



# Town of Windham

Town Offices  
8 School Road  
Windham, Maine

## Meeting Minutes - Draft

### Planning Board

---

Monday, October 22, 2018

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: Nick Kalogerakis, Griffin Bourassa, Drew Mayo, Kaitlyn Tuttle, and Michael Devoid.*

*Planner, Amanda Lessard was also present.*

#### 3 Approval of Minutes: October 11, 2018

*The October 11th minutes were not yet completed.*

### Public Hearings

*Andrew Mayo made a motion to take agenda items out of order.*

*Seconded by Nick Kalogerakis.*

*Vote: All in favor.*

#### 4 18-20 Windham Community Park. Major site plan. Town of Windham to request review of a 4.6 acre outdoor recreation facility. The property in question is located at 375 Gray Road and identified on Tax Map: 9, Lot: 71, Zone: Farm Residential (FR).

*Dan Diffin, of Sevee and Mahar Engineers was present representing the applicant. He explained:*

- *The community park would be located on the Windham Public Safety site. The property currently had the Public Safety Building, a skate park, parking, the community garden and a BMX track.*
- *They proposed a 2,500 square foot skate park; a 53 space parking lot; 2 basketball courts; 2 beach volleyball courts; picnic gathering areas; a small playground; a grassed amphitheater area; trails and open space, and a composting toilet. Walkways would be paved and meet access requirements or be gravel, topped with a soil/mulch mix.*
- *The existing waterline to the community garden would be replaced by a connection to a watermain in Gray Road.*
- *DOT had concerns regarding drainage off of the property and access management for the curb cuts.*
  - o *Everything drained towards Town Farm Road in a roadside ditch into a culvert. The increase would be minor and insignificant. Soil filters would be located around the property.*

- o They were allowed two curb cuts and were proposing four. The town engineer thought because of the amount of frontage and available site distance it would be acceptable to approve a waiver of the standard.
- Lighting was proposed for the ball courts.
- They were phasing the project. Next year they would do the parking area; skate park; and site improvements around the property. They had a grant for construction of the skate park. Funding for additional work would be needed later.

*Public comment:*

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

5 18-25 Sebago Basin Subdivision. Major subdivision. Jarod Robie to request review of a 7 lot subdivision. The property in question is located at 36 Basin Road and identified on Tax Map: 18A, Lot: 48-1, Zone: Farm Residential (FR) and Commercial II (C-2).

*Dustin Roma, a civil engineer with DM Roma Consulting Engineers, was present representing the applicant. He explained:*

- They proposed seven lots on 19 acres. Six residential lots would have frontage on Basin Road. One of the lots had a dwelling on it. The seventh, a commercial lot, would have frontage on Route 35. They didn't propose to develop the commercial lot.
- Net residential density calculations allowed ten lots.
- The developer had agreed to install a hydrant at the end of the town section of Basin Road.
- The Fire Chief thought emergency vehicle access was adequate as it existed on Basin Road.
- Public Water would be provided to the commercial lot, when it was developed.
- The town's engineer thought the waiver request for the hydrogeological study was reasonable given the large lots and highly permeable soils.
- Sappi used an existing trail for access to the dam. A 30 foot easement was proposed and it would be relocated to the lot line between lots 1 and 2. The location would be widened for use as a pull off area.

*Public Comment:*

*Heather Hall, Hackett Road – She urged the Board to consider the true impact when clear cutting and new construction was done. Recently, several lots had been cleared off of Marston Road. Now when it rained there were huge ruts on each side. The run-off went into the lake and caused severe beach erosion. She asked the Board to please consider the project's impact to Basin Road, and the community; to ensure it was done correctly; to follow the laws and rules that were in place; and to make sure they had boundaries and that they were quantified; to make sure safety and emergency access were a priority.*

*The erosion and run-off issue had yet to be resolved. Marston Road had not had those types of erosion or run-off issues. Every time it rained more went into the lake where her family and others got their drinking water.*

*Douglas Boyce, Basin Road – He was president of the Sebago Dykeside Association. The town had just repaved Basin Road from Route 35 to the public terminus, where the hydrant was proposed. From that point on the road condition was deteriorating. Their association took care of the portion of the road where*

*the lake frontage dwellings were. They only made pothole repairs for a significant portion of upper Basin Road.*

*The applicant was proposing additional lots with minimal infrastructure. As a major subdivision they believed that some effort should be made to improve access not only for those who traveled across that section of road to access their property but also for new lot owners.*

*The pavement was deteriorating. It needed significant grinding and resurfacing. Turn outs were needed; there was concern of inadequate width for two cars to pass in places. The right-of-way width was somewhat undefined. Modest improvements were needed to improve the road surface quality and to take down trees that were in the way. A utility pole and trees severely constrained the road where the new hydrant was proposed.*

*Dennis Brown, Pond Villa – He recommended that the town start considering some of the provisions that were used around Highland Lake for any area in a watershed. Double silt fence and some basic measures would go a long way to cut down on erosion to other lakes in town.*

*Doug Delesandro, Basin Road – The house on lot 5 had been built and two turn-outs had been removed. This was a concern; for anyone traveling it was one lane. When you lost a turnout it was a big issue. A shared driveway for two homes ran on the snowmobile trail. Without some distinction it was a possibility that the snowmobile trail would no longer exist. It was major artery for those who snowmobiled. Neighbors had asked if they could use the trail and the developer hadn't wanted to give them an answer at that point. For the community sense as well as the Center Day Camp it would be a concern if they didn't have access to the trail system.*

*Colin Swan, Basin Road – He owned lot 5 and was in favor of the subdivision. He understood the concerns about the bumpy road. After his house it was all woods and that meant people got back there. It was more of a safety issue for him. Year round neighbors with kids would be nice. There were a lot of ruts and run-off on Marston Road. That was a different situation. It was all dirt, going down a big hill. This was pretty flat with tons of trees and a paved road. It should be repaved at some point but right now there was no one living there that would contribute money to pave it. It was him and everyone who lived down below. No one wanted to pay to pave up there. It would be nice if the developer paved the whole section but there was a better chance if the homeowners got together and paved that section. He'd spoken with the developer who was willing to contribute with all the other neighbors.*

*Jeff Dunlop, Basin Road- He lived at the end of the town portion of the road. He was happy with the subdivision and the promise of a new hydrant across street from his home. The bigger consideration was the best interests of the neighborhood and town. The developer should be required to move the pole out of the roadway and remove three pine trees next to the pole. The developer wished to avoid the expense of improvements by claiming the road was private and out of his jurisdiction. He should be required to demonstrate a commitment to his subdivision, his neighbors, and to the community in general by making effort to get the work accomplished prior to approval of subdivision.*

*David Foster – He didn't think the developer should receive a waiver for the*

connection to public water. If they were continuing to have subdivisions around Windham they should provide the infrastructure and improvements when building them.

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

6 18-26 649 River Road Subdivision. Major subdivision. Robie Holdings, LLC to request review of an 8 lot residential cluster subdivision. The property in question is located at 649 River Road and identified on Tax Map: 8, Lot: 23B, Zone: Farm (F) and Resource Protection (RP).

*Dustin Roma, a civil engineer with DM Roma Consulting Engineers, was present representing the applicant. He explained:*

- *They proposed an eight lot cluster subdivision on 15.5 acres. There was an existing dwelling on the site.*
- *The 550 foot new road would be constructed to a minor local street standard. It would be offered for public acceptance.*
- *They would extend the watermain down River Road and up the new road to serve all the lots.*
- *Over nine acres of open space were proposed with access to it near the existing house.*
- *Power would be underground.*
- *Two filter ponds would be constructed, one on each side of the road.*
- *The Pleasant River flowed along the eastern boundary.*
- *There was over 1,000 feet of site distance to the left on River Road and about 675 feet to the right.*
- *They were seeking a bonus lot for providing public access to open space.*

*Public Comment:*

*Michael Greene, River Road – There had been some mention that lot 5 and open space 2 might be swapped. Would that happen? During the public meeting he had been told there would be no tree clearing. It appeared there would be some on lots 5, 4 and maybe 3. What would the impact be to wildlife in that area? Did the proposed trail cross the wetlands? He wanted more description regarding the ponds. How long would they retain water? Did they slowly leach water out? This was a concern for the neighbors across the road. Where would the parking for public access be? What waivers were they asking for? Where would mailboxes be? Had the homeowner's documents been submitted?*

*Victoria Chase, River Road – She lived directly across from the project. On plans there was just one pond proposed. There was a culvert that ran under River Road directly into her yard. When the road was done it was a field and they didn't care because the water didn't build up. If there were houses there it would happen and it was a problem. She opposed the streetlight. It was dark, quiet and peaceful. The development would cause a lot of light pollution that was not acceptable to her. There was little consideration that property owners had been there for years and assumed they were safe and that houses would be built on two acre lots. The existing lot had a rental on it. Could all the houses be multi-family? The open space area was not usable land. No one would use it to recreate. They were trying to stuff something where it didn't belong, changing the look of the entire area. It would be very crowded, with no privacy. She was disappointed this was happening.*

*Monica Atkinson, lived next door – She was concerned that so many changes had been made. The open space was unusable. She would rather not have any houses next to her; it was devastating. She had bought land in a Farm zone. Wildlife would be gone. She understood people needed houses to live in; she did not want it next to her. If the public was made knowledgeable of the open space would they be parking in her driveway? She was concerned that it would be affordable housing with families. Her son had equipment from his business in the yard. She couldn't police the neighborhood.*

*Don Tanguay, River Rd – He had been in his house for 48 years and agreed with the previous comments. Water flowed down Tradition Drive across the back of his property. Where would it go? He wanted to be sure he didn't have a lake in his back yard. Would there be a tree buffer line?*

*Micki Vansummern, Tucker Drive – The Presumpscot Regional Land Trust had said the Pleasant River, Colley Wright Brook, and Black Brook Preserve were all impaired streams. The Pleasant River ran against the property. They needed to be concerned with septic systems and drainage to be sure streams would still be usable.*

*David Foster, Highland Cliff Rd – They had proposed a waiver for pavement extension. Why would they waive that in a subdivision? People would be walking. If there wasn't a sidewalk it made sense that the road should be wider. His other concern was with noncontiguous open space. Based on the current ordinances the open space was supposed to be contiguous and usable. Why not take the two lots near River Road instead. Where would they park for public access to the open space?*

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

7 Amendment to Town of Windham Land Use Ordinance, Chapter 140, Sections 300, 400 and 900. Proposed changes to cluster subdivision standards include changes to ownership of open space, factors for reviewing lot arrangement, and removing density bonuses in the Farm and Farm Residential District.

*Amanda Lessard explained the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) had worked on the amendment as a way to advance the Comp Plan goal of keeping rural Windham rural. It was meant to be a minor change to tweak the existing cluster subdivision standards.*

*Public Comment:*

*Dennis Brown, Pond Villa – He thought setting a standard that only allowed cluster housing was not the right direction. A traditional layout may be more effective in some situations. In terms of development on Highland Lake, DEP had concern that, in general, cluster provisions made sense if buffers were the right size and it did not create a point source. Often you could get a lot of general filtration through natural buffers. It was the Planning Board's responsibility to decide which layout was the most appropriate in terms of the best fit for the neighborhood. He asked that cluster subdivisions not be made mandatory.*

*The amendment read that cluster subdivisions would be available to all other appropriate zoning districts. What did that mean? Depending on the layout of a*

property it was easy to upsize with a cluster subdivision. A conventional layout may not allow the same number of houses. In a rural setting did you want to jam more houses in?

John Parenteau, Highland Cliff – He supported the proposed amendment to remove the density bonus in Farm and Farm Residential. Currently the ordinance incentivized development where the Comp Plan didn't intend it to be.

Michelle Olay-Newton, Cobb Farm Road – She read a statement from her neighbor, Karen Lougee, who was unable to attend the meeting. Ms. Lougee had written that she understood the concept of cluster subdivision and intention of preserving open land in Farm and Farm Residential zones. It was a difficult issue, weighing the rights of land owners in an area where cluster development was proposed and the impact on the town as a whole. Cluster development did not fit in rural areas; rural areas were unique and contributed to the character of a town. Her opinion was that cluster development created greater environmental impacts than two acres lots. Cluster development required new access roads, generated more traffic, stressed groundwater supplies, increased surface runoff and could have a negative visual impact.

Ms. Lougee's statement expressed concern with the increase in homes under cluster subdivision. Should they become a requirement, there needed to be a limit on the number of lots in a certain area and the total approved for a specific area. Between 2017 and now approximately 143 lots were approved and waiting in a three to four mile radius, 200 or more for the entire town. She had concerns regarding the impact to existing wells, the impact on groundwater from septic systems, runoff to streams already deemed at risk, and traffic on country roads. If cluster development was mandated for rural areas then standards should be set for minimum and maximum size so they could support the open area concept and not overwhelm the surrounding neighborhood. There was no incentive to build in the growth areas as mandated by the Comp Plan. Variances should not be given to avoid the expense of development.

Ms. Olay-Newton added her own comment. They were starting a grassroots effort called Growing Windham Responsibly. The majority didn't believe cluster development was good for Farm and Farm Residential. She approved of removing the density bonus. Developers wouldn't develop where it would be more expensive for them.

Sarah Bronson, Johnson Road – She worked at Riding to the Top, which was adjacent to the proposed Land of Nod development. She read a statement from Alan Sheppard, who lived directly across from the proposed Highland Cliff subdivision. He could not be present at the discussion in regards to the proposed cluster development happening in his neighborhood. He had lived on Tucker Drive for over twenty years, the area was zoned as farm and to allow any changes was absurd. He was disappointed and outraged that cluster development should even be considered without the necessary infrastructure being in place. Demands on developers to build proper road access, and infrastructure were not uncommon. To pervert rules that were in place, clustering a concentration of homes to allow developers to "cash in" on the misguided claim to allow for more space, to build so close to wet lands, strain the aquifer, and traffic congestion on rural roadways was not, in his opinion, good planning. He supported his neighbors in their efforts to thwart this bad plan. He was not against development, but said to do it in a reasonable way, and have the

*developers put more effort into easing the impact on the land. The area could maintain the rural character the zoning rules were there to protect. If it had to be clustered then developers needed to put some skin in the game and provide proper infrastructure to support their need.*

*Ms. Bronson added her own comment. She knew it was a complicated subject. She reiterated that having only cluster development in farm zones was a bad precedent. There needed to be better thought put into it. The endless waivers were a waste of everyone's time. People should not be allowed to present at a Planning Board meeting if their application wasn't complete. She appreciated the daunting task and thought Windham could do better.*

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

## **Continuing Business**

- 8      [PB 18-091](#)      17-11 Majestic Woods, Phase 3. Major subdivision final plan review. Shoreland Development, LLC to request review of a 22 lot residential cluster subdivision. The property in question is located on Swett Road and identified on Tax Map: 6, Lot: 63-13, Zone: Farm (F).

**Attachments:**    [17-11 Majestic Woods Phase III Final 10-19-2018](#)

[JonEarle Swett Rd 2018-10-18](#)

[Shoreland Development LLC L27866AN](#)

[Majestic Woods - Design Plans \(2018-09-04\)](#)

[Majestic Woods 3 Final Submission 09-04-2018](#)

*Dustin Roma, a civil engineer with DM Roma Consulting Engineers, was present representing the applicant. He explained:*

- *The DEP permit had been received.*
- *They had met with the town engineer and public works director to review design plans and inspection reports regarding the existing condition of Swett Road. The town engineer recommended a line item in the performance guarantee for restoration of Swett Road damage caused by construction. He thought the existing condition of Swett Road was suitable, based on the amount of development for this phase.*
- *More trees were proposed at the entrance and then every 50 feet along the frontage to address abutter concerns regarding auto lights shining into the house at night.*

*Nick Kalogerakis made a motion to accept public comment.*

*Seconded by Drew Mayo.*

*Vote: All in favor.*

*Gray Lytle, Swett Road – He hadn't been aware of the public hearing and said the abutters hadn't been notified. The chair had asked that abutter notifications be sent and they had not received any. He and the Board Chair, David Douglass, had thought there was a separate site walk for the road. There had also been a waiver granted for bonus lots. The waiver was granted on the basis that they would pave the road. There were 14 houses on that part of Swett Road and they would add 22. When they had cut the roadway they had also cut an abutter's trees so there was no buffer. No reparation had been made. They had also caused damage when they dropped a tree in an abutter's*

grass. That damage had not been repaired. Phase One and Two work still wasn't completed. He didn't want to wait more years for them to sell the lots and not fix the road. There was a lot of damage at the end of Swett Road where the water pooled. They would prefer that mailboxes were in the subdivision instead of at the end of the road.

Amanda Lessard stated:

- The bonus lots were made an option by providing public access to the open space. Bonus lots were not tied to fixing the road.
- The waiver request was for the amount of developable land in the open space, not the number of lots.
- The post office set the requirements for mailboxes.
- Phase Two work had some line items remaining to be done. The town had funds to complete project.
- The public works director, fire chief, and police chief had not expressed any concerns.

The Board commented:

- Could it be a condition of approval that the Phase Two work had to be completed before moving onto Phase Three?
- In terms of the road, what was adequate? Road standards had requirements for a certain number of lots. Swett Road would have 36 homes. The ordinance standard was a paved road for over ten lots.
- The public hearing had been held on March 12, 2018.

Griffin Bourassa made a motion that the final subdivision plan application for project 17-11 Majestic Woods Phase three 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 Drew Mayo.

Vote: Five in favor. No one opposed. Michael Devold abstained.

Drew Mayo made a motion the final subdivision application for 17-11 Majestic Woods Phase Three on Tax Map: 6, Lot: 63-13 was to be approved with conditions with the following findings of fact and conclusions and with the added condition that no building permit will be issued for Phase Three until Phase Two improvements were complete. In addition the requirement for pavement on Swett Road would be stricken.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

##### A. POLLUTION

- A portion of this subdivision is within the mapped 100 year floodplain. No disturbance or new buildings are proposed within the 100 year floodplain.
- This subdivision is not located over a significant sand and gravel aquifer.
- A hydrogeologic assessment must be submitted as part of the Preliminary Plan as the subdivision is not served by public sewer and the subdivision has an average density of more than one dwelling unit per 100,000 square feet.
- A nitrate analysis plan was submitted on March 2, 2018.
- A Nitrate Impact Analysis prepared by Donald McFadden, C.G. of St. Germain Collins was submitted on March 9, 2018. The report concludes that the proposed subsurface wastewater disposal systems will not result in an increase of nitrate-nitrogen above 10 mg/L in groundwater outside the subject site boundaries.
- The new residential lots will not result in undue air or water pollution.

**B. WATER**

- All lots are proposed to be served by private wells for domestic use.
- The closest fire hydrant is located on at the intersection of Pope and Chute Roads. This is about 5,000 feet from the new subdivision street's intersection with Swett Road.
- A condition of approval from the original subdivision approval states that all homes in the subdivision must have sprinkler systems installed that meet NFPA standards. This condition has been included below.
- Well exclusion areas are shown on the preliminary subdivision plan dated February 20, 2018.

**C. SOIL EROSION**

- An erosion and sedimentation plan, prepared by DM Roma Consulting Engineers, dated December 18, 2017, has been submitted as part of the Preliminary Plan. Notes and details are shown on Drawing D-1.
- This project will require a Site Location of Development permit from Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). The permit must be submitted with the Final Plan submission.
- A portion of this project is in the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) area as designated by the Environmental Protection Agency for the Town of Windham. This may mean there are additional permitting requirements, and ongoing requirements for reporting of stormwater infrastructure maintenance if the developed area is greater than 1 acre.
- A stormwater management plan, has been submitted as part of the December 18, 2017 Preliminary Plan submission. The project proposes to treat the 2.60 acres of new impervious area with four underdrained filter basins, a bioretention cell, a forested buffer and a roof drip edge on each house.
- The stormwater treatment table is shown on Sheet SWP-2 of the preliminary subdivision plan set. A note should be added to the recording plan that describes the assumed impervious and developed area for each lot and the requirement for all new buildings to install a roofline drip edge.
- A note should be added to the plan that stormwater buffers will be permanently marked prior to the start of construction.
- The plan also includes an inspection, maintenance and housekeeping plan. The owners are responsible for the maintenance of all stormwater management structures and related site components until such time that a homeowner's association is created.
- In an email dated January 4, 2018, Town Engineer Jon Earle P.E., agrees that the project meets the MDEP basic and general standard for erosion control and stormwater treatment. Stormwater quantity calculations must be submitted to determine compliance with the Chapter 500 flooding standard. He also noted that the project is outside of the MS4 urbanized area and does not need to comply with the Town's Chapter 140 Post-Construction Stormwater Ordinance for annual inspections, but will require 5 year recertification for stormwater BMPs as part of the Site Location permit.
- The preliminary plan submission dated January 22, 2018 includes a high intensity soils map from Longview Partners, LLC. An updated stormwater management report that reflects the high intensity soil survey mapping was also submitted. Notes were added to the subdivision plan requiring buildings to have roofline drip edge installed, and stormwater buffers be permanently marked.
- In an email dated March 1, 2018, Town Engineer Jon Earle P.E., agrees that the project meets the MDEP basic and general standard for erosion control and stormwater treatment. Stormwater quantity calculations must be submitted to determine compliance with the Chapter 500 flooding standard.

- The applicant responded to peer review comments on March 2, 2018 that stormwater quantity calculations for each of the study points was submitted in the January 22 Response to Comments on page 19 of the document (Page 3 of the stormwater report).
- A Site Location of Development Act Permit #L-27866-L3-A-N was issued by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection on October 19, 2018.

#### D. TRAFFIC

- The subdivision lots will have frontage on a new 1,930 foot long subdivision street which intersects with Swett Road, which is a gravel surfaced public road. Improvements to Swett Road from the intersection with Chute Road to the vicinity of where the new street is proposed as part of the requirements for the Phase 2 approval of the subdivision.
- The new road will be built to a Minor Local Street standard, as is required in cluster subdivisions.
- Based on the distance to uses that would generate pedestrian trips, sidewalks are not required on the subdivision street.
- A road plan and profile, prepared by DM Roma Consulting Engineers, dated December 18, 2017, shown on Sheet 4, 5 and 6, was submitted as part of the Preliminary Plan. The roadway cross section is shown on Sheet 9.
- Section 911.M.3.d states that streetlights may be required at intersections with existing public streets. An existing utility pole is shown on Sheet 3 of the preliminary plan to be relocated at the intersection of the proposed street and Swett Road. The applicant should verify if there is an existing streetlight on this pole, and if not, if one is proposed.
- In the standards for Sidewalks or Shoulders, Major Local Streets and Minor Local Streets (page 9-61) state that sidewalks are not required if the subdivision is more than 1,000 feet from a "public building." If the applicant chooses not to build sidewalks on the subdivision street, additional 1 foot paved shoulders are required. Note that if the Planning Board finds that "vehicular trips from the generated by the subdivision will create unsafe pedestrian conditions, sidewalks can be required. A waiver has been requested from this standard.
- Street design standards for dead end streets in Section 911.K.4.g requires a hammerhead turnarounds every 1,000 feet. The preliminary plan dated December 18, 2017 is proposing a dead end street of approximately 1,930 feet to the start of the cul-de-sac without any hammerheads. A written waiver request that address the waiver criteria of Section 908 should be submitted.
- The preliminary plan submission states that the proposed 22 residential lots will generate 22 peak hour trip-ends.
- A traffic impact analysis must be submitted with the Preliminary Plan submission as the subdivision is projected to generate more than 140 vehicle trips per day. The applicant has requested a waiver from this submission requirement.
- There are two large properties which abut the proposed subdivision (Map 6 Lot 60 and Map 6 Lot 63A). Section 911.M.3.a (page 9-51) and Section 911.M.5.b.5.iii (page 9-60) allows the Board to require the dedication of a right-of-way to provide continuation of the road where future development is possible. The Preliminary Plan dated December 18, 2017 shows a right-of-way to the abutting property Lot 63A but it is labeled as private, to be retained by owner. This future right-of-way should also be offered to the Town when the road right-of-way is offered for public acceptance.
- In an email dated January 4, 2018, Town Engineer Jon Earle P.E., states that the waiver from the wider paved shoulder is reasonable and requested that sight distance at the proposed road intersection with Swett Road be shown on the plan.
- The preliminary plan submission dated January 22, 2018 states that the existing utility pole to be relocated does not currently have a street light and one is not proposed

due to neighborhood concerns. The only streetlight along Swett Road is located at the intersection with Chute Road. The preliminary plan also shows an intermediate hammerhead at approximate roadway station 9+50.

- The preliminary subdivision plan dated January 22, 2018 shows two (2) trail head public parking spaces and a park mulch area with picnic tables and information kiosk as well as some stormwater infrastructure located within the right-of-way to the abutting property Lot 63A. These elements would need to be redesigned and relocated if a future road was proposed.
- In the February 20, 2018 preliminary plan submission an easement was added around the intermediate hammerhead and the park mulch picnic area and trail-head kiosk were relocated outside of the right-of-way and a note added to the plan that if the roadway is extended within the right of way, the parking spaces will be relocated in front of the recreation area within a widened shoulder on the side of the new roadway.
- In an email dated March 1, 2018, Town Engineer Jon Earle P.E., stated that sight distances at the intersection of the proposed road with Swett Road should be shown on the plan and that the waiver request for a traffic impact analysis seems reasonable based on the amount of traffic anticipated to be generated by the project.
- At the meeting on March 12, 2018 the Planning Board required that the applicant pave Swett Road from the subdivision road to the Chute Road. A detail for Swett Road paving is not included in the final plan submission.
- In an email dated October 18, 2018 Town Engineer Jon Earle, PE, stated that he met with the applicant's representative and the Public Works Director on site and observed that the reconstruction of Swett Road required as part of the Phase 2 approval is in good condition with some minor rutting and potholes. He recommends that an amount be included with the performance guarantee to cover restoration/repairs to Swett Road during construction.

#### E. SEWERAGE

- Lots will be served by private subsurface wastewater disposal (septic) systems.
- Soil test pit analysis prepared by Longview Partners, LLC dated January 9, 2018 show that each lot has adequate soils to support a private septic system. Test pit locations are shown on the plan.
- A class A high-intensity soil survey prepared by Longview Partners, LLC plan dated January 5, 2018 was included with the January 22, 2018 preliminary plan submission.
- In a letter from Dustin Roma, PE dated February 19, 2018 he comments that the septic system test pits were conducted prior to establishing proposed clearing limits for each individual lot, so the specific location of each test pit does not fall within the proposed development area for some lots. For each of the lots where the test pit locations are within the tree save areas or in the filter basin, there are similar soils throughout the lot where a leach field could be located based on the Class A High Intensity Soil Survey.
- The Nitrate Analysis Plan dated March 2, 2018 shows the location of the proposed disposal field on each lot.

#### F. SOLID WASTE

- Private residences in this subdivision will participate in the Town trash bag program.
- Development of these lots should not produce an undue burden on the Town's ability to collect and dispose of solid waste

#### G. AESTHETICS

- The site is predominately wooded with some forested wetland areas shown on the

plan.

- Vernal pool survey information should be included in the Preliminary Plan submission. The large wetland in the center of Lot 13 was identified from aerial images as a Potential Vernal Pool by Stantec in 2008. The Town does not have regulations pertaining to vernal pools, but any vernal pools that are deemed "significant" are regulated as significant wildlife habitat by the Department of Environmental Protection.
- The mapped vernal pools are shown on the January 22, 2018 preliminary plan. The submission states that during the vernal pool investigation, all of the pools indicated within the development were classified as "non-significant" by the consultant, and forms have been sent to the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife for concurrence. This documentation should be submitted with the final plan.
- There are no documented rare botanical features or significant wildlife habitat documented on the site.
- A landscape plan is required for the preliminary plan submission. Street trees are required at least every fifty (50) feet.
- The preliminary plan shows a tree line on the plan.
- The January 2, 2018 includes Note 11 that restricts clearing for five years after planning board approval beyond the tree line shown and Note 10 that streets trees shall be planted or preserved at an interval no less than one tree every 50 feet.

#### H. CONFORMITY WITH LOCAL PLANS AND ORDINANCES

- Comprehensive Plan:
- The plan does meet the goals of the 2017 Comprehensive Plan.
- Land Use Ordinances:
- All lots fall within the minimum and maximum lot sizes of 30,000-50,000 square feet (one lot 60,000 sf max) for cluster lots in the F zoning district.
- Lots must meet the lot frontage requirements for the F zoning district, which for cluster subdivision lots is 100 feet, or 50 feet when on a cul-de-sac.
- Net residential density calculations are shown on the January 22, 2018 Preliminary Plan and show the net density of both the net density of the original subdivision (40 lots) as well as for Lot 13. In the submission dated February 19, 2018 the applicant notes that the net residential density shown on the original 2004 approved plan used the incorrect net residential density factor (80,000 square feet instead of the correct 60,000 square feet).
- Subdivision Ordinance
- The Tax Map and Lot numbers provided by the Tax Assessor must be shown on the Final Plan.
- Subdivision plan data compatible with the Town GIS must be submitted as part of the Final Plan submission.
- No more than 30% of the lots have direct vehicular access onto an existing public road.
- The open space reserved does not provide 50% of the land suitable for development. The applicant proposed 42.7% of the land suitable for development is located in the open space and has submitted a waiver request. Public parking, a picnic area and trail-head informational kiosk are proposed as amenities for the public use of the open space.
- This phase of the subdivision is utilizing the 20% density bonus to gain four (4) additional lots. In order to be eligible, the open space must be open for general public use, not just homeowners within the subdivision. Access easement for the open space must be recorded in the registry prior to the issuance of building permits. See suggested condition of approval #3. In the submission dated February 19, 2018 the application notes that the when the 14 lots approved previously approved are combined with the

*proposed 22 lots to total 36 lots, which is less than what is permitted on the total parcel.*

- *A Draft Declaration of Restrictions was included with the Final Plan submission and specifies the rights and responsibilities of each lot owner with respect to the maintenance, repair, and plowing of the subdivision streets, open space and stormwater infrastructure.*
- *Others:*
- *Chapter 221 Street Naming and Addressing: The Assessing Department, has approved the street name, Revolution Drive. The name must be shown on the Final Plan*

#### *I. FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL CAPACITY*

- *An estimate of the project construction costs was included in the December 18, 2017 preliminary plan submission.*
- *A letter dated February 14, 2018 from Aaron Cannan, Senior Vice President at Katahdin Trust Company was submitted as evidence of financial capacity.*
- *The applicant has provided information on the licensed professionals working on this project as evidence of technical capacity*

#### *J. RIVER, STREAM OR BROOK IMPACTS*

- *Colley Wright Brook and its associated Stream Protection District are shown on the plan and are entirely located within the proposed open space.*
- *This project will not adversely impact any river, stream, or brook.*

#### *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 site plan.*
- 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.*
- 7. The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality'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 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 with a duly adopted site plan regulation or ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan, or land use plan.*
- 10. The developer has adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section.*
- 11. The proposed subdivision is 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 not alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water.*

13. *The proposed subdivision is situated entirely or partially within a floodplain.*
14. *All freshwater wetlands within the proposed subdivision have been identified on the plan.*
15. *Any river, stream, or brook within or abutting the subdivision has been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application.*
16. *The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate storm water management.*
17. *If any lots in the proposed subdivision have shore frontage on a river, stream, brook, or great pond as these features are defined in Title 38, section 480-B, none of the lots created within the subdivision have a lot depth to shore frontage ratio greater than 5 to 1.*  
N/A
18. *The long-term cumulative effects of the proposed subdivision will not unreasonably increase a great pond's phosphorus concentration during the construction phase and life of the proposed subdivision.*
19. *For any proposed subdivision that crosses municipal boundaries, the proposed subdivision will/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. (N/A)*
20. *Timber on the parcel being subdivided 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 April 3, 2017, as amended October 19, 2018, 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. *All new homes in the subdivision hall have residential sprinkler systems that meet NFPA standards.*
3. *An access easement for public use of the open space must be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds prior to the issuance of building permits.*
4. *The applicant shall pave Swett Road from the subdivision road to Chute Road.*

*Seconded by Kaitlyn Tuttle.*

*Michael Devoid requested the requirement to pave at least the primary access on Swett Road up to the subdivision.*

*Vote: Four in favor. Nick Kalogerakis and Michael Devoid opposed.*

#### 9 [PB 18-092](#)

18-20 Windham Community Park. Major site plan final plan review. Town of Windham to request review of a 4.6 acre outdoor recreation facility. The property in question is located at 375 Gray Road and identified on Tax Map: 9, Lot: 71, Zone: Farm Residential (FR).

**Attachments:** [18-20 Community Park Final 10-18-18](#)  
[Peer Review Community Park 10-11-18](#)  
[Community Park Site Plan Review Application](#)  
[Community Park20181002-ISSUED FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW-SS](#)

*Amanda Lessard had received a waiver request for:*

- *The increase to the stormwater flooding standard.*
- *Four curb cuts instead of two.*

*Griffin Bourassa made a motion to accept the waiver request for the curb cuts.*

*Seconded by Nick Kalogerakis.*

*Vote: All in favor.*

*Drew Mayo made a motion to accept the waiver request of the stormwater flooding standard.*

*Seconded by Kaitlyn Tibbetts.*

*Vote: All in favor.*

*Drew Mayo made a motion that the site plan application for project 18-20 Community Park 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 are not fully addressed.*

*Seconded by Griffin Bourassa.*

*Vote: All in favor.*

*Griffin Bourassa made a motion that the Site Plan application for 18-20 Community Park on Tax Map: 9, Lot: 71 was to be approved with conditions with the following findings of fact and conclusions.*

#### *FINDINGS OF FACT*

##### *Utilization of the Site*

- *The project is located on a 12.8 acre parcel. The Public Safety Building and associated parking area, a Skate Park and parking area and a Community Garden are currently located on the site.*
- *There is currently a gravel parking area to serve the existing Skate Park that can accommodate about 20 vehicles, located just off Route 202. The parking area is gated.*

##### *Vehicular and Pedestrian Traffic*

- *The applicant is proposing to use the existing Skate Park entrance and provide 54 parking spaces.*
- *An additional parking area with an 18 foot entrance on Route 202 at the south end of the property is proposed to provide 12 grassed parking spaces for the Community Garden.*
- *Sight distances for the Park and Community Garden entrances are shown on the final plan and exceed the standard of 60 feet for a 40 mile per hour roadway.*
- *The applicant should clarify if the existing gate will remain to control access to the property. No gate is shown on the final plan.*
- *The applicant is requesting a waiver from the curb cut and driveway openings standard.*
- *Walking paths are proposed around the perimeter of the Park area with connections to the Public Safety Building. The final plan shows the walkways immediately*

surrounding the parking lot, playground area, and skate park as well as the connection to the amphitheater and along the frontage of Gray Road will be a 6 foot wide bituminous sidewalk. The remainder of the sidewalks will be 6 foot wide superhumus topped gravel path.

- At the Development Team meeting on July 10, 2018 Public Works Director Doug Fortier said that the applicant should verify that the Maine Department of Transportation will allow the walking paths within the Route 202 right-of-way.
- The final plan submission states that according to the ITE Trip Generation Manual the use will result in approximately 9 trips in the AM peak hour and 36 trips in the PM peak hour.

#### *Sewage Disposal, Water Quality and Groundwater Impacts*

- The development is located in the Black Brook watershed.
- The applicant proposes to serve the property with a composting toilet so no septic system is required.
- The proposed use should not have a significant impact on the quantity or quality of area groundwater.

#### *Stormwater Management*

- Per Section 812.E., a stormwater plan needs to be submitted that meets the standards DEP Chapter 500 Stormwater Management. If this project requires a Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Chapter 500 Stormwater Permit, it must be submitted with 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 if the area of development is greater than one (1) acre.
- A stormwater management plan, prepared by Sevee & Maher Engineers, has been submitted as part of the Final plan. The existing park area includes 1.91 acres of impervious area and 8.11 acres of developed area. This project will result in 2.48 acres of impervious area and 8.20 acres of developed area, for a net increase in impervious area of 25,000 square feet (0.57 acres) and a minor increase in developed area of 0.09 acres. No DEP permit is required. Stormwater will be treated with two (2) underdrained soil filters, two Tree Box Filters, and surfacing the natural trail network with Superhumus.
- In an email dated October 11, 2018, Town Engineer Jon Earle, P.E., states that the Basic and General stormwater standards have been met but notes minor increase in post development flow at study point #1 (2.10, and 25 yr storms) and study point #2 (2 yr). A written waiver request should be submitted.

#### *Erosion Control*

- A soil erosion and sediment control plan has been submitted as Sheets C105 and C106 of the final plan set.

#### *Utilities*

- The project will provide a new water service for the Community Garden. An Ability to Serve Letter from the Portland Water District must be submitted with the Final Plan.
- Electrical service will be brought to the site from Route 202. Utility lines must be placed underground.
- The closest fire hydrants on Route 202 are at the property line in front of the Public

Safety Building, and to the south at the intersection of Pope Road and Route 202.

- In an email dated October 11, 2018, Town Engineer Jon Earle, P.E., noted that correspondence from the Portland Water District will need to be received prior to final approval for the 1" irrigation service tap.

#### *Financial and Technical Capacity*

- The sketch plan submission states that the project will be completed in multiple phases. The initial phase will include construction of the new skate park and parking areas and site preparation for construction of other park features and is funded through a Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant awarded to the Town.
- The final plan submission includes a copy of the grant application as evidence of financial capacity.
- The applicant has provided information on the licensed professionals working on this project as evidence of technical capacity.

#### *Landscape Plan*

- A landscaping plan has been submitted as Sheet LA-101 the final plan set.

#### *Conformity with Local Plans and Ordinances*

##### *1. Land Use*

- Recreation Facility, Outdoor is a Conditional Use in the Farm Residential (FR) District. The project must comply with the review criteria in Section 516, see below.
- The project meets the minimum lot size and setback requirements of the FR zoning district.

##### *2. Comprehensive Plan*

- This project is located in the Windham Center Growth Area and meets the goals and objectives of the 2017 Comprehensive Plan.

##### *3. Others:*

#### *Impacts to Adjacent/Neighboring Properties*

- Site lighting is shown Sketch Plan, and details of fixtures should be included in the Final Plan submission.
- Details of exterior lighting fixtures were included in the final plan submission.
- In an email dated October 11, 2018, Town Engineer Jon Earle noted that a photometric plan for the lighting of the basketball and volleyball courts was not included in the submission and is intended to be submitted in a later phase of the project. Once lighting is selected for these two areas, a photometric plan will need to be submitted that meets the lighting ordinance of 0.5 foot candles at the property line. See Condition of Approval #2.
- Impacts to nearby properties should be minimal, based on the proposed use.

#### *CONCLUSIONS*

1. The plan for development reflects the natural capacities of the site to support development.
2. Buildings, lots, and support facilities will be clustered in those portions of the site that have the most suitable conditions for development.

3. *Environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to, wetlands; steep slopes; flood plains; significant wildlife habitats, fisheries, and scenic areas; habitat for rare and endangered plants and animals; unique natural communities and natural areas; and, sand and gravel aquifers will be maintained and protected to the maximum extent.*
4. *The proposed site plan has sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the site plan.*
5. *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.*
6. *The proposed use and layout will be of such a nature that it will make vehicular or pedestrian traffic no more hazardous than is normal for the area involved.*
7. *The proposed site plan will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal.*
8. *The proposed site plan conforms to a duly adopted site plan regulation or ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan, or land use plan.*
9. *The developer has adequate financial capacity to meet the standards of this section.*
10. *The proposed site plan will not alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water.*
11. *The proposed site plan will provide for adequate storm water management.*
12. *The proposed location and height of buildings or structure walls and fences, parking, loading and landscaping shall be such that it will not interfere or discourage the appropriate development in the use of land adjacent to the proposed site or unreasonable affect its value.*
13. *On-site landscaping does provide adequate protection to neighboring properties from detrimental features of the development that could be avoided by adequate landscaping.*

#### CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. *Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated July 2, 2018, as amended October 2, 2018, 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 814.G. of the Land Use Ordinance.*
2. *A photometric plan for the lighting of the basketball and volleyball courts that meets the lighting standard of 0.5 foot candles at the property line shall be submitted prior to the installation of these facilities.*

*Seconded by Drew Mayo.*

*Vote: All in favor.*

10

[PB 18-093](#)

18-25 Sebago Basin Subdivision. Major subdivision preliminary plan review. Jarod Robie to request review of a 7 lot subdivision. The property in question is located at 36 Basin Road and identified on Tax Map: 18A, Lot: 48-1, Zone: Farm Residential (FR) and Commercial II (C-2).

**Attachments:** [18-25 Sebago Basin Prelim 10-19-18](#)  
[Peer Review Sebago Basin 10-18-2018](#)  
[Chief Libby Basin Rd 09-28-2018](#)  
[Sebago Basin Subdivision Preliminary Application 2018 10 1](#)  
[Sebago Basin Subdivision Preliminary Plans 2018 10 1](#)  
[Dunlop BasinRd 2018-10-22.pdf](#)  
[181022 Cohen Basin Rd.pdf](#)  
[Jim Goode Sebago Basin Subdivision 10-29-2018.pdf](#)

*Meeting went into Recess*

*Meeting Reconvened*

*Mr. Roma addressed the public comment:*

- *In regard to erosion issues on Hackett and Marston Roads, they were not proposing any development in that area.*
- *The developer had committed to providing adequate space to pull out. They would provide a wide radius where the Sappi easement was proposed. They had no control over the other side of the road.*
- *Testimony had been that pavement improvements were done by the road association. There would be six additional home owners who would contribute to the improvement of the roadway.*
- *They had no intention to restrict the snowmobile access on lots 5 and 6. The pipeline and gas line had easements there. Whatever arrangement they had would essentially remain.*
- *Moving utility poles and cutting trees on Basin Road were beyond anything they could do. Those were either in the public right-of-way or on the portion of the road that was owned by the Manchesters.*
- *The fire chief had said he could get around the pole and trees.*

*The Board commented:*

- *It would be good to know where the geographic right-of-way was.*
- *They were putting in a new subdivision. There was already a fairly substantial traffic load on deteriorating road. All the lots had frontage along the road.*
- *The road was already in that condition. It shouldn't be the developer's responsibility to fix it.*
- *Road association membership should be included in the deeds.*

*Drew Mayo made a motion to approve the request for a waiver of the hydrogeological study.*

*Seconded by Kaitlyn Tuttle.*

*Vote: Five in favor. No one opposed. Drew Mayo abstained.*

*Drew Mayo made a motion to accept the waiver request for the requirement to connect to public water.*

*Seconded by Griffin Bourassa.*

*Vote: Two in favor. Nick Kalogerakis, Kaitlyn Tibbetts, Griffin Bourassa, and Michael Devoid opposed.*

*The Board requested additional information regarding:*

- *The water line*
- *Road improvements*
- *The utility pole*

- 11      [PB 18-094](#)      18-26 649 River Road Subdivision. Major subdivision preliminary plan review. Robie Holdings, LLC to request review of an 8 lot residential cluster subdivision. The property in question is located at 649 River Road and identified on Tax Map: 8, Lot: 23B, Zone: Farm (F) and Resource Protection (RP).

**Attachments:**    [18-26 649 River Rd Prelim 10-17-18](#)  
[Peer Review 649 River Rd 10-11-18](#)  
[649 River Road Preliminary Subdivision Application](#)  
[649 River Road Subdivision - Preliminary Plan Set 2018 10 1](#)

*Mr. Roma explained:*

- *The project was meeting the requirement for net buildable area and also the 50% total area.*
- *There were two ponds at the entrance that were really just filter basins that would drain within 24 hours after a rain. They treated the water and held it so it didn't flood adjacent properties.*
- *Stormwater analysis was required to demonstrate the amount of stormwater leaving the site.*
- *The road would be offered for public acceptance. On-street parking for the open space could be around the cul-de-sac.*
- *It was up to the town whether there should be a street light.*
- *The houses would be single family. Multi-family housing wasn't allowed in the zone.*
- *24 foot wide pavement with a cul-de-sac seemed reasonable for the project. A wider road would not provide any benefit.*
- *They were not making the front two lots bigger to protect the usable open space buffer.*

*The Board commented:*

- *Would like to see the road built the way it should be.*
- *No streetlight was acceptable.*
- *The town would not maintain a sidewalk.*
- *A narrower road would have less impact and require less maintenance.*
- *The applicant was required to have less water leaving the site than before development.*
- *Consensus of the Board was not to oppose the waiver request for the sidewalk performance standard.*

- 12      [PB 18-095](#)      Amendment to Town of Windham Land Use Ordinance, Chapter 140, Sections 300, 400 and 900. Proposed changes to cluster subdivision standards include changes to ownership of open space, factors for reviewing lot arrangement, and removing density bonuses in the Farm and Farm Residential District.

**Attachments:** [PB packet Cluster Subdivision 10-17-18](#)  
[vanSummern letter to pl board 2018-10-15](#)  
[Alan Shepard Cluster development 2018-10-22.pdf](#)

*The Board commented:*

- *Not a big fan of cluster development in a Farm zone. Farm zone should have bigger lots.*
- *Cluster should be in residentially zoned areas as opposed to farm zones.*
- *Cluster should be served by public water. Eventually they would run into water quality issues with all the leach fields so close together.*
- *The purpose of requiring cluster was if a farmer sold his acreage half of it would never be built on. The LRPC had gone with only cluster development because it would preserve 50% of the land for wildlife and rural character.*
- *Requiring impact fees would allow the purchase of usable land and establishment of a network, rather than chunks of land with dead-end trails.*
- *Cluster development was good in that the impact was minimized.*
- *Bigger buffers around the perimeter would provide privacy and not impact neighbors.*
- *There should be a choice of cluster or traditional.*
- *Retaining open space was more beneficial to rural character than walking through woods.*
- *Other communities that were similar in distance to Portland only had large tracts of land that were in land trusts or were farms.*
- *Open space was underutilized and may inhibit plans that would work better. The focus should be on larger lot sizes and exploration of land trusts so the land could be used and protected.*

*The remainder of the application discussion was postponed until the November 14th meeting.*

## **New Business**

*All new business was postponed until the November 14th meeting.*

- 13      [PB 18-096](#)      18-32 Quarry Ridge Business Park 4th Amended Subdivision. Copart of Connecticut Inc. to an amendment to an approved subdivision to combine Lots 5, 6, 7 and a portion of 15 into one 42.31 acre lot. The subject property is located at 11 Bedrock Terrace and identified on Tax Map: 21 Lots: 15, 15-5, 15-6, 15-7 Zone: Enterprise Development (ED), Farm (F) and Resource Protection (RP).

**Attachments:** [18-32 Quarry Ridge 4th Amend 10-19-18](#)  
[10-01-18.Copart SKETCH SUBDIVISION 14135](#)  
[Quarry Ridge Sketch Amended Subdivision Plan](#)  
[Overall 2nd Amend Sub](#)

- 14      [PB 18-097](#)      18-33 Copart Phase 2. Major site plan sketch plan review. Copart of Connecticut Inc. to request review of an Automobile Auction Facility consisting of a 7,200 square foot office/warehouse building with a 28.1 acre gravel storage area. The subject property is located at 11 Bedrock Terrace and identified on Tax Map: 21 Lots: 15, 15-5, 15-6, 15-7 Zone:

Enterprise Development (ED), Farm (F) and Resource Protection (RP).

**Attachments:** [18-33 Copart Phase 2 10-18-18](#)  
[10-01-18.Copart SKETCH SITE 14135](#)  
[Copart Overall Site Plan Sketch 2018-10-01](#)  
[Copart Site Plan Sketch 2018-10-01](#)  
[Overall 2nd Amend Sub](#)

- 15      [PB 18-098](#)      18-34 989 Roosevelt Trail Lumber Warehouse. Minor site plan final plan review. 989 Roosevelt Trail, LLC to request review of a 1,760 square foot addition to an existing retail building for lumber storage. The subject property is located at 989 Roosevelt Trail and identified on Tax Map: 21 Lot: 18 Zone: Commercial I (C-1).

**Attachments:** [18-34 989 Roosevelt Trail Lumber Warehouse 10-18-18\\_Final](#)  
[989 Roosevelt Lumber Warehouse Application 10-12-2018](#)  
[14 - Drawings 10-12-2018](#)  
[13 - Arch Drawings](#)  
[Peer Review\\_ 989 Roosevelt Lumber Warehous 10-11-18](#)  
[989 Roosevelt Lumber Warehouse Application 10-01-2018](#)  
[12 - Drawings 10-01-2018](#)

- 16      [PB 18-099](#)      18-35 State of Maine Correctional Center. Conditional use and major site plan sketch plan review. State of Maine, Department of Corrections to request review of a 20,017 square foot maintenance and central plant building. The subject property is located at 17 Mallison Falls Road and identified on Tax Map: 3, Lot 5 Zones: Industrial (I), Stream Protection (SP), and General Development (GD).

**Attachments:** [18-35 MDOC Control Plant Sketch 10-19-18](#)  
[Peer Review\\_DOC Control Plant 10-18-18](#)  
[DOC Plan Set to Town 2018-10-11](#)  
[DOC Sketch application 2018-10-11](#)

## **Other Business**

### 17 Adjournment

*Drew Mayo made a motion to adjourn.*

*Seconded by Michael Devold.*

*Vote: All in favor.*

