

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
TOWN OF CUMBERLAND
Cumberland Town Hall
290 Tuttle Road, Cumberland, Maine 04021
Tuesday, March 29, 2016
7:00 p.m.**

A. *Call to Order:* The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. *Roll Call:*

Present: Steve Moriarty, Chair; Gerry Boivin, Vice Chair; John Berrett, Jeff Davis, Terri Maloney-Kelly, Joshua Saunders, Peter Sherr

Absent:

Staff: Carla Nixon, Town Planner

C. *Approval of Minutes of the January 19, 2016 and February 16, 2016 meetings.*

Mr. Moriarty explained that the minutes from the January 19, 2016 meeting were not available. They will be voted on at the April 26, 2016 meeting.

D. *Staff Site Plan Approvals: None*

E. *Minor Change Approvals: None*

F. *Hearings and Presentations:*

1. *Informational Presentation by the Maine Turnpike Authority re: Changes to Service Plaza.*

Mr. Moriarty stated this is an informational presentation as the Town has no authority over improvements done by the Maine Turnpike Authority.

Mr. Bruce VanNote, Director of Policy and Planning for the Maine Turnpike Authority presented background information as follows: I work for Peter Mills handling policy and communication. The project consists of removing Starbucks and installing a Burger King drive through. I am present with Ralph Norwood the project manager and he will review the project.

Mr. Norwood, project manager with the Maine Turnpike reviewed the project as follows:

- Service Plaza closed March 21st for renovations
- Starbucks replaced with Burger King with a drive – thru
- Reopening by Memorial Day
- Review of aerial photo of existing service plaza
- There is a local access from Forest Lake Road to the plaza.
- Review of the new drive-thru location
- landscape plan – there will be more plantings by the drive-thru order board there will be a canopy over the drive-thru
- The order speaker will automatically determine ambient noise and will be lower at night
- The dumpsters will be re-located and fenced
- The back of the building will have a walk in cooler

- Review of building elevations – new canopy will match existing green roof and will have some brick columns. The drive-thru is sized to allow Turnpike plows to plow snow.
- Buffering / Mitigation measures:
 - smart speaker
 - light fixtures on diesel pumps to be converted to full cut off fixtures
 - fencing will be added to screen view from neighbors on Forest Lake Road
- The northbound service area is in Gray and the same renovations will be done on the northbound side. There will be some additional clearing of trees to add signage for Burger King

Mr. Norwood stated would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Moriarty asked if there would be any change in access to the Burger King from Forest Lake Road.

Mr. Norwood stated there is no drive thru service from the local roads, but you can drive in and access the Burger King.

Mr. Berrett asked about renovations to the restrooms and fuel area.

Mr. Norwood stated the entire building is currently closed, the restrooms are not being changed. There will be some interior renovations. The gas stations are self-service.

Ms. Maloney-Kelly asked if the plaza was open 24 hours a day.

Mr. Norwood stated yes, and the drive-thru will operate 24 hours a day as well.

Mr. Moriarty thanked the Maine Turnpike Authority and stated if any residents have comments or questions the Maine Turnpike Authority will address them in the East Conference room.

2. Public Hearing: Site Plan Review for Cumberland Memory Care; a twelve (12) bedroom, 8,656 square foot facility to be constructed on Lot # 5 of the Cumberland Business Park on U.S. Route One as shown on Tax Map R02D, Lot 1 in the Office Commercial North (OCN) district. FMC Development, LLC, Applicant: Flash Holdings, LLC, Owner. Thomas Greer, P.E., Pinkham and Greer Civil Engineers, Representative.

Ms. Nixon announced that item #6 for Site Plan Review of the Town's Gravel Pit has been tabled until the April 26, 2016 meeting.

Mr. Moriarty stated the Cumberland Business Park was approved about twenty years ago, and this is the last remaining lot to be developed. The lot is next to Norton Insurance.

Ms. Lynn Peel from FMC Development stated the project is a proposed 12 bed assisted living community specifically for people with memory loss. Currently, I own and operate Beach Glass Transitions where I am a senior care advisor, helping families with senior care needs and referrals; we specialize in memory loss care. For a long time there has been a very limited scope of services for these families.

Mr. Paul Peck, partner of FMC reviewed the location of the proposed site and ease of access. We have been working with Architects Gawron, Turgeon and Pinkham and Greer Engineers on the design for the project. We have the DEP permit and are waiting for the Army Corps permit.

Mr. Greer, P.E., Representative reviewed the plan as follows:

- Review of site location; the building has been placed as far back as possible to mitigate noise from I-295.
- There are two building envelopes on the site; we have additional stormwater impact.
- Sewer and water is available at Route One – there will be a 2” water line for service and a 6” line for fire service.
- Electrical lines will be along the driveway.
- Access mostly automobiles, occasional delivery trucks for food service.
- Dumpster location in the back
- Fire lane in the back for access to the two sides of the building
- Minimum parking at the entrance to keep the feel of a small residence
- There will be a courtyard and a walkway
- All residence rooms are on the back side of the building
- Front rooms will be a community dining room and kitchen
- There is a proposed wooden bridge over the wetland that will be a cleared area and there will be a vegetable and flower garden
- There will be a greenhouse / shed to start plants in the spring and store yard equipment.
- There is overflow parking with landscape buffering
- An ADA sidewalk is provided.
- Drainage plan – underground soil filters at the end of the parking lot 9,000 to 10,000 square feet of required treatment. This will discharge into the wetland in the front
- Review of building elevations, the building will be fenced and have a front porch. The building has the look and image of a 2,500 square foot home.

Board Comments:

- Have the Fire Chief’s comments been included into the design.

Mr. Greer stated yes, the building will have a sprinkler and fire monitor, the Town Engineer has detail for emergency vehicle access.

- Is there a plan for the shared driveway with Norton Insurance?

Mr. Greer stated they have met with Norton several times; at this time there are no plans for development. The lot was bought by Norton as a buffer.

- Who is responsible for the fire hydrant?

Mr. Greer stated it is the responsibility of the applicant, the final plans have been sent to Portland Water District for technical standards review. The Water District has capacity

- Snow storage provisions

Mr. Greer stated they will plow the snow along the edge of the road, the snow cannot be stored above the underground soil filter.

The public portion of the meeting was opened.

Ms. Kathy Zambello, of Sand Point Lane in Rockwood Condominiums stated these are hiking trails and I walk down to the dentist. Will there be a perimeter fence around the entire boundary of the property.

Mr. Greer stated we will need to rework the path as it goes along the dumpster. There will be fencing so residents cannot wander off, the fence will be in the woods and similar to a deer fence. The current walking trail will not be blocked. There will not a perimeter fence, the paths etc. will be fenced.

Mr. Tom Gruber, 88 Foreside Road stated there is no gate shown to contain the residents. Will there be any other recreational activities such as Bache ball, which is the number one activity for seniors with dementia.

Ms. Peel reviewed the location of the secure memory care garden. Staff will be able to see residents through the glass windows on the side of the building. There will be a gate to access the second walking path. The door into the building will be a secure door. The front entrance door has a small walking path. Our recreation program will be developed based on the needs of the tenants.

Mr. Greer reviewed the location of the service entrance.

Mr. Moriarty stated the Board has a sketch of the internal building which shows a library, spa, and communal dining area.

Ms. Sandy Poor of Route One stated she lives north of Ledgerview Assisted Living. She asked if the 12 bed facility will be phase one and after five years the facility size will double. What is the number of proposed employees and will spouses / family members be allowed to stay overnight.

Ms. Peel said there are no plans to make this project any larger. We are striving for a small intimate staff ratio. We can have overnight guests, visiting anytime of the day is encouraged based on spouse's needs. There will be a total of 15 new employees, it will be a 3: 1 staff ratio and overnight 2:1 staff for overnight.

The public portion of the meeting was closed.

The Board reviewed the two waiver requests as follows:

Mr. Saunders moved due to the unique nature of this project the Board waive the request for a High Intensity Soils Mapping.

Mr. Davis seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 7-0

Mr. Saunders moved due to the unique nature of the project the Board waive the request for a traffic study.

Mr. Davis seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 7-0

The Board reviewed the findings of fact as follows:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

Sec. 229-10 Approval Standards and Criteria

The following criteria shall be used by the Planning Board in reviewing applications for site plan review and shall serve as minimum requirements for approval of the application. The application shall be approved unless the Planning Board determines that the applicant has failed to meet one or more of these standards. In all instances, the burden of proof shall be on the applicant who must produce evidence sufficient to warrant a finding that all applicable criteria have been met.

A. Utilization of the Site

Utilization of the Site - The plan for the development, including buildings, lots, and support facilities, must reflect the natural capabilities of the site to support development. Environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to, wetlands, steep slopes, floodplains, significant wildlife habitats, fisheries, scenic areas, habitat for rare and

endangered plants and animals, unique natural communities and natural areas, and sand and gravel aquifers must be maintained and preserved to the maximum extent. The development must include appropriate measures for protecting these resources, including but not limited to, modification of the proposed design of the site, timing of construction, and limiting the extent of excavation.

Letters from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission and the Maine Division of Fish and Wildlife are on file. The development has been designed to fit the unique topography and sensitive natural areas of the site by creating two parking areas that will be connected to the building with a paved walking path. A Tier 1 MDEP NRPA permit is on file.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

B. Traffic, Circulation and Parking

Note: The Town Engineer has reviewed and approved the plan for conformance with the following standards:

- (1) Traffic Access and Parking: Vehicular access to and from the development must be safe and convenient.
 - (a) Any driveway or proposed street must be designed so as to provide the minimum sight distance according to the Maine Department of Transportation standards, to the maximum extent possible.
MDOT Entrance Permit on file.
 - (b) Points of access and egress must be located to avoid hazardous conflicts with existing turning movements and traffic flows.
Met
 - (c) The grade of any proposed drive or street must be not more than +3% for a minimum of two (2) car lengths, or forty (40) feet, from the intersection.
Met
 - (d) The intersection of any access/egress drive or proposed street must function:
(a) at a Level of Service D, or better, following development if the project will generate one thousand (1,000) or more vehicle trips per twenty-four (24) hour period; or (b) at a level which will allow safe access into and out of the project if less than one thousand (1,000) trips are generated.
Met
 - (e) Where a lot has frontage on two (2) or more streets, the primary access to and egress from the lot must be provided from the street where there is less potential for traffic congestion and for traffic and pedestrians hazards. Access from other streets may be allowed if it is safe and does not promote short cutting through the site.
N/A
 - (f) Where it is necessary to safeguard against hazards to traffic and pedestrians and/ or to avoid traffic congestion, the applicant shall be responsible for providing turning lanes, traffic directional islands, and traffic controls within public streets.
N/A
 - (g) Accessways must be designed and have sufficient capacity to avoid queuing of entering vehicles on any public street.

Met

- (h) The following criteria must be used to limit the number of driveways serving a proposed project:

1. No use which generates less than one hundred (100) vehicle trips per day shall have more than one (1) two-way driveway onto a single roadway. Such driveway must be no greater than thirty (30) feet wide.

No use which generates one hundred (100) or more vehicle trips per day shall have more than two (2) points of entry from and two (2) points of egress to a single roadway. The combined width of all accessways must not exceed sixty (60) feet.

Only One (1) entrance is proposed.

(2) Accessway Location and Spacing

Accessways must meet the following standards:

- a. Private entrance/exits must be located at least fifty (50) feet from the closest unsignalized intersection and one hundred fifty (150) feet from the closest signalized intersection, as measured from the point of tangency for the corner to the point of tangency for the accessway. This requirement may be reduced if the shape of the site does not allow conformance with this standard.

Met

- b. Private accessways in or out of a development must be separated by a minimum of seventy-five (75) feet where possible.

Met.

3. Internal Vehicular Circulation

The layout of the site must provide for the safe movement of passenger, service, and emergency vehicles through the site.

- a. Projects that will be served by delivery vehicles must provide a clear route for such vehicles with appropriate geometric design to allow turning and backing.

Met

- b. Clear routes of access must be provided and maintained for emergency vehicles to and around buildings and must be posted with appropriate signage (fire lane - no parking).

Met

- c. The layout and design of parking areas must provide for safe and convenient circulation of vehicles throughout the lot.

Met

- d. All roadways must be designed to harmonize with the topographic and natural features of the site insofar as practical by minimizing filling, grading, excavation, or other similar activities which result in unstable soil conditions and soil erosion, by fitting the development to the natural contour of the land and avoiding substantial areas of excessive grade and tree removal, and by retaining existing vegetation during construction. The road network must provide for vehicular, pedestrian, and cyclist safety, all season emergency access, snow storage, and delivery and collection services.

The driveway, parking areas and sidewalks were located and designed to provide safe circulation while minimizing impacts to the sensitive natural areas.

(4) Parking Layout and Design

Off street parking must conform to the following standards:

- a. Parking areas with more than two (2) parking spaces must be arranged so that it is not necessary for vehicles to back into the street.
- b. All parking spaces, access drives, and impervious surfaces must be located at least fifteen (15) feet from any side or rear lot line, except where standards for buffer yards require a greater distance. No parking spaces or asphalt type surface shall be located within fifteen (15) feet of the front property line. Parking lots on adjoining lots may be connected by accessways not exceeding twenty-four (24) feet in width.

- c. Parking stalls and aisle layout must conform to the following standards.

Parking Angle	Stall Width	Skew Width	Stall Depth	Aisle Width
90°	9'-0"		18'-0"	24'-0" 2-way
60°	8'-6"	10'-6"	18'-0"	16'-0" 1-way
45°	8'-6"	12'-9"	17'-6"	12'-0" 1-way
30°	8'-6"	17'-0"	17'-0"	12'-0" 1 way

- d. In lots utilizing diagonal parking, the direction of proper traffic flow must be indicated by signs, pavement markings or other permanent indications and maintained as necessary.
- e. Parking areas must be designed to permit each motor vehicle to proceed to and from the parking space provided for it without requiring the moving of any other motor vehicles.
- f. Provisions must be made to restrict the "overhang" of parked vehicles when it might restrict traffic flow on adjacent through roads, restrict pedestrian or bicycle movement on adjacent walkways, or damage landscape materials.

The parking spaces conform to these requirements.

(5) Building and Parking Placement

Building and parking placement are located in appropriate areas.

(6) Pedestrian Circulation

The site plan must provide for a system of pedestrian ways within the development appropriate to the type and scale of development. This system must connect the major building entrances/ exits with parking areas and with existing sidewalks, if they exist or are planned in the vicinity of the project. The pedestrian network may be located either in the street right-of-way or outside of the right-of-way in open space or recreation areas. The system must be designed to link the project with residential, recreational, and commercial facilities, schools, bus stops, and existing sidewalks in the neighborhood or, when appropriate, to connect the amenities such as parks or open space on or adjacent to the site.

Met. There are walkways from the parking areas to the building.

C. Stormwater Management and Erosion Control

- (1) Stormwater Management. Adequate provisions must be made for the collection and disposal of all stormwater that runs off proposed streets, parking areas, roofs, and other surfaces, through a stormwater drainage system and maintenance plan, which must not have adverse impacts on abutting or downstream properties.
 - (a) To the extent possible, the plan must retain stormwater on the site using the natural features of the site.
 - (b) Unless the discharge is directly to the ocean or major river segment, stormwater runoff systems must detain or retain water such that the rate of flow from the site after development does not exceed the predevelopment rate.
 - (c) The applicant must demonstrate that on - and off-site downstream channel or system capacity is sufficient to carry the flow without adverse effects, including but not limited to, flooding and erosion of shoreland areas, or that he / she will be responsible for whatever improvements are needed to provide the required increase in capacity and / or mitigation.
 - (d) All natural drainage ways must be preserved at their natural gradients and must not be filled or converted to a closed system unless approved as part of the site plan review.
 - (e) The design of the stormwater drainage system must provide for the disposal of stormwater without damage to streets, adjacent properties, downstream properties, soils, and vegetation.
 - (f) The design of the storm drainage systems must be fully cognizant of upstream runoff which must pass over or through the site to be developed and provide for this movement.
 - (g) The biological and chemical properties of the receiving waters must not be degraded by the stormwater runoff from the development site. The use of oil and grease traps in manholes, the use of on-site vegetated waterways, and vegetated buffer strips along waterways and drainage swales, and the reduction in use of deicing salts and fertilizers may be required, especially where the development stormwater discharges into a gravel aquifer area or other water supply source, or a great pond.

The stormwater management plan was reviewed and approved as part of the subdivision approval; the Town Engineer has reviewed the plan again to ensure it will function as needed for this specific development.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

2. Erosion Control
 - (a) All building, site, and roadway designs and layouts must harmonize with existing topography and conserve desirable natural surroundings to the fullest extent possible, such that filling, excavation and earth moving activity must be kept to a minimum. Parking lots on sloped sites must be terraced to avoid undue cut and fill, and / or the need for retaining walls. Natural vegetation must be preserved and protected wherever possible.
 - (b) Soil erosion and sedimentation of watercourses and water bodies must be minimized by an active program meeting the requirements of the Maine Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook for Construction: Best Management Practices, dated March 1991, and as amended from time to time.

Slope and wetland impacts were limited. During construction, erosion control will be in conformance with the Maine Erosion and Sediment Control manual. The Town Engineer has reviewed and approved the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

D. Water, Sewer and Fire Protection

(1) Water Supply Provisions

The development must be provided with a system of water supply that provides each use with an adequate supply of water. If the project is to be served by a public water supply, the applicant must secure and submit a written statement from the supplier that the proposed water supply system conforms with its design and construction standards, will not result in an undue burden on the source of distribution system, and will be installed in a manner adequate to provide needed domestic and fire protection flows.

The project will utilize public water. An ability to serve letter is on file from the Portland Water District.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

(2) Sewage Disposal Provisions

The development must be provided with a method of disposing of sewage which is in compliance with the State Plumbing Code. If provisions are proposed for on-site waste disposal, all such systems must conform to the Subsurface Wastewater Disposal Rules.

The project will utilize public sewer. It will connect to the public sewer line in Route 1. There is a letter on file from the Town Manager stating that the Town has the ability to handle the requested flow amounts and has reserved this capacity.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

(3) Utilities

The development must be provided with electrical, telephone, and telecommunication service adequate to meet the anticipated use of the project. New utility lines and facilities must be screened from view to the extent feasible. If the service in the street or on adjoining lots is underground, the new service must be placed underground.

Electric and telecommunication service will be underground from Route 1 within the entrance drive and then to the building.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

4. Fire Protection

The final plans have been reviewed and approved by the Fire Chief who has proposed recommendations for the project which have been incorporated into the plans.

The Planning Board finds this standard to be met.

E. Water Protection

- (1) Groundwater Protection. The proposed site development and use must not adversely impact either the quality or quantity of groundwater available to abutting properties or to the public water supply systems. Applicants whose projects involve on-site water supply or sewage disposal systems with a capacity of two thousand (2,000) gallons per day or greater must demonstrate that the groundwater at the property line will comply, following development, with the standards for safe drinking water as established by the State of Maine.

The project will connect to public water and sewer. The proposed use is a small, twelve (12) bedroom, residential care facility. This use will have no adverse impact on the quality or quantity of groundwater.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

- (2) Water Quality

All aspects of the project must be designed so that:

- a. No person shall locate, store, discharge, or permit the discharge of any treated, untreated, or inadequately treated liquid, gaseous, or solid materials of such nature, quantity, obnoxious, toxicity, or temperature that may run off, seep, percolate, or wash into surface or groundwaters so as to contaminate, pollute, or harm such waters or cause nuisances, such as objectionable shore deposits, floating or submerged debris, oil or scum, color, odor, taste, or unsightliness or be harmful to human, animal, plant, or aquatic life.
- b. All storage facilities for fuel, chemicals, chemical or industrial wastes, and biodegradable raw materials, must meet the standards of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection and the State Fire Marshall's Office.

No substances described above will be stored or discharged in a way that could contaminate surface or groundwater.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

- (3) Aquifer Protection (if applicable)

If the site is located within the Town Aquifer Protection Area a positive finding by the board that the proposed plan will not adversely affect the aquifer, is required.

The parcel is not located in the Aquifer Protection Area.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

F. Floodplain Management

If any portion of the site is located within a special flood hazard area as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, all use and development of that portion of the site must be consistent with the Town's Floodplain management provisions.

The property is located in Zone C – Area of Minimal Flooding on FIRM map 230162-0016C.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

G. Historic and Archaeological Resources

If any portion of the site has been identified as containing historic or archaeological resources, the development must include appropriate measures for protecting these resources, including but not limited to, modification of the proposed design of the site, timing of construction, and limiting the extent of excavation.

There is a letter on file dated 2/29/16 from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission stating that no historic properties are affected by the proposed project.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

H. Exterior Lighting

The proposed development must have adequate exterior lighting to provide for its safe use during nighttime hours, if such use is contemplated. All exterior lighting must be designed and shielded to avoid undue glare, adverse impact on neighboring properties and rights - of way, and the unnecessary lighting of the night sky.

A photometric plan was provided. The plan shows that no light will spill over to abutting properties.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

I. Buffering and Landscaping

(1) Buffering of Adjacent Uses

The development must provide for the buffering of adjacent uses where there is a transition from one type of use to another use and for the screening of mechanical equipment and service and storage areas. The buffer may be provided by distance, landscaping, fencing, changes in grade, and / or a combination of these or other techniques.

(2) Landscaping:

Landscaping must be provided as part of the site design. The landscape plan for the entire site must use landscape materials to integrate the various elements on site, preserve and enhance the particular identity of the site, and create a pleasing site character. The landscaping should define street edges,

break up parking areas, soften the appearance of the development, and protect abutting properties.

The applicant has submitted a landscaping plan that utilizes the natural site vegetation and grading for buffering as well as additional plantings of trees and flower beds.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

J. Noise

The development must control noise levels such that it will not create a nuisance for neighboring properties.

The building and parking area will be in a commercial office park. The proposed use, a small, 12 bed residential care facility, will not create a nuisance for neighboring properties.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

K. Storage of Materials

- .1 Exposed nonresidential storage areas, exposed machinery, and areas used for the storage or collection of discarded automobiles, auto parts, metals or other articles of salvage or refuse must have sufficient setbacks and screening (such as a stockade fence or a dense evergreen hedge) to provide a visual buffer sufficient to minimize their impact on abutting residential uses and users of public streets.
- .2 All dumpsters or similar large collection receptacles for trash or other wastes must be located on level surfaces which are paved or graveled. Where the dumpster or receptacle is located in a yard which abuts a residential or institutional use or a public street, it must be screened by fencing or landscaping.
- .3 Where a potential safety hazard to children is likely to arise, physical screening sufficient to deter small children from entering the premises must be provided and maintained in good condition.

The applicant has shown the location of dumpster that will be enclosed by a six (6) foot high fence. There will be no outdoor storage of equipment or machinery.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

L. Capacity of the Applicant

The applicant must demonstrate that he / she has the financial and technical capacity to carry out the project in accordance with this ordinance and the approved plan.

TECHNICAL: The applicant has utilized the services of a professional engineer, architect, landscape architect and soils evaluator to design the site plan and building.

FINANCIAL: The applicant has provided a letter dated February 16, 2016 from Camden National Bank which states that financing has been approved, subject to certain conditions and the completion of additional due diligence and that the developers maintain a satisfactory relationship with the bank.

The Planning Board finds the standards of this section have been met.

(M) Design and Performance Standards

- (1) Route 100 Design Standards (if applicable)
All development in the Village Center Commercial, Village Office Commercial I and II, and the MUZ Districts shall be consistent with the Town of Cumberland Route 100 Design Standards; in making determination of consistency, the Planning Board may utilize peer review analysis provided by qualified design professionals.
N/A
- (2) **Route 1 Design Standards (if applicable) (APPLICABLE)**
All development in the Office Commercial North and Office Commercial South districts is encouraged to be consistent with the Route 1 Design Standards.
- (3) Town Center District Performance Standards (if applicable)
N/A
- (4) Village Mixed Use Performance Standards (if applicable)
N/A

ROUTE ONE DESIGN STANDARDS

Section 200: Master Planning

On properties that are large enough to accommodate more than a single structure, developers shall prepare a conceptual master plan to show the Planning Board the general location of future buildings, parking areas, circulation patterns, open space, utilities, storm water management plan and any other pertinent information.

Master Planning is not required. This project will be the full build out of Lot 5.

Section 300: Site Development Standards

301. Site Design

Wherever possible, large buildings shall fit into the existing topography and vegetation, and shall not require dramatic grade changes around their perimeter. Landscaping, site walls, pedestrian amenities and existing trees can be utilized to reduce the apparent scale of large buildings.

This is not a large scale building. It is well buffered from Route 1 by the existing vegetation.

302. Rt. 1 Buffer Strip:

A 75' buffer from the Rt. 1 right-of-way to the buildings is required for all lots with frontage on U.S. Route 1, except for lots located in the U.S. Route 1 Overlay District.

Healthy trees within the 75' buffer shall be maintained in their natural state. Where there are few or no trees within the buffer, the buffer area shall be landscaped with trees or with flowering shrubs, fencing, or architectural features such as stone walls, in accordance with an approved landscape plan. When plantings do not survive or grow to a point where they no longer serve as effective buffers, they shall be replaced or enhanced to meet the intent of the approved plan.

The site development leaves 130 feet of existing buffer between Route 1 and the development

303. Vehicular Access:

New driveways and existing driveways for which the use has changed or expanded require a Maine Department of Transportation "Driveway Entrance Permit." Shared entrance locations will be required whenever possible.

The MDOT Entrance Permit is on file. The entrance is shared with Lot 4.

304. Parking:

Parking shall not be the dominant visual element when viewed from US Route 1. Parking shall be located to the side or rear of buildings.

The parking is well buffered from Route 1. It is split into two sections to reduce the scale of the parking's visual impact.

305. Service Areas:

Exterior dumpsters, recycling facilities, mechanical units, loading docks and other similar uses shall meet the needs of the facility with a minimum of visual, odor or noise impacts. They shall be fully screened from view by plantings or fencing. Service areas are not permitted on any front or side of a building that is visible from US Route 1.

The building or service areas will not be visible from Route 1. The building is 500 feet from Route One.

306. Electric, Telephone and Cable:

All wired connections from existing utilities on U.S. Route 1 shall be made to individual lots via underground conduit.

The utilities to the building will be underground.

Section 400: Building Standards:

401. Building Design

All structures shall be designed in the traditional New England style of architecture whenever feasible.

The building is designed to emulate the residential Cape Cod style architecture, thus reflecting a traditional New England style.

402. Facades and Exterior Walls

Unbroken facades in excess of 80 feet are overwhelming whether they are visible from Route 1, other roadways or pedestrian areas, or when they abut residential areas. Breaking up the plane of the wall is required to reduce this sense of overwhelming scale. Where the plane of the wall is broken, the offset shall be proportionate to the building's height and length. A general rule of thumb for such projections or recesses is that their depth shall be at least 3% of the façade's length, and they shall extend for at least 20% of the façade's length.

All facades in excess of 80 feet are broken up with wall offsets, porches or projections with the exception of the south/right side elevation as this faces the back portion of the site that is against the tree line and not visible to Route One, a roadway or pedestrian areas.

Other devices to add interest to long walls include strong shadow lines, changes in rooflines, pilasters and similar architectural details, as well as patterns in the surface material and wall openings. All façade elements shall be coordinated with the landscape plan.

Interest on all the elevations include wall offsets, gable roofs, and porches with columns.

Commercial buildings shall include a focal point – such as a raised entranceway or clock tower, or other architectural element – to add visual interest and help reduce the scale of the building.

While this is not a typical commercial building as it is designed to look and feel like a home, the entrance elevation does provide a focal point with the front porch and dormers.

Facades of commercial buildings that face U.S. Route 1 or other roadways shall have transparent openings along 30% or more of the length of the ground floor.

Not Applicable.

403. Building Entrances

Large structures shall have clearly defined and highly visible entrances emphasized through such devices as significant variations in rooflines or cornice lines, changes in materials, porticos, landscape treatments, distinctive lighting or other architectural treatments.

Although not a large structure, the entrance is clearly defined from the approach to the building and parking through the walkway system and front porch.

Where building entrances do not face U.S. Route 1, the U.S. Route 1 façade shall be complimentary to the general style of the building and surrounding buildings.

The building's main entrance shall be a dominant architectural feature of the building and clearly demarcated by the site design and landscaping.

The building entrance is demarcated through the walkway system and front porch. Pedestrian entrances to each business or tenant shall be clearly defined and easily accessible.

The entrance to the building is defined by the front porch and will meet ADA accessibility requirements.

Not Applicable.

404. Building Materials

Traditional siding materials common to New England are brick, painted clapboard and either painted or unpainted shingles. Contemporary materials that have the same visual characteristics as traditional materials (e.g., cementitious clapboards or vinyl siding) are acceptable if attention is paid to detailing (e.g., corners, trim at openings, changes in material). Metal cladding is not allowed on any front, rear or side of the building that is visible from Route 1.

Traditional clapboard and/or shingle siding will be used on all facades of the building

Common traditional roofing materials are shingles —, as well as standing seam metal. Where visible, the roofing color shall be selected to complement the color and texture of the building's façade. Roofing colors shall be darker than the color of the façade.

Traditional architectural roof shingles will be used for the roofing material.

405. Architectural Details

Architectural details, such as colonnades, pilasters, gable ends, awnings, display windows and appropriately positioned light fixtures, shall be used to reduce the scale and uniformity of larger buildings.

Architectural details consisting of gables, dormers, trim, and columns are being used as part of the building design.

406. Roofs

Flat roofs are prohibited, unless the applicant can demonstrate that a flat roof can meet these standards.

Not applicable.

407. Windows

Windows shall reflect a classic New England style by featuring divided lights (window panes) and detailing trim around them.

Windows will be double hung or awning style windows with a grid pattern to reflect a traditional style.

Mr. Boivin moved to approve the findings of fact as amended.

Mr. Berrett seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 6-0

LIMITATION OF APPROVAL:

Construction of the improvements covered by any site plan approval must be substantially commenced within twelve (12) months of the date upon which the approval was granted. If construction has not been substantially commenced and substantially completed within the specified period, the approval shall be null and void. The applicant may request an extension of the approval deadline prior to expiration of the period. Such request must be in writing and must be made to the Planning Board. The Planning Board

may grant up to two (2), six (6) month extensions to the periods if the approved plan conforms to the ordinances in effect at the time the extension is granted and any and all federal and state approvals and permits are current.

STANDARD CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

This approval is dependent upon and limited to the proposals and plans contained in the application and supporting documents submitted by the applicant. Any variation from the plans, proposals and supporting documents, except minor changes as so determined by the Town Planner which do not affect approval standards, is subject to review and approval of the Planning Board prior to implementation.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. That all fees be paid prior to pre-construction conference.
2. That a performance guarantee in an amount acceptable to the Town Manager be provided prior to the preconstruction conference.
3. That a preconstruction conference be held prior to the start of construction.
4. That all clearing limits are staked and inspected by the Town Engineer prior to the preconstruction conference.
5. That a permit for blasting, if needed, be obtained from the Town.
6. The developer shall prepare and execute sewer easements prior to the sewer system extension being taken over by the Town.
7. That a Fire Marshal's Permit be obtained prior to submission of building permit application.
8. Building, electrical and plumbing permits are required prior to all construction.
9. Sign permit applications are required prior to construction and installation of signs.

Mr. Saunders moved to grant Site Plan Approval for Cumberland Memory Care; a twelve (12) bedroom, 8,656 square foot facility to be constructed on Lot # 5 in the Cumberland Business Park on U.S. Route One as shown on Tax Assessor Map R02D, Lot 1 in the Office Commercial North Zoning District. This approval is subject to the Limitation of Approval, the Standard Condition of Approval and the nine Conditions of approval.

Mr. Boivin seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 7-1

3. Public Hearing: Contract Zoning Agreement with Cumberland Foreside Village, LLC to include the rezoning of Tax Assessor Map R01, Lot 12A and revisions regarding the development of multiplex dwellings on Tax Assessor Map R01, Lots 11, 11A, 11B, and 12A.

Mr. Shane, Town Manager presented background information as follows: This project started a little over a year ago in February 2015. Councilor Gruber and myself met with Avesta housing and discussed the possibility of 32 units of senior housing. At the time there was the possibility of a state bond to assist with the financing of the project however at the end of the legislative session the bond money had not been funded at the expected level. We were at that time told our project was not likely to be funded. In early summer we met with David Chase and Loni Graiver of Graiver Homes who presented the town with a proposal for market rate apartment housing. Cumberland has very little if any transitional housing and this might be a good place for such housing. In February the Planning Board recommended to the Council that the Contract Zone amendment go forward on February 22, 2016 the Town Council approved the contract zone amendment. In early March town staff realized that proper abutter notification had not happened. Many of the abutters did not receive the proper notice for this project and were not able to

participate in the public process. The Council re-considered their motion and sent it back to the Planning Board with a 5-1 vote. The contract zone has been revised with the following changes:

- Additional senior units have been added, there will be nineteen (19) units rented to seniors 55+ years of age.
- Berms have been added to the parking areas
- This project will be exempt from the Growth Management Ordinance, however the \$100.00 fee will be collected and the Impact Fee at \$1.40 per square feet after the first 1,000 square feet will be charged. The nineteen senior units are exempted by Ordinance.
- Growth Ordinance allows 65 new dwelling units, we can take 10 from last year and 10 from next year and technically 85 units can be added per year.
- Typically the town issues between 40 and 50 new dwelling units per year.
- There are 56 single bedroom units and 42 double bedroom units
- Earth colors will be used for the buildings
- Cumberland is a very desirable community to reside and transitional housing has not been available.

Mr. Shane stated tonight he is asking for a recommendation to the Town Council who will hold a public hearing on April 11th. The project will then return to the Planning Board for subdivision and site plan review.

Mr. Tom Greer, P.E., of Pinkham and Greer Civil Engineers presented an overview of the project as follows:

- Aerial view of the neighborhood beginning with Sky View Drive, Exactitude, Sea Fax and Pack Edge. With this contract zone amendment we will add an additional commercial lot on Route One. Review of Middle Road location and I-295. The pool on Middle Road is approximately 900 feet from the site. The residential housing is being built out quickly and several of the homes are occupied.
- Review of the site showing a conceptual landscape plan, and location of the community building

Board Comments:

- The additional lot cannot be used for residential.

Mr. Greer stated that is correct.

- The plan shows a road from the single family homes to the multiplex dwellings with a gate, what is the purpose of the gate?

Mr. Greer stated the rationale is for the people purchasing residential single family homes it would be better to limit the additional traffic and the gate is for emergency access.

- Questions regarding capacity of the school and emergency services to serve this project.

Mr. Shane stated the town is growing and it is working with the Town of North Yarmouth on another growth study. We have capacity to handle these units, these are transitional units and the majority are one bedroom which will limit children. I believe we have the capacity and this need has been addressed in several comprehensive plans. We are an older community but would like to add balance to the community.

The public portion of the meeting was opened.

Ms. Shirley-Storey-King of 18 Shirley Lane presented the following to the Board.

Thank you for your time, and for allowing this matter to return to you for public hearing. For the record, my neighbors and I received only one notice for this contract zone a long time ago, but I do not believe

we have received notices for any of the changes made in the last year or more. As you know, changes to contract zones require contacting neighbors within 500 feet of the projects. Neighbors within 500 feet on Middle Road should have had their wells tested before the enormous blasting that occurred last summer. I know of at least one neighbor who believes her well water quality has been impacted since the explosions jolted the very bedrock beneath our homes. It has been a crazy year here at town hall, but we all need to be more mindful of these details in future contract zones.

I thank both the Town Council and the manager for allowing this particular notification error to be corrected and for their assistance in bringing it back to you.

Ms. Storey-King presented slides showing the impact on neighbors and the differences in the landscape on the site and current conditions:

- Slide

To tell you the truth, I did not think this development would have any impact on me or my neighbors. Each time something was added to this contract zone agreement, I asked about how much Middle Road residents would be able to see, and I was told it would be minimal if anything at all. That is not the case. The true impact of the development in this contact zone began to surface just recently when the homes along Nautical Drive started appearing. This is a house on Nautical Drive that appeared just a couple weeks ago. It is behind my parents' house. Clipper Drive is still to be built, meaning there are still twenty-two more houses to be built between this house and the neighbors on a three-quarter mile stretch of Middle Road.

- Slide

While I am not the only one impacted, I will use myself as an example: This is the view out my bedroom window. The red line is where the apartments are proposed to be built...eight buildings, nearly forty feet tall. Notice the tree circled in red. Now look at what I used to look at...

- Slide

That's the same tree circled in red. The density impacted by the clearing has eroded any protection we have from this project. And though the hardwoods will leaf out in a month or so, and we perhaps may not see as much of this development for a few months, we will see it, and all its illumination, and parking for six or more months a year.

- Slide

This is the same view out my downstairs, family room door just three days ago. The red line is where the apartments are proposed.

- Slide

This is the view out my living room window at the front of my house, where houses are being built. They will not be down behind the hill or ridge as I believed when this project was proposed. Up to fifty feet of the ridge has been removed. The houses on Clipper Drive will be sitting on or near the flat area marked by this red line. Please notice the lack of vegetation above the red line. The topography is such that the 100 foot buffer in this situation is not providing the density that a hundred foot buffer would provide on flat land. In addition, the required thirty foot setback being proposed in this contract zone is part of the 100 foot scenic highways setback. Because of boundary lines, some of the thirty feet required for the rear setback in this phase of the plan is overlapped into the 100 feet. It is not 100 feet plus thirty more feet. Incidentally, the phase for the apartments proposes only a twenty-five foot setback, which again overlaps the scenic buffer. This is the same view...

- Slide

You could not see through the vegetation in dead winter, even if I had a better picture. The cutting and mining operation have changed that.

- Slide

This is the view looking at the apartment site from my brother's living room. It used to look more like this (same time of year)...

- Slide

These next two slides show the impact of the mining operation from the Middle Road point of view. For the most part, the stockpiling of material, shown between the red lines, has shielded us from seeing the true impact this development is going to have on us. But once the material is removed, we will see it all six or more months a year.

- Slide

I don't know if you have seen these yet, but these are the apartment buildings....eight of them, fairly close together, that are being planned for behind my house. While beauty is in the eye of the beholder, these buildings are hideous! They are, in my opinion, big, ugly boxes that meet no design standards. I hope to convince you not to support this phase of the development.

I have a couple questions and comments that I think must be considered as you make your decision whether or not to endorse the proposed changes.

First, is there a process, and did we go through it, to add the additional land David Chase purchased from the town to his other, already-existing CZA? Was that an amendment? I couldn't find it in the minutes, so I'm wondering how contract zones get expanded? From the map in tonight's agenda provided by the engineer, it looks like it was added in January just this year. Perhaps it was part of the purchase and sale agreement, and if so I'm embarrassed not to know. Still, shouldn't it have had a public hearing at the planning board and have you consider unintended consequences of expanding this CZA? I believe it should have a separate CZA.

I have shared with you the notes I took while looking back over some of the changes to this CZA.

Even if I was noticed, while I don't like the development of all those homes and the destruction of the ridge that makes up our horizon, I don't own the land and I cannot conscientiously object if it is determined this is a public benefit to the citizens of this town. I can tell you that I'm skeptical...the integrity of the public benefit in this project has, in my opinion, been whittled away with each amendment...and there have been many. Aside from the few businesses that have been brought in, we have not broadened our tax base as was the intent with the first CZA. Consequently, the public benefit has morphed into it being a public benefit because it is supported by the Comprehensive Plan.

So, I reviewed the Comprehensive Plan and I could not find support of the apartment phase anywhere. I sat on the Comprehensive Plan committee and the update committee, and while we talked of expanding our housing opportunities, apartments outside the center of town were not specifically discussed.

There is only one goal in the housing section of the plan: Continue to encourage the development of housing which provides for a mix of people from all income, ages, trades, and professionals. However, not one of the four action items listed with that goal suggests an apartment complex anywhere in town, whereas it does specifically talk about smaller, single family homes. Therefore, the homes being built in Foreside Village do broadly meet the goals of the plan. However, the apartments do not.

The executive summary of the Comprehensive Plan references having a mix of housing options to keep young and old people in town, but those options, according to the narrative, should be near town services, specifically referencing the development of the Doane Property. The final phase of the Village Green development plan has a plan for apartments, in a walkable part of town.

Furthermore, I wholeheartedly reject the contract zone amendments because in addition to the impact on my neighbors and me, the number of rental units is excessive. I point again to the process and timeline for this project. This project jumped from 30-40 affordable units for seniors in two to four buildings to 96 market-value units, with little if any discussion. Again, there needs to be a public benefit to a contract zone. The apartments, no matter how you look at it, do not provide a public benefit, required in all contract zones, to the hard-working, tax-paying citizens of Cumberland or their families. In fact, the unintended consequences of this number of units, nearly five percent of the current housing options in our community, could cost the town money in services, the very opposite of a public benefit.

Now, let's say the argument that the town needs more apartments is valid by some far out interpretation of the Comp Plan, I'd like to point out that with this logic, any developer could come to any part of our community, apply for and receive a contract zone, depending on the vision of town leaders, and construct this kind of development....8 large apartment boxes, twelve units each, thirty-nine feet six inches tall... in your backyard...because it is supposedly part of the Comprehensive Plan...that is not my vision of Cumberland.

In conclusion, I am a NIMBY on this matter. I fully confess. But aside from that, I sincerely and truly believe that this proposal is not right for our town, in any part of town. I have tried to be rational and look at this from many perspectives. It has been very difficult to go against the recommendations of our manager, but with mutual respect we have agreed to disagree. And it is emotional for me because it is in my backyard and I had never thought of myself as a NIMBY. However, the bottom line is these are not apartments for our citizens, no matter what you are led to believe. At the end of the night, you need to be able to answer the question: what is the public benefit being provided to the citizens of our town?

Thank you for your time. I sincerely appreciate the time and thoughtfulness you are giving to this, and all matters, that come before you.

Ms. Janet Hotham of Middle Road stated she has been a resident for 35 years and read her letter submitted to the Planning Board. Ms. Hotham's entire letter is available in the Planning Department files. Ms. Hotham voiced concern regarding:

- The 150 dwelling units to be exempt from the Growth Management Ordinance. 150 units far exceed the 65 dwelling units currently allowed under the Growth Management Ordinance.
- Increased school enrollment and impact on the school system
- Impact on fiscal resources for the Town
- Density of the development

Mr. Gerald Croce of 26 Skillin Road stated this is not in my back yard. However, he does want everyone to think about our twenty year olds who cannot remain in town due to lack of affordable housing. He stated property owners only can control what is within their property pins. I have been a member of the Cumberland Fire Department for the last 28 years, many of our junior firefighters cannot stay in the community due to the lack of housing options.

Board comments:

- Did the previous CZA amendment allow exemption of the Growth permits? How many permits have already been issued in the project?

Mr. Shane stated approximately twenty one or twenty two approximately half, and growth permits are issued on a calendar year.

- How many units are one bedroom?

Mr. Shane stated there are a total of 136 total bedrooms 56 single bedroom units and 42 two bedroom units.

- The contract zone requests 150 residential units when you add the 45 single family units and 96 apartments, 141 units is the total number.

Mr. Shane stated the original CZA had 132 units, we picked that as a number.

- Is there any concern to drop back the number to the actual 141 units proposed.
- Who will operate the community building?

Mr. Graiver stated the building will be for the apartment residents and managed by a property management company.

- When dealing with an amendment to CZA do you go back to square one and access public benefit?

Mr. Shane stated the public benefit the town identified was the 55+ housing, originally there was a proposal for senior housing. We felt it was important that 20% of the housing be 55+ housing.

- We can probably never do enough for senior housing, but the town has done a good job with senior housing. One of the types of housing notably missing in town is the housing for young 20+ year olds. One of the most appealing aspects of this project is the creation of housing stock for younger students.

Ms. Storey-King stated these apartments are not affordable these are market rate apartments at \$1,800 per month. The provision written in the contract zone is if they can't rent 20% to seniors then they can rent to anyone. I am not sure how these units diversify our tax base, these are not homeowners these will be renters. I ask that we be patient, the Bateman's have a plan for apartments in the center of town.

Mr. Shane stated the rent prices are \$1,200 to \$1,500 a month and if the units can't rent 20% to 55+ the contract zone needs to come back to the town council. The Contract Zone would need to be amended.

Mr. Loni Graiver stated he is building these units off a model of previously built apartments. Of the 48 units occupied in that development there is only one school age child. Regarding the price of the homes, I wasn't involved in the initial project but, of the 22 we have under contract 10 are \$300,000 or less. There has been one house priced over \$350,000.

The public portion of the meeting was closed.

Board Comments:

Ms. Maloney-Kelly stated this town needs apartments for people to come back to or for our children to move out of our houses. I support this project.

Mr. Saunders motioned to recommend to the Town Council amendments to the Contract Zoning Agreement with Cumberland Foreside Village, LLC to include the rezoning of Tax Assessor Map R01, Lot 12A and revisions regarding the development of multiplex dwellings on Tax Assessor Map R01, Lots 11, 11A, 11B and 12A.

Mr. Davis seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 7-0

The Board took a five minute break at 9:00 p.m.

The Board reconvened at 9:15 p.m.

4. *Public Hearing: Recommendation to the Town Council to create a Multiplex, Retail and Restaurant Overlay District for areas shown on Tax Assessor Map R01, Lots 14A, 14, 14B and 13B in the Office Commercial South (OCS) District.*

Mr. Moriarty stated the Ad-Hoc Land Use Committee recommended an overlay district in the four most northern lots in the OC-S district to create an overlay district for Retail and Restaurant use in the district.

Mr. Shane, Town Manager stated the change from the Council is multiplex use. This change occurred when a developer approached the Council for some multiplex use dwellings. These lots are located north from Ledgeview Assisted Living Center towards Tuttle Road.

Mr. Berrett asked if there was any consideration as to whether multiplex would be viable in such a close and noisy environment.

Mr. Shane didn't disagree however, over the last ten years there have been a variety of different uses proposed for the lots. The lots are a challenge with limited building envelopes.

The public portion of the meeting was opened.

Ms. Sandra Poor of U S. Route One stated the first lot north of Ledgeview was going to be an insurance building and now is proposed to be an insurance building with luxury apartments above. I wouldn't want any eight unit buildings next to our property. I would ask that the number of units in a multiplex be limited to four or less.

Mr. Moriarty stated this request is to allow multiplex, retail and restaurants as permitted uses on these four lots in the OCS district.

Mr. Sherr stated these small lot sizes and the proposed limitations of 3,500 square foot buildings for restaurant and retail with buffers and setbacks will limit development on the properties.

Ms. Nixon stated the size of the lot will limit development.

Mr. Shane stated the proposal before the council was 16 to 20 units. The idea of a multiplex was supported by the Council.

The public portion of the meeting was closed.

Ms. Nixon asked if the motion should be specific to the document provided for the Board with the uses as proposed.

Mr. Saunders moved to recommend to the Town Council approval of an Office Commercial South (OCS) Overlay district to allow multiplex, retail and restaurant as permitted uses as presented to the Planning

Board this evening for areas shown on Tax Assessor Map R01, Lots 14A, 14, 14B and 13B in the Office Commercial South (OCS) district as shown on the map below.

Mr. Berrett seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

- 5. Public Hearing: Major Subdivision Amendment to the approved Village Green Subdivision to change the names of two private roads and to adjust the lot lines for lots shown as Tax Assessor Map U10, Lots 47 and 48. Village Green, LLC, Owner and Applicant. Jason Vafiades, P.E., Stantec, Representative.**

Mr. Sherr disclosed members of his firm have done work for the Batemans. He has not had any work on this project.

Mr. Nathan Bateman, Bateman Partners stated they are looking to adjust the dividing line between lots 47 and 48; and to change road names in the development. After approval of the project it was discovered that one name was very similar to an existing road in town and created a public safety issue. We changed the name to a road that hadn't been built yet, and now we have to rename that road as well.

The lots 47 and 48 could have been either a duplex or individual houses and in order to have the 10' setback side line the dividing line needed to be amended to allow the 20' setback.

Mr. Bateman showed the roads where the names were changed. The overall lot size has not changed.

Mr. Moriarty asked the width of the strip.

Mr. Bateman stated he thought it was approximately ten feet. These two lots were purchased by the same builder.

The public portion of the meeting was opened.

There were no public comments, the public portion of the meeting was closed.

Board comments:

- Has public safety approved the road name changes?

Mr. Bateman stated yes.

Mr. Boivin moved to approve the reconfigured dividing lot lines for lots 47 and 48 in the Village Green Subdivision to accommodate building envelopes for the prospective buyer as depicted on the amended subdivision plan.

Mr. Davis seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 7-0

Mr. Boivin moved to approve the name change to the two private road names as proposed; to change to Reid Lane to Peaks Lane and Acadia Lane to Reid Lane.

Mr. Davis seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 7-0

G. Administrative Matters / New Business

- 1. The April Planning Board meeting will be April 26, 2016.**
- 2. May 17, 2016 meeting will have training with the Town Attorney at 6:00 p.m.**
- 3. Mylar signing for: Village Green Subdivision and 199 Middle Road.**

H. Adjournment:

Mr. Saunders moved to adjourn.
Mr. Davis seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 7-0

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Stephen Moriarty, Board Chair

Pam Bosarge, Administrative Assistant