at match lines – please review.
6. General Comment - DMH-s very deep. Recommend early coordination with contractors to verify feasibility due to depths > 14'
7. Electrical
- a. Verify plan provides power to vicinity of Main St bus shelter.
 - b. Seavey St – Electrical connection to remain overhead over Seavey St and drop underground on project side of the right of way.
 - i. Need more information on power – concern with the number of drops from utility pole and electrical design will impact sidewalk clearances.
8. Lighting
- a. Cut Sheets – provide more detail on “CXX” as labeled in the description table on lighting plan.
 - b. Clarify finish on light fixture and pole.
9. Pedestrian Connectivity
- a. Truncated domes as shown do not meet ADA standard (gaps on edges are greater than 3". Review and revise, where necessary (both plan view and in detail)
 - b. VGC in public ROW requires concrete fill – revise detail (aggregate shown)
 - c. Main Street sidewalk requires 9" subbase gravel and 3" gravel – revise detail.
 - d. Reconstruction of sidewalk along Seavey Street parcel frontage required as part of project.
 - e. Curbing in Seavey Street right of way – granite radii; slipform concrete otherwise permitted.
 - f. Pathway connection to Stockhouse – paved path for ADA compliance and maintenance due to slopes

- g. New Ventures under building parking – provide pedestrian protection (curbing, curb stop, etc.) to prevent vehicles from parking over walkway.
- 10. Avesta Parking Lot does not show curbing tipdown in vicinity of ADA parking spaces.
- 11. Fire
 - a. DBA testing once building up/closed in and again prior to c/o.
 - b. Verify hydrants are provided and are no further than 800' apart.
 - c. FDC connection location subject to review/approval by FD
- 12. Provide no parking signs on both sides of Clover Lane in the vicinity of the Clover/Main St intersection.
- 13. Avesta turnaround paved rather than reinforced turf due to the regular use by garbage and delivery vehicles (as well as emergency vehicles)
- 14. Trench repair – square off trench repair at Clover Lane intersection
 - a. If multiple trench cuts are in same vicinity – combine into single trench repair.
- 15. C-102 – Retitle Site/Subdivision Plan and include signature block.
 - a. Additional signature block on Cover Sheet
- 16. Show limits of access easement area for 448 Main St on site/subdivision plan for recording
 - a. Completion of driveway relocation and closure of 448 Main curb cut required prior to c/o. (Condition of Approval)
- 17. Installation and lighting of bus shelter is the responsibility of development and required prior to issuance of first c/o (condition of approval)
- 18. Any areas greater than 3:1 slope adjacent to vehicles or pedestrians require guardrail.
 - a. Seavey Street retaining wall – railing required due to height of retaining wall > 30"
 - b. Code compliant rail required for stairs from Seavey St to Avesta unit – provide detail.
- 19. C104 – Show temporary sediment basins for construction conditions.
- 20. Revised cost estimate needed to provide quantity or unit costs for sitework.
- 21. Final review of draft association docs pending Staff review
- 22. Final DEP permit pending

Rebecca Dillon opened Public Hearing

No Comments

- a. Zoom participation.

Rebecca Spitella If there is anyone here who would like to speak, if you would like to provide a comment, please raise your hand now.

Blake Jenkins. I live at 54 Seavey Street, the eight units across the street from the development. I was hoping to hear some information on any studies, traffic pattern studies that may have been done by the developers that may kind of address particularly rush hour. I am thinking 7:30 o'clock traffic as well as about 5, 5:30 o'clock traffic, both entering and exiting the site from Seavey Street and Main.

I think that is my only comment for right now.

Rebecca Dillon is there anyone else?

Rebecca Spitella no, that is it.

Rebecca Dillon Close Public Hearing

Mr. Jenkins was asking about traffic.

Nate Howes Yes, a traffic study was conducted by Tom Erico. I do not remember off the top of my head exactly what was the conclusions of it.

I know it was favorable and was not unfavorable. He supported our parking ratio as it was at the time, which we have now obviously made more favorable to how the Board and how the neighbors wanted it.

So, I think we have addressed the concerns.

Jennie Franceschi I have the information that was provided. During the AM peak hour, the site is projected to generate 65 trips, in the PM peak hour It is projected to generate 82.

And I just want to re-verify this study is based upon the complete build out. So, this is with 30 additional units that will be incorporated into the next phase. So, these numbers have a future forecast of traffic already included in them.

So, based upon their analysis there was no need for additional traffic control measures to be incorporated from this project. There is a great feature with this particular project where you have two points of egress, one on Main and one on Seavey. So, there is actually diffusion of traffic from the site.

Rebecca Dillon are there any Board comments or questions?

Robin Tannenbaum Just have one, I can't remember. Is it, two ways in egress and ingress at both locations.

I feel like at one point maybe it was just egress onto Main Street.

Nate Howes the application shows two ways.

Jennie Franceschi on Main Street right in and right out

Rebecca Dillon Any other board comments or questions?

If not we have a motion on page 10 of the memo.

Nancy Litrocapes move to continue the Board's Deliberation of the Site Plan, Subdivision, Village Review application for Avesta Housing and New Ventures, LLC to finalize site design details and receipt of all State permits.

2nd by Robin Tannenbaum

Roll Call Vote

Karen Axelsen	Yes
Robin Tannenbaum	Yes

Vice Chair - Larry McWilliams	Yes
Nancy Litrocapes	Yes
John Turcotte	Yes
Jason Frazier	Absent
Kevin Price	Absent
Susan Roma	Yes
Chair - Rebecca Dillon	Yes

The vote is unanimous in favor 7-0

Rebecca Dillon let the record show it is unanimous in favor.

Jennie Franceschi discussed electronic technology for the Board.

**** Editor's note Board members discussed electronic accessibility**

Jennie Franceschi explained that the packets will be electronically digitized with larger paper maps still provided to the Board.

Further information to follow.

Rebecca Dillon may I have a motion to adjourn?

Karen Axelsen Move to adjourn.

2nd by Larry McWilliams

Roll Call Vote

Karen Axelsen	Yes
Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Nancy Litrocapes	Yes
John Turcotte	Yes
Jason Frazier	Absent
Kevin Price	Absent
Susan Roma	Yes
Chair - Rebecca Dillon	Yes

The vote is unanimous in favor 7-0

6. ADJOURN

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 and lgain@westbrook.me.us

S:\Planning\Administration\Minutes\2023 PB Minutes\06.06.2023 PB Minutes.docx