



Town of Windham

Town Offices
8 School Road
Windham, Maine

Meeting Minutes - Final

Planning Board

Monday, February 10, 2020

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

1 Call To Order

2 Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair, Keith Elder. Other members present were: Colin Swan, Kaitlyn Tuttle, Tyler Dunlea, and welcome to new member, Charles Hawkins.

Planner, Jenn Curtis, was also present.

3 [PB 20-011](#) Approval of Minutes: January 27, 2020

Attachments: [Minutes 1-27-2020 - draft](#)

Kaitlyn Tuttle made a motion to accept the minutes of the January 27, 2020 meeting.

Seconded by Charles Hawkins.

Vote: Four in favor. No one opposed. Kaitlyn Tuttle abstained.

Public Hearings & Continuing Business

4 [PB 20-007](#)

Attachments: [19-16 Twilight Cove Preliminary 2-6-20](#)
[Sunrise Cove Preliminary Application Materials](#)
[Sunrise Cove Preliminary Plans](#)
[Sunrise Cove Stormwater Report - Full](#)
[2019-09-24 JNK to Town Planner re Chase Subdivision \(P1688020x9F873\)](#)
[GP Peer Review Jan 2020](#)
[MA Peer Review 1-21-20](#)
[Additional Preliminary Submission Materials](#)

Jeff Amos, a civil engineer with Terradyne Consultants, was present representing the applicant. He reviewed the project.

- *The site currently contained:*
 - o *An existing paved road, in extremely poor condition*
 - o *Access to the lake*

- o A stream
- o An existing perimeter swale, which would be filled in
- They proposed:
 - o A gated 55 and older community with 60 condo units in duplexes or four-unit buildings of one and two stories
 - o Walking trails throughout the site
 - o A golf cart parking area
 - o A club house
 - o A swimming pool
 - o Access to the waterfront
 - o A community dock and boats which could be signed out by the residents. Moorings would not be allowed.
- Two mixed-use buildings with commercial uses on the first floor and apartments on the second floor.
- Nine septic systems throughout the site. Septage would be treated for removal of 30% to 50% of the nitrates and phosphates, resulting in smaller plumes
- Public water
- Underground utilities
- The project would require a Site Location Permit from DEP.
- The developer had addressed concerns regarding impacts to Highland Lake.
- o Their allowed phosphorous export allocation was 0.02 pounds of phosphorous per acre.
- o The project would be .6 pounds below the existing export and 1.43 pounds under the allocated amount.

Public Comment:

Rosie Hartzler, Highland Lake Association – She said the Association had a lot of concerns regarding how the sizable development would affect the lake, which had been demonstrating signs of stress with diminished water quality over past years. They appreciated the developer’s efforts to mitigate phosphorous to the lake.

There was concern regarding implementation. She asked the Planning Board to make sure infrastructure was done at the beginning, regardless of how many residences were completed. Things could change between the beginning and the end of the project. They wanted to make sure all Best Management Practices (BMPs) were installed at the beginning, not in phases as construction progressed.

They had questions and concerns regarding ongoing maintenance of the septic system. What was the maintenance schedule and who would be in charge of it? Who from the town would monitor the BMPs?

Ms. Hartzler said there were already issues getting onto Route 302 and suggested a 35 mph zone, or a stop sign at the intersection with Route 302 for safety. She stated access to the lake should be kept private because of milfoil.

There was no more public comment. The public hearing was closed.

The Board commented:

- Erosion control was a huge part of it. Erosion control fencing worked better than a mulched berm.
- Was it possible to have only have one means of access and maintain emergency safety? One entrance would be better; removal of the second entrance was preferred.

- *How would traffic flow with one entrance?*
- *The Lake Association seemed happy with it.*
- *What was the density difference if the project wasn't for 55 and older?*
- *How was the parking?*
- *Would nitrate plumes go over a property line?*
- *What about trash disposal?*
- *How many community boats would be there be?*
- *What were the Fire Chief's comments?*

Jenn Curtis explained:

- *The Fire Chief's opinion was:*
 - o *One entrance would be safer.*
 - o *The roads would be built to a wider standard.*
 - o *There was an internal loop where the housing was.*
 - o *The entrance should be aligned with Land of Nod Road.*
- *There was a conflict in the ordinance, subdivision required two connections for 30 or more dwellings, but the performance standards limited connection to Route 302 to one curb cut. The town's attorney said the more restrictive ordinance standard should prevail.*
- *Septic plans currently showed the nitrate plume for units 35 to 40, 51 and 54 to be slightly over the property line.*
- *Correspondence had been received regarding the application.*

Colin Swan made a motion to reopen the public hearing.

Seconded by Keith Elder.

Dave Nadeau had asked how there could be the number of bedrooms they were proposing. They couldn't have those if they were using the Retirement Community & Care Facility Overlay (RCCF) zone.

The public hearing was closed.

Kaitlyn Tuttle made a motion that the application for project 19-16 Sunrise (formerly Twilight) Cove Retirement Community and Mixed Use Commercial Buildings – Sketch Subdivision Plan & Site Plan was found complete in regard to the submission requirements based on the application checklist, but the Planning Board retained the right to request more information where review criteria were not fully addressed.

Seconded by Colin Swan.

Vote: All in favor.

Kaitlyn Tuttle made a motion that the Preliminary Subdivision application for 19-16 Sunrise (formerly Twilight) Cove Retirement Community and Mixed Use Commercial Buildings -on Tax Map: 7, Lot: 66 was to be approved with conditions with the following findings of fact and conclusions.

FINDINGS OF FACT

A. POLLUTION

- *The applicant should indicate whether there are mapped floodplains on the project parcel.*
- *As the proposed subdivision is in a Direct Watershed of a Lake Most at Risk*

from New Development (Highland Lake), independent professional review is required. An independent third-party reviewer, a Professional Engineer at Gorrill Palmer, Inc, is performing peer-review of the application in addition to the staff review.

- The applicant is proposing the use of septic treatment tanks to result in reductions of phosphorus and up to 70% of total nitrogen removal. The flow leaving the tank would be below the State's standard for level of nitrogen in the groundwater at the property boundary.
- The applicant needs to submit a hydrogeologic assessment with the preliminary plan submission, or otherwise prove compliance with 910.C.1(c)(3)
- 911.J.7.A states that projects in the Highland Lake watershed shall not be allowed to pay the compensation fee for exceeding the project's phosphorus allocation. The applicant needs to demonstrate that they are not exceeding their phosphorus allocation. The applicant submitted materials that indicate they believe the project will result in an overall decrease of .6 pounds of phosphorus export, per year. The calculations are based on a design that includes construction of a stormwater pond that will treat runoff from a drainage swale that collects water from a portion of route 302.
- The preliminary plan submission included "Hydrogeologic Assessment of the Proposed Sunrise Cove Development 19 Roosevelt Trail, Windham" produced by Mark Cenci Geologic, Inc. It states that "The systems proposed by Terradyn Consultants use aerating pre-treatment to reduce the content of organic compounds in the wastewater before disposal into the ground."; "...the 10mg/liter NO₃-N plumes will be 70 to 150 feet in length. Using the inferred ground water flow directions, the calculated No₃-N lines were drawn on the plan"; and "All plumes will eventually filter through wetland soils where biochemical removal of nitrates and other nutrients will take place before seeping into Highland Lake." And concludes "The proposed development of 60 residences with a clubhouse on this parcel meets the standards of both the Town of Windham Subdivision ordinance, and the Site Location of Development Act, with regard to ground water quality."
- In an email dated January 21, 2020 Mark Arienti, P.E., Town Engineer commented that the applicant should show the 10 mg/l plumes on one of the plan sheets.
- In a response to comments dated February 5, 2020 the applicant submitted Nitrate Plume Plans. The plans show all plumes staying within the boundaries of the property, except for the one associated with units 35-40 and 51 & 54. The plans also do not indicate which septic and plume is associated with units 52 and 53. The applicant needs to amend the plan so that the nitrate plume does not extend over the property line.
- The applicant submitted a Subsurface Wastewater Disposal System application prepared and signed by Site Evaluator Mark Cenci, dated 12-23-19. Documents a 900 gpd system serving units 21-24, and 46; a 1800 gpd system serving units 25-34; an 1800 gpd system serving units 47-50, 55-60; and an 1800 gpd system serving units 35-40, 51-54.
- Further Subsurface Wastewater Disposal System information was submitted in an email from Site Evaluator Mark Cenci, dated January 31, 2020. It included septic system applications including one for a 1600 gpd system serving the six 2-bedroom multifamily dwelling units and clubhouse; an 1800 gpd system serving units 5-14; and an 1800 gpd system serving units 1-4, & 15-20.

B. WATER

- All dwelling units will be served by public water.
- The closes hydrant is on 302 south of the intersection with Land of Nod. At the Development Team meeting on August 1, 2016, Deputy Fire Chief John Westcott

recommended additional fire hydrants so that all units were within 1,000' of one.

- Existing and proposed fire hydrants should be shown on the plan.
- The preliminary plan submission must include a written statement from the Portland Water District (PWD) that there is adequate supply and pressure for the subdivision.
- In a response to comments dated February 5, 2020 the applicant estimated the project's demand for water based on the septic designs at approximately 12,400 gpd. The applicant stated they have sent plans to Portland Water District and are waiting for sign-off and an ability to serve letter.
- The final plan submission must include an ability to serve letter from the PWD.

C. SOIL EROSION & STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

- The applicant must submit a stormwater management plan that meets the water quality and quantity standards as well as the flooding standard of Section 3 DEP Chapter 500 Stormwater Management.
- The final plan must include stream crossing permits
- A soil erosion and sediment control plan must be submitted as part of the Preliminary Plan.
- A soil erosion and sediment control plan was submitted with the updated Preliminary Plan which includes temporary erosion control BMPs, Permanent stabilization requirements, re-vegetation plans, winter construction plans, maintenance and inspection, and details for typical erosion control measures for dwelling units, erosion control blanket, grassed swale, silt sack, filter sock, silt fences, construction entrance, erosion control mix berm.
- Section C.2.A. of the Surface Water Protection Ordinance requires that projects within the Highland Lake watershed must incorporate double temporary erosion control measures at the perimeter of the project.
- A DEP Site Location of Development Act and NRPA permits are required for this project. The permits must be submitted as part of the Final Plan.
- This project is in the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) area as designated by the Environmental Protection Agency for the Town of Windham. As a result, there will be additional construction inspection requirements and ongoing requirements for reporting of stormwater infrastructure maintenance as there is more than one (1) acre of development. See recommended Condition of Approval #2.
- Per 906.E.7., where the project is located in the Highland Lake Watershed, a direct watershed of a lake most at risk from development, it is subject to peer review by qualified independent geotechnical, hydrogeologic, site evaluation, engineering, and similar professional consulting services to determine adherence to best practices in planning and engineering when any portion of the development is within the direct watershed of a lake most at risk from new development as designated in Chapter 502: Direct Watersheds Of Lakes Most At Risk From New Development, And Urban Impaired Streams of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection. The project shall be reviewed in compliance with the stormwater standards included in the Maine Department of Environmental Protection Chapter 500 including basic, general, phosphorus, flooding, and other standards.
- Will Haskell, P.E. of Gorrill Palmer commented in peer review dated January 17, 2020: The overall stormwater management plan appears to meet Chapter 500 standards, with several minor discrepancies as noted in comments below. Comments include a number of items that should be shown on the plans, a request for additional details such as stream crossing culvert sizing, and proposed gravel wetlands, as well as that the applicant should address protection of walking trail from concentrated flow, the need to enlarge a forebay, that the runoff from the stormdrain

outlet at Sta. 9+25 RT does not appear to enter the forebay of the gravel wetland, and discrepancies at the inverts for the outlet control structure.

- In an email dated January 21, 2020 Mark Arienti, P.E., Town Engineer commented: "The overall stormwater management plan appears to meet Chapter 500 standards, with several minor discrepancies as noted in comments below." Comments included that additional clarification of phosphorous export factors, summaries for % treated of impervious and developed areas, Gravel Wetland details, underdrain invert elevation data, and a stream culvert detail should be included.
- In a response to comments dated February 5, 2020 and February 6, 2020 the applicant responded to the peer review comments. At the time of this memo, peer review staff have not had time to verify if all comments were addressed.

D. TRAFFIC

- Two road entrances are proposed to the development from Route 302. One entrance is aligned with Land of Nod Road and the other is approximately 200 feet to the south. Requisite Maine Department of Transportation road entrance permit(s) must be submitted with the final application.
- It was determined by Staff that the project is in the urban compact zone and will require road opening permits from the Town of Windham.
- The sketch plan shows 3 curb cuts – the two proposed, and one existing right of way for an abutting property.
- Sight distances should be shown on the plan.
- In an email dated January 21, 2020 Mark Arienti, P.E., Town Engineer commented: The Traffic Impact Study (submitted with preliminary plan) states that sightline distance from the center of the road meets or exceeds the 580 feet required for a Mobility Corridor with a 40-mph speed limit. However, it also states that site distance looking right from the driveways will require minor clearing of all small trees and low-level vegetation to ensure acceptable site distance is provided. A note should be included in the Final plan to this effect as well as to show measured sight distance.
- The Preliminary Plan sheet C-1.1 dated February 5, 2020 shows sight distances as 600' north of each opening, and 700' south of each opening.
- The applicant submitted a revised plan on February 6, 2020 that shows the proposed right of way area to be cleared.
- There is no minimum parking requirement, but the applicant should indicate in the final plan that the amount of parking will be adequate during both summer and winter conditions.
- A walking path loops around the perimeter of the development and would provide access to Highland Lake through the adjacent property located in Falmouth.
- A traffic impact study is required if the project will generate fifty (50) or more trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour. Trip generation information should be provided with the preliminary plan submission.
- Per Section 911.M.5.a.6 (pg 9-58) access drive standards for condominium subdivisions shall meet the major private road standard
- A bus stop is shown on the plan. At the Development Review Team Meeting on August 16, 2019 Will Haskell, P.E. of Gorriil Palmer noted that the shoulder of 302 may need to be altered to accommodate the bus stop.
- The applicant is proposing gates restricting traffic to the retirement community. The applicant shall provide with the final plan, letters of approval by the Windham Police and Fire Departments of a plan for their necessary access.
- The Land Use Ordinance, at 522.2.(a) states that "a parcel shall be limited to one (1) curb cut on the same street." The Planning Board is not able to waive this standard. The applicant should indicate how they intend to comply with the standard.

- 911.M.5(b)(7) Street Connection Requirements, requires a subdivision with 31 or more lots or units to have a minimum of 2 connections with an existing public street.
- In a legal opinion dated September 24, 2019, Town Attorney James N. Katsiaticas concluded of the apparently conflicting curb-cut requirements: "While it is not entirely clear which is the more restrictive provision, Sections 400 G and 522 or Sections 546 and 911 M, the Planning Board could reasonably determine that Sections 546 and 911, which apply specifically to retirement communities in a zoning overlay district enacted for that purpose and which requires a residential subdivision street to have a minimum of two connections with an existing public street, is more restrictive than the Sections 400 G and 522 requirement that applies generally in the C3 District and requires only one curb cut."
- Will Haskell, P.E. of Gorrill Palmer commented in peer review dated January 24, 2020 some notes on how trip generation calculation might be improved, and that Gorrill Palmer's professional opinion is that the site does not warrant the need for two accesses onto Route 302, and that the two access drives would decrease the mobility and safety of the section [as opposed to one]. He also commented that the stretch of Route 302 is within the Urban Compact and does not require a Maine DOT entrance permit.

E. SEWERAGE

- The site will be served by engineered subsurface septic systems. The final plan must include approval from the Maine Department of Health and Human Services.
- Soil test pit analysis which indicates soils that will support a septic system for this use must be included with the final plan submission. Test pit locations must be shown on the plan.
- See findings under "A. POLLUTION" for descriptions of the subsurface wastewater application, including test pit analysis, that were submitted with the Preliminary Plan application.
- Test pit locations must be shown on the Final Plan.

F. SOLID WASTE

- The applicant should identify how the disposal of solid waste will be managed.
- A dumpster is depicted in the parking lot area across from the commercial units. It is not clear if that is intended to be used by the commercial units or the entire development. The applicant should specify how solid waste will be managed.

G. AESTHETICS

- An existing single-family home is located on site as well as the remaining road network and infrastructure of a long closed campground (electrical hookups and a bath house). The lot is generally wooded.
- There are no documented rare botanical features or significant wildlife habitat documented on the site.
- Street trees are required at least every fifty (50) feet.
- Limits of tree clearing are shown on the preliminary plan. A note should be added to the plan stating that clearing of trees is not allowed in areas where tree cover is depicted on the plan for a period of at least five (5) years from the date of Planning Board approval.
- The Preliminary Plan depicts a dumpster enclosure in the parking lot opposite the commercial units. A detail of the enclosure depicts a concrete pad under the dumpster, fencing around it. The applicant stated in the preliminary plan submission that it will be screened with a 7' high architectural fence.

H. CONFORMITY WITH LOCAL PLANS AND ORDINANCES

- *Comprehensive Plan:*
- *The plan does meet the goals of the 2017 Comprehensive Plan.*

- *Land Use Ordinance:*
- *The net residential area calculations are shown on the plan. At 38.3 acres, or 1,668,348 sf, the project meets the minimum lot size requirement of 200,000 sf. The proposed 60 units results in a net density of 27,805.8 sf/unit.*
- *District Standards, Section 407.E. The project must meet the standards of the RCCF zoning district.*

- *Subdivision Ordinance*
- *A landscaping plan must be submitted with the Preliminary Plan.*
- *Standard notes and the standard condition of approval must be shown on the plans.*
- *Digital transfer of the subdivision plan data must be submitted with the Final Plan submission for inclusion with the Town's GIS.*
- *The plan should show the entire parcel*

- *Others:*
- *Chapter 221 Street Naming and Addressing: Following consultation with the Assessing Department, a proposed road names for both access drives must be shown on the Final Plan.*
- *The Preliminary Plan shows proposed road names. All road names must be approved by the Town Addressing Officer in the Assessing Department.*
- *Chapter 142 Surface Water Protection: Section C.2.A. of the Surface Water Protection Ordinance requires that projects within the Highland Lake watershed must incorporate double temporary erosion control measures at the perimeter of the project.*
- *Chapter 144 Post-Construction Stormwater Ordinance: The site is in the NPDES MS4 area as well as the Highland Lake watershed.*

I. FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL CAPACITY

- *Evidence of financial capacity must be provided as part of the Preliminary Plan submission.*
- *Evidence of technical capacity must be provided as part of the Preliminary Plan submission.*
- *The preliminary plan submission included the names and qualifications of the professionals preparing the plan materials, including Jeff Amos, P.E. of Terradyn Consultants, LLC; Mark Cenci, Site Evaluator & Wetland Delineator from Mark Cenci Geologic, Inc.; Surveyor Wayne T. Wood, Traffic Engineer William Bray, P.E., and Mark Hampton, CSS performing the High Intensity Soil Survey.*

J. RIVER, STREAM OR BROOK IMPACTS

- *This project will not adversely impact any river, stream, or brook. See findings under "A. POLLUTION", and "C. SOIL EROSION AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT" above.*

CONCLUSIONS (N/A)

1. *The proposed subdivision will/will not result in undue water or air pollution.*
2. *The proposed subdivision has/does not have sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the site plan.*
3. *The proposed subdivision will/will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply.*
4. *The proposed subdivision will/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/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/will not provide for adequate sewage waste disposal.*
7. *The proposed subdivision will/will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste.*
8. *The proposed subdivision will/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 subdivision conforms/does not conform with a duly adopted site plan regulation or ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan, or land use plan.*
10. *The developer has/does not have adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section.*
11. *The proposed subdivision is/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 subdivision will/will not alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water.*
13. *The proposed subdivision is/is not situated entirely or partially within a floodplain.*
14. *All freshwater wetlands within the proposed subdivision have/have not been identified on the plan.*
15. *Any river, stream, or brook within or abutting the subdivision has/has not been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application.*
16. *The proposed subdivision will/will not 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/do not have a lot depth to shore frontage ratio greater than 5 to 1.*
18. *The long-term cumulative effects of the proposed subdivision will/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/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/has not been harvested in violation of rules adopted pursuant to Title 12, section 8869, subsection 14.*

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. *Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in*

the application dated January 10, 2020, as amended, 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 or the Town Planner in accordance with Section 913 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

2. Approval is subject to the requirements of the Post-Construction Stormwater Ordinance, Chapter 144. Any person owning, operating, leasing or having control over stormwater management facilities required by the post-construction stormwater management plan must annually engage the services of a qualified third-party inspector who must certify compliance with the post-construction stormwater management plan on or by May 1st of each year.

Seconded by Colin Swan.

Vote: All in favor.

New Business

- 5 [PB 20-009](#) 20-01 Bangor Savings/Cross Insurance. Major site plan sketch plan review. Bangor Savings Bank to request review of a 7,000 square foot branch office building and Cross Insurance office space. The properties in question are located at 745 and 747 Roosevelt Trail and identified on Tax Map: 67, Lots: 54, 55, Zone: Commercial 1 (C-1).

Attachments: [20-01 Bangor Savings & Cross Office Major Site Plan - Sketch 2-6-20](#)
 [Sketch Plan Application](#)
 [Sketch Plan - Site Plan](#)
 [Exterior Elevations](#)

David Latulippe was present representing both Bangor Savings Bank and Cross Insurance. He explained:

- o The site was currently occupied by Cross Insurance. They proposed to construct a new building for both businesses and a drive-in, and to incorporate a small, abutting lot into the site.*
- o Currently, there were turning movements from Route 302, Tandberg Trail, and Abby Road. When the project was complete Abby Road would be the primary access; turning movements would be greatly reduced and traffic would be redirected.*
- o The landscaping plan would preserve existing mature trees and there would be green space around the building.*
- o Two existing septic systems would be combined into one new system.*
- o The building would have brick and clapboard siding with a shingled, gable end roof. They would have blue solar panels instead of awnings and additional solar panels on the roof.*

The Board commented:

- Loved the character and look of the building. It set a nice example.*
- It seemed there were a lot of places internally where two cars would be interacting.*
- Liked the solar panels.*
- Would people use the parking lot as a short cut to avoid the light?*
- How would traffic from Route 302 access the drive through?*

- People who parked in the larger parking area would be walking across cars that were pulling out.

Consensus of the Board was a site walk wasn't needed but a public hearing should be scheduled.

- 6 [PB 20-010](#) 20-02 Town of Windham Landfill Solar Array. Major site plan sketch plan review. Town of Windham to request review of a 72,686 square foot developed area, including 24,878 square feet of solar panels to be installed on a town owned, capped landfill. The property in question is located on Enterprise Drive and identified on Tax Map: 21, Lo: 19, Zone: Commercial 1 (C-1).

Attachments: [20-02 Windham Landfill Solar - Site Plan Sketch 2-6-20](#)
[Landfill Solar Sketch Plan Application - Scan](#)
[Windham, Town of, Landfill - Site Map for Sketch plan review-20200116](#)

Josh Baston, the project manager with Revision Energy, was present representing the applicant. He explained:

- It was a 20 acre site, 10 acres of which had been the municipal landfill, now capped. There were no structures on the property but there were landfill gas vents. The total boundary footprint was 24,000 square feet.
- The proposed solar array would have 1,300 panels, arranged in 13 rows with 25 feet between each row. Racking would be ballasted on concrete which was on a bed of crushed stone. Because the installation would be on a landfill they didn't want to damage the clay cap and PVC membrane. Most of the project was grass because of the spacing between panels.
- Connection to CMP service would be 250 feet from the intersection of Enterprise Drive and Route 302. The transformer pad would not be on the landfill. Any conduit would be in a vegetated berm that was built up above the cap.
- CMP would dictate how power was brought into site so they may need to request a waiver of the requirement for underground utilities.
- They proposed to fence the perimeter of the entire landfill with a black vinyl chain link fence.
- An amendment to the DEP Solid Waste Closure License would be required.
- They expected a two to three month construction period and then a maintenance visit and inspection once a year.

The Board commented:

- Would there be any long term monitoring?
- Would the panels reflect any glare onto Route 302?
- Were there any other options for the chain link fence?
- It was a good project, with no traffic, low impact, and a good use of space.
- If electrical service couldn't be underground, they wanted to know the reason for the potential waiver request.

Consensus of the Board was a site walk wasn't needed but a public hearing should be scheduled.

Other Business

7 Adjournment

Kaitlyn Tuttle made a motion to adjourn.

Seconded by Colin Swan?

Vote: All in favor.