



Town of Windham

Town Offices
8 School Road
Windham, Maine

Meeting Minutes - Final

Planning Board

Monday, April 27, 2026

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. Call to Order – Chair’s Opening Remarks

2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

Chair, Marge Govoni, called the meeting to order. Other members present were: Melissa Young, Evert Krikken, Kathleen Brown, and Rick Yost.

Planning Director, Steve Puleo, and Assistant Town Manager, Amanda Lessard, were also present.

3. [PB 26-017](#) Approval of Minutes - The meeting of April 13, 2026

Attachments: [Minutes 4-13-2026 - draft.pdf](#)

Evert Krikken made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 13, 2026 meeting.

Seconded by Rick Yost.

Vote: All in favor.

Public Hearing

4. [PB 26-018](#) #26-07 Land Use Ordinance Amendments to Article 12 Impact Fees - North Route 302 Road Improvements Impact Fee The Town is proposing an amendment to Chapter 120 Land Use § 120-1204K to extend the time limit of the fee.

Attachments: [LUO_AMD_NorthRoute302Fee.pdf](#)
[26-07_PB_memo_NorthRoute302Fee_04-16-26.pdf](#)

Amanda Lessard explained:

- *The Route 302 impact fee language had a set time limit of July 1, 2026 in which to collect \$150,000. That amount had not yet been collected.*
- *The amendment would extend the impact fee for another five years.*
- *It would be applicable to all new development in three collection areas which contributed new trips through the Route 302/Anglers Road intersection.*

Public Comment

There was no public comment. Public comment was closed.

Board Comment

- *This seemed like a reallocation of taxes.*

- The amendment was understandable, they were trying to get to \$150,000.

Evert Krikken made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Land Use Ordinance Chapter 120 Article 12 Impact Fees to extend the time limit of the North Route 302 Road Improvements Impact Fee.

Seconded by Kathleen Brown.

Vote: Three in favor. Melissa Young and Rick Yost opposed.

New Business

5. [PB 26-019](#) #26-04 Riding to the Top - Major Site Plan - Sketch Plan Review - 14 Lilac Drive - Riding to the Top Therapeutic Riding Center
 The application is for expansion of the facility to include a new barn, an outdoor riding area, and a tractor shed, and improvements to the existing indoor arena/office building, reconfigured paddocks and parking areas and updated utilities and stormwater facilities. Subject property is identified as Tax Map: 7; Lot: 27B; Zone: Farm (F) in the Inkhorn Brook watershed.

- Attachments:** [26-04 PB MEMO MJR SP SKP RTT 042326.pdf](#)
[26-04 MJR SP RTT WaiverRequest 4-2-2026.pdf](#)
[26-04 MJR SP SKP PLANS RTT 3-24-26.pdf](#)
[26-04 MJR SP SKP APPL RTT 3-24-26 redacted.pdf](#)

Sarah Bronson, Executive Director of Riding to the Top, was present with Andy Johnson, from Atlantic Resource Consultants; Stephen Blatt from Stephen Blatt Architects; and Pat Carroll, with Carroll Associates.

Ms. Bronson explained:

- Their mission was enhancing health and wellness through equine assisted services. They served children and adults with disabilities.
- The proposal was to:
 - o Relocate and cover the outdoor riding space
 - o Build a larger new more functional barn
 - o Add onto the main building for additional program and office space
 - o Improve infrastructure including:
 - Regrading and resurfacing the road
 - Installing a new septic system
 - Installing a centralized pump house for water distribution
 - Entry improvements
 - Improvement of overall services to allow them to serve more clients
 - Improved living area for the horses
 - Conservation of water and reduced environmental impacts

Mr. Johnson reviewed the proposed plan:

- They were reconfiguring the parking for proximity to the building.
- One issue was horse, pedestrian, vehicular and service traffic in the front area. They were trying to separate those streams of traffic and didn't anticipate a high increase in traffic as a result of the improvements.
- The new riding arena would have a roof, but no walls.
- They were requesting a waiver for the existing overhead power line.

- Adequate service access had been provided to all the buildings.

Amanda Lessard discussed the site:

- It was a large parcel with streams, non-significant vernal pools, and wetlands.
- There was an existing single family dwelling, well, and septic on site.
- The ordinance required buffering to abutting residential uses.
- Sprinklers were not required. Because of the distance to a hydrant and lack of public water, the Fire Department had recommended installation of a cistern.
- A stormwater permit was required by the Army Corp of Engineers.

Board Comment

- Almost everyone who came before the Board wanted a waiver of the requirement for underground power. This waiver request seemed appropriate.
- Did the lot have adequate road frontage?
- Were there any regulations regarding manure storage?
- The cistern was a good idea.
- Additional information regarding buffering requirements was requested.
- This was a good plan.
- Where were the nearest houses?

6. [PB 26-020](#) #26-05 North Windham Public Safety Building - Major Site Plan - Sketch Plan Review - Franklin Drive - Town of Windham
 The application is for a new 14,330 sq ft footprint, 27,950 sq ft gross floor area, 2-story public safety building. Subject property is identified as Tax Map: 7; Lots: 14 (portion) and 14A (portion); Zone: Commercial I (C-1) in the Little Sebago Lake watershed.

Attachments: [26-05 PB MEMO MJR SP SKP NWPS 042326.pdf](#)
[26-05 MJR SP SKP APPL NWPS 2026-03-31 redacted.pdf](#)
[26-05 MJR SP SKP PLANS NWPS 20260331.pdf](#)

Tanner Goodine, from Sebago Technics, was present with Andrew Kosusko from Great Falls Construction. Mr. Goodine explained:

- The existing North Windham Fire Station was constrained by its current site and the building was nearly too small for the required uses. The new location would accommodate the space requirements for both the Fire and Police Departments.
- It would provide reduced emergency response times.
- The subject property was part of the Windham Mall subdivision and would need an amendment to that plan.
- Primary access would be via a new driveway from Franklin Drive.
- Parking was proposed along the east and south sides of the building and along Franklin Drive.
- The project required a site law permit amendment from DEP.

Amanda Lessard explained:

- The use was a public building which was not required to meet dimensional district standards.
- There were no abutting residential uses.

Fire Chief, Brent Libby, elaborated on benefits of the project:

- The Cumberland County Sheriff's Office had invested funding and the Patrol Division would be based at the facility. Eventually, the lower, two-bay area would be constructed. It would be used to store apparatus that was currently kept at other scattered locations.

- With the addition of the new Veteran’s Memorial Drive, call volume would be split with half the calls going out of Veteran’s Memorial Drive and half going out to Route 302.
- Relocating the current station would remove 400 to 450 calls from the Boody’s Corner intersection, and enhance efficiency.

Board Comment

- Would the Board approve the entire plan at this point?
- Where would people entering the building from Franklin Drive park? What about ADA access?
- What determined the location of the driveway off of Franklin Drive?
- How close was Home Depot to the entrance? Were there any concerns regarding conflicts with traffic?
- The building was close to the roadway. Would that affect future expansion?
- Given future anticipated development, there would be an increase in traffic on Franklin Drive. Were the parallel parking spaces a good idea?
- Why was the parking lot so far from the building?
- There were fenestration requirements for commercial buildings.
- On the plan, there was no door for the path that went from the parking spaces to the building.
- Was buffering required?

7. [PB 26-021](#)

#26-06 24 Depot Street Residential Development - Major Site Plan - Sketch Plan Review - 24 Depot Street - 24 Depot Street, LLC

The application is to construct a 15-unit multi-family residential development on a 1.2 acre property. The development will include a 5,040 SF footprint building with paved parking and stormwater management facilities and be served by underground utilities and public water and sewer. The site is further identified as Tax Map 38; Lot 52; Zone: Village Commercial (VC) in the Presumpscot River watershed.

- Attachments:** [26-06 PB MEMO MJR SP SKP 24 Depot St 042326.pdf](#)
[26-06 MJR SP SPK PLAN 24 Depot St 2026 4 6.pdf](#)
[26-06 MJR SP SKP APP 24 Depot St 2026 4 6 redacted.pdf](#)

Dustin Roma, from DM Roma Consulting Engineers, was present representing the application. He explained:

- The proposal was to further develop an existing residential project. The existing building was a multi-family with three dwelling units in it.
- They proposed to straighten the access into the property to make one main driveway and new parking spaces.
- A new 15-unit building would be constructed. They anticipated one bedroom, small footprint units.
- A stockade fence ran along the property line shared with abutting residential uses that would provide buffering.
- A sewer main would be extended up to the property. The existing moratorium would expire in 2028.
- Public water was available.
- The building would be sprinkled.
- Overhead power currently existed on site. They would like to maintain that to the existing building.
- Site distance was adequate for the speed limit.

Amanda Lessard clarified:

- A turn-around was requested on the far side of the 15-unit building to provide fire access to all sides of the building.
- The width of the entrance at the intersection would need review.
- There was no sidewalk there on Depot Street.
- The existing building was not part of the site plan review.

Board Comment

- What about snow storage.
- Was a traffic impact study required?
- To what extent did the Fire Department want access?
- The overhead electric went for a very short distance. Please provide a cost estimate for the installation of underground power.
- The project was for small, one bedroom units. The Town had been wanting affordable housing. Why add expense to the project?
- Components of the existing building were being altered. Did that pull the existing building into review?

Evert Krikken made a motion that the Board did not apply the underground power standards to the existing building.

Seconded by Kathleen Brown

Vote: Four in favor. No one opposed. Melissa Young abstained.

Other Business

8. [PB 26-022](#) Adopt revision to the Rules of the Planning Board

Attachments: [Rules of the Planning Board 04-13-2026draft.pdf](#)

Board Comment

- The Board had, under Site Walks, added a fourth bullet point, which required areas to be marked as requested by the Board.
- The fourth bullet point read, "as request" by the Board.

Evert Krikken made a motion to amend so that it read "as requested".

Seconded by Kathleen Brown.

Vote: All in favor.

Vote to approve the amended addition of the fourth bullet: All in favor.

- On page 3, C. Agendas, it stated the application checklist was adopted by the Planning Board.

Amanda Lessard explained the checklist was a direct reflection of ordinance requirements for site plan and subdivision. It was of concern that if the Board wanted to add things to the checklist for requirements that were not reflected in the ordinance it was a deviation.

Steve Puleo clarified the checklist was part of the ordinance submission requirements. If you reviewed the application according to the checklist, it should come from the

ordinance and not be modified by the Planning Board in the checklist. The checklist reflected the ordinance.

- *The Rules of the Planning Board should be changed.*
- *The Board should vote to accept the checklist so it complied with its own rules.*

9. Adjournment

Kathleen Brown made a motion to adjourn.

Seconded by Evert Krikken .

Vote: All in favor