

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
TOWN OF CUMBERLAND
Cumberland Town Hall - 290 Tuttle Road
Cumberland, Maine 04021
Tuesday, August 17, 2010
7:00 p.m.**

A. *Call to Order*

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. *Roll Call*

Present: Bill Ward, Board Chair, Bob Couillard, Chris Neagle, John Ferland, April Caron, Bill Richards, Bob Vail

C. *Approval of Minutes of June 15, 2010*

Mr. Richards moved to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2010 meeting.
Mr. Couillard seconded.

Mr. Neagle asked that the tabled workshop language be removed. It appeared as if the workshop took place.

VOTE: Unanimous

D. *Consent Calendar / Minor Change Approvals:*
The Board Barn; Rockwood IV

Mr. Ward stated that the Consent Calendar Items would be moved to the end of the meeting after the public hearings. Mr. Ward also stated that Item # 4. Regarding Subdivision Ordinance amendments had been tabled.

E. *Hearings and Presentations:*

1. Public Hearing: Recommendation to the Town Council regarding the adoption of the recommendations of the Town Center Advisory Committee to include a new zoning district (Town Center District -TCD), zoning map revision, and associated design and performance standards.

Ms. Nixon, Town Planner presented a PowerPoint overview of the Council Charge to the Committee, the committee's process, and recommendations to the Council.

Mr. Couillard asked if the Design Standards prohibiting garage doors facing the street would apply to single-family homes.

Mr. Follett, Vice-Chair of the Committee stated the Design Standards apply only to commercial development.

Mr. Vail asked if there was a benchmark for the lot frontage requirement.

Mr. Follett stated the Committee looked at existing lots and frontages using the Currie lot as an example of the smallest existing frontage in the district.

Mr. Richards asked for an explanation on why the expanded areas were deleted

Mr. Follett stated the area on Blanchard Road by the Apple Barrel was deleted because the Committee didn't feel there was sufficient infrastructure in that location and that there would be cost to the Town. The Committee's idea was to have the Town Center District area walkable and pedestrian friendly. In review of the area south of the intersection by the Library the Committee determined the area was primarily residential, difficult to develop and also would require additional infrastructure.

Mr. Sweetser stated the upper area of Main Street currently has mixed uses.

Mr. Richards asked about the Doane property.

Mr. Sweetser stated the Doane property was not part of the study.

Mr. Ferland stated he was looking at the list of permitted and special exceptions and wanted to understand the logic. In the existing zoning daycares were listed as a special exception, and now are permitted, but adult daycares (a new use) are special exceptions.

Ms. Nixon stated we added a new use for adult day care. The answer to the question why are they special exceptions; if you recall a couple of months ago the Planning Board made a recommendation to the Town Council on uses throughout the town's zoning districts that require both Board of Appeals and Site Plan Review. It was determined that uses that are non-residential and that will receive Site Plan Review did not require the Board of Appeals review. A special exception is essentially a permitted use. These uses would include a home occupation, home based occupation, home based retail, etc. Permitted uses that are non-residential would require Site Plan Review.

Mr. Ferland stated the special exception seems to imply an additional level of review is necessary.

Ms. Nixon stated we have learned it is not an extra level of review; if the business is home-based in nature, it doesn't require Planning Board review; so there is no extra review. The reasoning is the less intense use.

Ms. Caron asked for an explanation of infill development and what that would mean to people in the district.

Mr. Follett stated infill is to allow large parcels with the required frontage another residence or possibly a multi-family to increase density.

Ms. Caron stated Ms. Nixon in her presentation talked about Contract Zoning and the fact they are often lengthy and contentious because they give the sense of unpredictability; which I agree with. I am always worried about adopting a new plan because some residents feel this gives them unpredictability. At this point what is the general sense of neighborhood inclusion?

Mr. Follett stated there are several people in the audience affected by the change. I live on Main Street although not in the affected area. We have had open and frank discussions at the neighborhood meetings. The Committee's thoughts were to give consistency to the zoning. They didn't feel contract zoning is the

way to move forward. The choices were to change nothing; contract zoning, or come up with a framework for change.

Ms. Caron asked if Mr. Follett knew how many of the properties had changed hands since 1986.

Mr. Follett stated no.

Mr. Neagle stated this is a great piece of work and well presented. He is excited about something different on Main Street. He respects there will be some property owners not in favor. He feels our Town has been lacking what this change will allow. He asked why a café' would close at 9:00 p.m. He would like to have a place to watch a Red Sox Game. His other comment has to do with the Design Standards; there should be a reference in the zoning ordinance which says you need to follow the Design Standards. Where did these Design Standards come from and how much input did the Committee have in these Standards.

Mr. Follett stated the limit is to stop serving at 9:00 p.m. with the intent to limit franchise restaurants and out of respect for the residential area. Mr. Follett stated the Committee did have input into the Design Standards, and the Route 100 Standards were used as a basis.

Mr. Vail stated Cumberland is a community of homeowners' and residents on Main Street has longevity of ownership. He is concerned about potential for change and concern of non-owner occupied rental properties.

Ms. Burnsteel stated the Comprehensive Plan references life cycle to allow younger people and retired people to reside in Town. She said that since so many of the affected houses are tiny, the concern about the possibility of conversion to multi-family units is unlikely. It would be a big process to build multifamily houses. However, the Comprehensive plan encourages keeping community members in Town throughout a life cycle.

Mr. Vail stated he appreciates the concerns of affordability, but he is not convinced that absentee landlords will protect the character of Main Street.

Ms. Burnsteel stated the Committee looked at making current non-conforming uses into conforming uses.

Mr. Ward thanked the Committee for the many hours of hard work. This is a public hearing; Mr. Ward asked to not bring redundancy into the input by listening to the previous presenter.

The public portion of the meeting was opened.

Mr. Brian Wood of 285 Main Street asked if his property was included in the proposal.

Ms. Nixon stated no.

Mr. Wood asked why they were not included.

Ms. Nixon stated the initial charge didn't extend below Blanchard and Tuttle Roads. The Committee did a comprehensive review of the appropriateness of uses, which seemed to fit in the area north of the intersection.

Mr. Wood stated there are rental units within the deleted zone, and we operate a home based business. How will their business be impacted?

Ms. Nixon stated home based businesses are allowed in all districts, this will not change.

Mr. Neagle asked if the Wood's wanted their property included in the proposed Town Center District.

Mr. Wood stated yes.

Mr. Tom Powers of 306 Main Street stated he has lived on Main Street since 1983. There has been very little change on Main Street over the course of 27 years. Mr. Snow lived in his house and operated his business, then built another house and received permission to operate his business. Dr. Frost the dentist office is a similar property. The home went away but the business remained. These are both very low impact activities. Mr. Powers stated he would like to have some of his neighbors speak during his presentation; unfortunately some of the folks are not here. The people he has asked to speak have lived in Cumberland and specifically Main Street for some time.

Mr. Dick Grass of 302 Main Street stated he has lived at 310 and 358 Main Street. He is 57 years old and has lived in Cumberland his whole life. He started paying taxes in his 20's when he purchased his first home. He has seen businesses come to Main Street and fail, because Cumberland is not a destination point. He expects protection as a taxpayer from the Town. Cumberland is a viable community, why change it? He asked how the proposed changes would affect his property value. People live in Cumberland for what it is, not what it could be. He asked which properties would turn commercial. Mary Yeo and Carolyn Currie who are not present this evening live next door and across the street from the Food Stop and understand the impact of commercial activity.

Mr. Powers stated Mary Yeo has lived in Town for many years, and he wanted her to describe the impact of the Food Stop next door; and the same thing is true of Carolyn Currie. Both of these families understood that the store existed prior to them purchasing their property. To anticipate the changes proposed will not have an impact on a residential neighborhood are ridiculous. Mr. Powers asked Mike Tardiff to speak about the impact of the new credit union.

Mr. Mike Tardiff of 331 Main Street, next to the new Credit Union stated he doesn't wish the noise on anyone. The construction noise starts at 7:00 a.m. He is not looking forward to a 24-hour ATM or a drive through. The proposed Town Center District doesn't a drive through. Has the Comprehensive Plan been applied to anywhere else in Town?

Ms. Nixon stated it has, and referenced the potential development of the Doane property, and Route 88 pedestrian safety. These are being done. The Comprehensive Plan is a blueprint for policy decisions.

Mr. Tardiff stated the question isn't how many real estate transactions since 1986, but how many will sell as a result of the proposal. Commercial development will creep; lots can be bought up and combined into one large lot. I have been approached by the Credit Union regarding sale of my property. Mr. Tardiff asked about the designation of a Growth Area.

Ms. Nixon stated the State Planning Office requires that towns designate a "growth area" in areas of infrastructure. This was done by the Comprehensive Plan Committee.

Mr. Powers stated the point being that businesses have their own agendas. Mr. Powers cautioned the Board regarding "unintended consequences". We do not know today what we will know tomorrow. We know that we have a viable residential community since 1986 when the zoning was changed. We do not know what that community will be if the zoning is changed. Once the Ordinance is in place the Planning Board has limited control. The future impact of the Credit Union is unknown. We can't assume houses

will be preserved and the appearance will not change. This is not acceptable to him and he has heard nothing in the proposal regarding the necessity of the change. Surveys are abstract. It has not been asked which houses we should destroy for commercial development. If you look at the current nature of Main Street there are tree fronted homes with lawns with limited breaks, businesses will increase asphalt. This proposal has nothing to do with Contract Zoning that is a tool that is always available to the Town Council. The credit union was a change from one commercial use to another and the other two contract zoning agreements were multi-family residential. He has asked the Council what was the last time they entered into a contract zone agreement, prior to these on Main Street. His point is contract zoning doesn't happen very often and two of the last three on Main Street were for residential. Mr. Powers stated multi-family residential and increased density makes sense. There are homeowners who plan to move from Main Street after their children finish school as a result of the proposed zoning. Home Occupations with the emphasis on "home" are okay. This proposed zoning goes beyond the realms of the known. There is no need for the Town Center to change as proposed. The Committee did an excellent job; he encouraged the Committee to conduct a site walk and envision some of the proposed changes, such as increase in asphalt, signs, and cars, and how the character of Main Street will be preserved with these changes. Mr. Powers stated removing Timber Harvesting as a use is a good change. Mr. Powers thanked the Board for the time and again encouraged a close look at Main Street.

Mr. George Turner, Town Councilor stated he didn't show up with the intent to speak. He congratulated the Committee on the wonderful job they have done. He doesn't anticipate the unattended consequences. He thinks the Credit Union will be good for the town. He thinks everything Mr. Powers and others have said has some merit, and we should fine tune this if possible. He stated when the Council first started its deliberation about the credit union there was a hue and cry. One of the things he pointed out about a contract zone is the control of design, location, and type of business. The most important thing is Tom's scenario of a domino effect; history shows that contract zoning is the last resort the Council wants to take. If this Committee's work is given approval from the Council; the Council would be hesitant to support anything outside the permitted uses in the zone. It would show a total lack of respect for the Committee's work. His point is the unintended consequences are more likely to be there if we are not careful how we structure permitted uses. He was the first to say he didn't want to see a committee for Main Street uses. The contract zone situation was fine with the reasoning in his opinion that from the Library to the cemetery there might be two or three properties that are not commercial now which might make sense as a future commercial use. On a contract zone basis that might take twenty or thirty years to evolve. With the suggestion of new zoning we have to keep in mind that Tom Powers is entirely right. It is a question of economics there is a possibility of two houses being purchased and turned into a business; under the contract zoning scenario that wouldn't happen. I'm not sure of the wisdom, and he is hoping Tom's worst fears are realized. He hopes the historical architecture stays in tact. People should think twice before abandoning a technique, contract zoning is always an option; it is not going away.

Mr. Jim Guidi, of 14 Hedgerow Drive and Main Street property owner, stated he is in favor the proposal. He is in favor of re-zoning; and he asked if the Town was compelled to work on this project because of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Nixon stated it was an action in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Guidi stated his understanding was that the State mandates that Town's update their comprehensive plan every ten years, and zoning must be consistent with the plan. He can certainly emphasize with Mr. Powers, he is a developer and has looked at Main Street from a commercial standpoint. There are possibly only a few homes that could be developed. He doesn't think there will be a large influx of commercial uses on Main Street. He would prefer contract zoning, and maybe we need to redefine "public need". The Town needed a bank and we have a bank, booster organizations are receiving donations from Atlantic Federal. He agrees it would be nice to have a locale café'.

The Public portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Neagle stated more than one person has mentioned that zoning is a guarantee; that is a myth. Zoning is intended to be flexible and change with times. He doesn't know which way he will go, but when he sees a committee which has put in this much time and effort and the comprehensive plan data, it is compelling. He would like to see something on Main Street.

Ms. Caron stated this is the Planning Board which is tasked with planning for the future. If you don't plan for a change you aren't able to shape what it will look like. She is surprised how people don't feel it is a citizen process, this committee has been meeting for a long time, and people have input to these committees. I don't know how to vote yet either, but she takes her job very seriously. She lives in a zone where zoning was changed; she had no idea the noise of construction until she experienced it. Commercial development on Main Street could happen if this is passed. That is why citizens meet on committee's and we have Town Council and Planning Board. She does not take citizen impact lightly, but her responsibility on this board is to look at the impact on the Town in the future.

Mr. Ferland stated it has been interesting to listen to comments. It is a process filled with irony and contradictions. He thinks somewhere there is a solution; it may not be exactly what the committee is presenting. I have been on committee's similar to this, and there is a lot of hard work, and eventually you have to stop as a committee or you will work for another two years. Committees must come to a consensus and present a document for public review. I am not interested in a Main Street filled with signs and pavement and motor vehicles instead of children. He doesn't want to see a strong housing stock disappear because it is being torn down. On the other hand we are trying to provide an opportunity for people within the proximity of Main Street to be able to walk to conduct a business transaction or have a night or morning out. There is an opportunity for people to get out of their vehicles. The same is true for people from the Foreside or West Cumberland who are traveling through the center of town for a specific reason. It would be beneficial to the community at large. Business implies traffic and we are trying to reduce traffic. The design standards will address lighting better than it has been previously addressed. He would like to talk more about is how any changes in use affect the existing building stock. We have to look at this as a neighborhood mix of residences and businesses. It would be a shame to have lots that are now open treed space become asphalt parking lots. The Design Standards address parking locations, maybe there is a way to cluster parking for offsite parking options. He supports the idea of integrating more businesses appropriately within this area of town, and agrees there is no rush it needs to be carefully planned. He is leaning in the direction of supporting the Committee's work understanding what has been presented is probably not the final product.

Mr. Richards stated he could not vote in the affirmative, there have been some compelling comments made by Mr. Powers and neighbors. As well as a lack of clarity on lower Main Street, upper Main Street and the center of Town. It seems to be highly selective and he is not sure this is the correct location for a café or small store. He cannot vote in the affirmative at this point. He appreciates the hard work from the Committee but the arguments are compelling.

Mr. Couillard complimented the committee for their work. He was on the Route 100 committee. He too is undecided because he would like to see more businesses in the center of town but he doesn't live there. He is bothered by a café or restaurant which might be noisy. He too is not sure which way to go; he wouldn't mind walking up and down Main Street.

Mr. Vail stated he has served on two committees that the Council rejected the recommendation of the Committee. He has been on the school board and had to vote against a committee's recommendation. He has been on both sides. He thought the best course of action for this group is to pass the football to the

Council; he feels it is the Council's position to make this decision. He is uncomfortable making a recommendation in the affirmative this evening. The survey indicates things we would like to see; he is not convinced there are proper safeguards to relieve his concerns of absentee landlords. Perhaps a workshop with the Committee might be appropriate. He cannot move this forward this evening.

Mr. Neagle presented a couple of ways to balance the issues. He has looked at the map more carefully and the sewer doesn't go where he thought it did. The cluster of red and blue dots on the map is where the sewer is located. That pocket of Main Street fits with higher density and the comprehensive plan. At the intersection of Tuttle and Main there are red dots and one of the owners have indicated they would like to be rezoned to the new zone. He could support recommending this for all the areas except the white lots between Lawn Avenue and Food Stop; which don't have sewer. He might make a motion to adjust those two areas.

Ms. Caron asked a process question; and wanted to know how many Board members would approve some sort of commercial development on Main Street and perhaps a workshop.

Mr. Ward stated what we are looking for tonight is either a motion to recommend or not recommend to the Town Council.

Mr. Richards moved to not recommend that this document be forwarded to the Town Council.

Mr. Vail seconded.

Discussion on the motion:

Ms. Caron asked what the process was if we vote to not recommend, do we get this document back at any point.

Mr. Neagle stated the process is; it goes to the Council without the endorsement of the Planning Board. The Council has the option of returning the document to the Planning Board.

Point of Order: Mr. Richards asked if he could make a motion in the negative.

Mr. Neagle stated yes.

Discussion:

Mr. Ferland stated he is not sure he fully understands the process. There needs to be something more said to the not recommend. He mentioned is thinking of an amendment.

Mr. Vail motioned to amend the motion that the Council returns it to the Planning Board for a workshop.

Ms. Caron seconded.

Councilor Moriarty stated the Committee completed its work on July 26th, eleven months after it began, and gave a presentation to the Town Council. The Town Council did not make comment and referred the item to the Planning Board as it is a zoning issue. If the Board is questioning if they need to do something with this document this evening; the Council referred it to the Planning Board who can conduct a site walk, hold a workshop with or without the Committee and Council. There is no particular urgency on the part of the Town that something be decided this evening. After eleven months of committee work he doesn't want to see a rushed product.

Mr. Ward thanked Councilor Moriarty for the clarification.

There is a motion with an amendment to workshop. The amendment was to refer to the Council with the recommendation to return to the Planning Board for a workshop.

Mr. Neagle stated it was not necessary to send this to the Council if the Board wants a workshop.

Mr. Vail withdrew his motion.

VOTE ON THE MOTION: To not recommend that this Committee's re-zoning document be forwarded to the Town Council.

VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR (Ward, Richrds, Vail, Caron)
3 OPPOSED (Neagle, Ferland, Couillard)

Mr. Neagle clarified that the Board voted to reject this recommendation.

Ms. Caron moved to reconsider the vote.

Mr. Neagle seconded.
Couillard)

VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR (Neagle, Caron, Ferland,
Couillard)
3 OPPOSED (Richards, Vail, Ward)

Mr. Neagle stated the Planning Board hasn't made a recommendation. Mr. Neagle stated Councilor Moriarty stated the Board can workshop this etc., He is willing to do that if the Board is willing.

Mr. Ferland stated he likes the idea of the Planning Board keeping the document and supports a workshop with the Committee.

Mr. Ferland moved that the Planning Board ask the Committee to have a workshop meeting before the next Planning Board meeting to discuss the proposal.

Mr. Richards asked if the Committee was willing to attend a workshop.

The Committee members agreed to a workshop.

Mr. Neagle seconded.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

The Planning Board recessed for a ten minute break at 9:05 p.m.

The Board resumed the meeting at 9:15 p.m.

2. Pre-Application Presentation and Scheduling of site visit for the construction of the proposed Central Maine Power Ravens Farm Power Station at 37 Greely Road, Tax Assessor Map R02 Lots, 34B, 34C, 34E, 34D, and a portion of 38F in the Rural Residential 2 (RR2) district; Rick Paquette, Jr., P. W. S. of TRC Representative, Central Maine Power Company, Owner.

Mr. Ward stated this is not a public hearing, this is a pre-application hearing; we do not have an application on file. We have some correspondence that has been received either by letter or e-mail which

the Board members will probably advise the applicant of any issues of concern. Again, this is not a public hearing and there will be no public comment.

Ms. Nixon presented background information as follows: Central Maine Power contacted the Town of Cumberland approximately a year ago stating they were going to be starting the permitting process, but that they needed to receive Public Utilities Commission approval. The PUC has approved the substation, but not the location of the transmission lines, so CMP is presenting the plan in two parts. The first part is the site plan for the substation. Ms. Nixon stated she asked Mr. Paquette to give an overview of what the project will mean for Cumberland.

Mr. Ward asked Mr. Paquette what P.W.S. stood for.

Mr. Paquette stated it is a Professional Wetlands Specialists. Mr. Paquette stated he would give a brief overview to the Board. He is present with team members for the Reliability Program; Terry DeWan, DeWan Associates, Andrew McDonald from Burns & McDonald, Ken Fortier, from Power Engineers and Mark Beaumont from Central Maine Power.

The MPRP project is to:

3. Upgrade bulk power transmission system in greater Portland area.
4. \$24 Million investment in CMP transmission system in Cumberland for substation.
5. New substation to be located north of Greely Road and west of Middle Road.
6. Realign portions of 345 kV & 114V lines at site.
7. Construct new 345 kV line (Sec. 3020) within the existing CMP corridor.

The project has undergone extensive regulatory review: Permits that have been received include:

- Maine Public Utilities Commission – (PUC) -6/10/10
- Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP)– 4/10/10
- U. S. Army Corps – 8/10/10

Local permits requested:

- Cumberland Site Plan Review
- Local – Building Permit

The Maine PUC issued CPCN for substation but deferred construction on Section 3020 to further address design alternatives within Segment 19 corridor.

- The substation application is to be filed before August 31, 2010 to meet construction schedule
- File a separate Application with Cumberland for Section 3020 T-line when PUC process is completed – Anticipated December 2010

Background:

- CMP invited property abutters to an informational session to answer questions
- Listened to comments and concerns:
 - Visual impacts and vegetated buffers
 - Water quality, stormwater, dust control
 - Substation lighting
 - Noise
 - Electric & magnetic Fields
 - CMP working to address issues and concerns where possible

Mr. Paquette explained substations as follows:

- Substations are integral to power grid system
- Serve as connection points between transmission line segments

- Serve as switches to allow segregation and isolation of transmission lines for maintenance work and outages
- Sites where bulk power is stepped down to lower voltages for further transmission or distribution.

Mr. Paquette showed pictures of the substation in Gorham, similar to what will be built in Cumberland.

A slide depicting current conditions of the site was presented.

- The site is north of Greely Road, West of Middle Road
- Site was selected as key node in CMP system (3 intersecting corridors)
- Existing CMP Corridor width = 450 feet (approx. 30 acres in Cumberland)
- One 345kV line, two 115 kV lines, one 34.5 kV line
- CMP purchased 7 adjacent parcels for substation project
- Zoned Rural Residential 2 and Rural Industrial

Layout of facility on site

- Proposed yard setback approximately 500 feet from Greely
- Approximate site area = 75 acres / substation disturbance area = 25 acres
- Graded yard = 15.4 acres
- Fenced – in 345 kV Section = 8.6 acres (un-fenced area – 6.8 acres)
- About 28 acres of total woodland clearing, 3.3 acres of wetland fill
- Remove 2 houses on CMP purchased parcels (R2-34B and R2-34D)

Substation Features

- Fenced crushed stone/gravel yard (8.6 ac.)
- Remaining yard area graded and finished with topsoil and seed (6.8 ac)
- Control house 40' x 90' (approx. height 20-25')
- Electrical Equipment
 - Breakers, switches
- Five dead-end A-frames
- 65' height for two 115 kV A-frames
- 100' height for three 345 kV A-frames
- Permanent gravel access road
- Stormwater management structures
- Water well and holding tank

Mr. Paquette showed existing condition photos and proposed photo-simulated photos. Mr. DeWan is working on buffering as an ongoing project.

Summary:

- MPRP is a needed upgrade and investment in CMP's bulk power system.
- The Raven Farm Substation was designed to address:
 - System reliability needs
 - Engineering requirements
 - Natural resources
 - Public health and safety
 - Visual / aesthetics and Noise
 - Landowner / abutter concerns
 - Stormwater Management

CMP will continue to work with landowners and planning board to resolve issues

Mr. Ward thanked Mr. Paquette for the brief overview and asked if he was looking for feedback from the Board.

Mr. Paquette stated his intention was to provide an overview and schedule for the project. And if there are specific issues that the Board has that they want to bring to their attention. They would be happy to take input as they continue with the application.

Mr. Ward polled the Board members.

Mr. Neagle thanked Mr. Paquette for the presentation; he would like to see them work on continuing to improve the landscape nearest the road.

Ms. Caron thanked him for the presentation and had no comments.

Mr. Ferland urged the applicant to look carefully at the standards; big issues are screening, buffering, visibility, noise, lighting levels, hours, and personnel at the site, impact on wildlife and water quality. It is great that they have reached out to neighbors, and asked if there are minutes from the neighborhood meetings.

Mr. Paquette stated there aren't any formal minutes, but they could provide notes in written form.

Mr. Richards asked how the substation compared in size to the one in Pownal.

Mr. Paquette stated the substation in Pownal is about 6 acres currently after the MPRP project that will enlarge to approximately 9-1/2 acres. The proposal is to grade out 15.4 acres for any future expansions.

Mr. Richards asked how many people were in attendance at the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. McMillan stated approximately eleven people attended last Tuesday, and most of the people in the audience this evening were at that meeting.

Mr. Richards stated his concern is make sure neighborhoods are informed throughout the process.

Mr. Vail asked about upgrades to the existing power lines.

Mr. Paquette stated yes there will be new 345kV lines from Pownal.

Mr. Vail asked why the two separate reviews.

Mr. Paquette stated the PUC process has deferred Section 3020 for alternate design review.

Mr. Vail asked the length of time for construction.

Mr. Paquette stated construction will take approximately 12 – 18 months.

Mr. Ward also encouraged communication with the neighbors. He doesn't ever remember receiving phone calls and e-mails at his residence which he has had with this project, there seems to be a high level of frustration.

The Board agreed that the applicant needed to be in contact with neighbors and address concerns.

Mr. Shane stated Terry DeWan is one of the best landscape architects in the area, and encouraged the applicant to work closely with him to give visuals of what the project will look like and impact to abutters. He encouraged buffering for the upgrade in the power lines.

The Board discussed whether to have a site walk to the Gorham station and agreed to hold a site walk at the 37 Greely Road site.

The Board scheduled a site walk for August 30th at 5:00 p.m.

3. Public Hearing: To recommend to the Town Council a draft definition for Road and Rail Facilities in the Rural Industrial District.

Ms. Nixon stated during the review of Rural Industrial last month, she noticed there was no definition for one of the uses: Road and Rail Facilities. She has drafted a definition to recommend to the Town Council.

ROAD AND RAIL FACILITY: The occupation and use of land, buildings, and structures for purposes directly connected with rail transportation of articles, goods, and passengers, including such facilities as tracks, sidings, signal devices and structures, loading platforms, ticketing sales and offices, and passenger and freight terminals.

Mr. Neagle moved to amend the definition as follows: **Railroad Facility: The occupation and use of land, buildings, and structures for purposes directly connected with rail transportation of articles, goods, and passengers, including such facilities as tracks, sidings, signal devices and structures, loading platforms, parking facilities, ticketing sales and offices and passenger and freight terminals.**

Mr. Ferland seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

D. Consent Calendar / Minor Change Approvals:

1. The Board Barn – Michael Record is going with the approved Planning Board design.

Mr. Neagle stated he does not want the berm lower than the Planning Board's specified 3' tall.

2. Rockwood IV – Thomas Drive serves the Phase 1-III. When Rockwood Phase IV was approved the walking trail was shifted to go along Thomas Drive, due to topography issues the trail has been moved to connect to the other side of the road. This has already been built.

Mr. Neagle asked if the Rockwood IV -Homeowners' Association had been notified.

Ms. Nixon stated no, but it is a visible change.

Mr. Neagle stated if you are going to change the location of a path they should be notified.

Mr. Ward stated if he were an owner of a condominium he would want to be notified, and asked Ms. Nixon to contact the Condo Associations.

Ms. Nixon asked if the letter would be something with a diagram showing how the trail had been moved and to contact the Town Planner with any concerns.

Mr. Ward suggested a letter stating this change has occurred and showing how the trail reconnects.

The Town Planner will notify residents.

F. Administrative Matters:

Ms. Nixon asked about a date for the workshop with the Town Center Advisory Committee or whether to look at available dates and send some emails.

Mr. Ward stated with the guidance given by Councilor Moriarty we don't need to rush to judgment, that perhaps we let a little bit of time go by and think about it; and at the next meeting schedule a workshop.

Mr. Neagle asked about the date for the site walk, and were we going to Gorham.

Mr. Ward stated we will go on our own to Gorham; he wants to see the site during daylight and evening hours.

Mr. Neagle stated the site walk will only be on Greely Road.

Ms. Nixon asked what time they wanted to meet.

The Site Walk was set for Monday, August 30th at 5:00 p.m.

G. Adjournment:

Mr. Richards moved to adjourn.

Mr. Couillard seconded.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

William P. Ward, Board Chair

Pamela Bosarge, Board Clerk

