

Minutes
Planning Board Meeting
Tuesday, June 16, 2015

Present: Neil Schuster, Chairperson; Rene Ittenbach, Donna Bailey, Peter Scontras, Bob Hamblen, City Planner, Angela Blanchette, City Engineer. Absent: Don Girouard, Marty Devlin

Workshop – 5:00p.m.

- Review of draft Utility Expansion Plan
- Sketch Plan – a proposed commercial building off Ocean Park Road. Applicant is Ocean Park, BC, LLC. Tax Map 34, Lot 14. Zoned B-2c.

Regular meeting - 5:45pm

1. Minutes of June 2, 2015

Peter moved to accept the minutes as written, seconded by Rene. Vote was 4-0. Motion passes.

2. Public Hearing: Preliminary plan review of a proposed nine lot subdivision off McKenney Road. Applicant is Dearborn Family LLC. Tax amp 125, Lot 2. Zoned C-1.

Hamblen: Applicant Dearborn Family LLC proposes to create nine new lots from a roughly 24.5 acre parcel with frontage on McKenney Road. Lots 1, 2 and 9 would derive frontage from McKenney Road, while Lots 3-8 would front on a proposed new street, Joanna Drive. Aside from electricity, cable and phone, public utilities are not available or nearby, so lots would be serviced with private wells and septic systems.

Fire protection would be addressed with an underground cistern, within a proposed easement adjacent to McKenney Road. No open space is proposed; the draft conditions of approval require payment of an open space and recreational facilities impact fee.

Project manager Bill Thompson, BH2M, is representing the applicant.

A. Determination of Completeness

The applicant has not requested waivers for any submission items. The plan is not labeled “preliminary plan,” (Sec. 5.2.2). No information has been submitted as to financial or technical capacity (5.2.3.10). The roadway section detail does not include sidewalk, curb or gutters, nor are parking areas, street lights, service buildings and structures, or dumpsters shown. (5.2.2.16) Maine IF&W input on wildlife habitat has not been addressed 5.2.2(18).

Peter: Why wouldn't the developer note the plan as a Preliminary plan? It is a requirement. **Neil:** To move forward as a complete application we must vote as complete waivers. **Bob:** He suggests that the street lights be held until next meeting.

Rene: I move that the Board waive the specified submission requirements: **No second. Motion fails.**

Donna: I move that the Board waive only Sec. 5.2.2.16, seconded by Peter. **Vote was 4-0.**

Donna: for discussion to move forward, I move to waive Sec. 5.2.2, 5.2.2.18 and 5.2.216 (street light), seconded by Peter. **Vote was 4-0. Motion passes.**

Peter: I move to find the application for preliminary subdivision review to be complete, seconded by Donna. **Vote was 4-0.**

Bill Thompson, BH2M: A 760ft long road will be built to City Public Road Standards of 24ft wide with a 4ft gravel shoulder on each side. All stormwater will be directed to a road ditch/culvert system and managed by a detention pond with an outlet control structure. The controlled discharge will use the existing culvert at the Grant Road. All lots will be served by a drilled well and an individual subsurface disposal system. Test pits have been completed and each lot can support a septic system. Sight distance along McKenney Road at the proposed Joanne Drive exceeds the City's minimum required. Underground electric utilities will be installed to serve lots 4 thru 7 and all other lots will be serviced from existing overhead utilities along McKenney Road.

Peer review of wetlands waiver on Wildlife Habitat, clearly shows no issues. There is clear support that there are no vernal pools on property. **Neil:** Will Joanne Drive be a City Street? Yes.

Donna: How often are the Wildlife maps updated? She would like to see a letter stating that. **Bill:** the maps are not published.

Rene: Move to open the public hearing, seconded by Donna. **Vote was 4-0.**

Keith LeHigh, 160 Grant Rd: What would be considered an unreasonable burden on water supply? The water runs toward his property. Will there be a sidewalk? What is required as a buffer? How many trees will be left standing? **Bob:** Usually a larger project than this one is where we require sidewalks.

Bill Thompson: Can't impact groundwater. This is a small subdivision to have a sidewalk. There are no water quality issues.

Peter: Move to close the public hearing, seconded by Rene. **Vote was 4-0.**

Rene: the barrier between this and the Clearing, he would support waiving. Neil agreed. He is mindful of wording on no-cut buffer. **Peter:** How do you bring values up in a subdivision? Sidewalk vs. no sidewalk?

Neil: They are two different projects. For me, it would be a sidewalk to nowhere. **Peter:** It says that every street should have a sidewalk. This is precedent for me. **Rene:** sidewalks in Strawberry Fields, Juniper Knoll, connect to somewhere. Here, there is no connection.

Peter: I move that the Board grant approval under the provisions of the Saco Subdivision Regulations for the preliminary plan submitted for the proposed Morrill Estates subdivision based on the attached Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval dated June 16, 2015, with condition that information on IFW letter, no-cut buffer and street lights be provided, as discussed tonight. Seconded by Rene. Vote was 4-0. Motion passes.

3. Public Hearing: Preliminary plan review and Site Location of Development review of a proposed 91-lot subdivision off Jenkins Road. Applicant is Pinehurst Development, LLC. Tax Map 89, Lot 35 and Tax Map 90, Lots 24-2, 21 and 23. Zoned R-1d. This shall serve as a Public Information Meeting.

Hamblen: Board members will recall the approval granted on Sept. 17, 2014 for preliminary clustered residential development review of the proposed Hemlock Estates subdivision. At this time, the applicant returns for review of the preliminary subdivision plan, and has re-titled the project as West Side Village.

What was a 93 lot clustered subdivision on roughly 85 acres made up of four parcels is now 91 lots on about 86.5 acres. The project would be serviced with public sewer and water. The details of the proposed sewer extension, in particular, remain a work in progress. Likewise with traffic, as a study has been submitted and is under review by the City's consultant.

Somewhat more than 60% of the site – roughly 58 acres -- is proposed to be set aside as open space, well in excess of the required 35% of the subject parcel for open space.

Items that bear consideration:

- Sec. 607-2: a registered landscape architect shall be retained to provide a site plan if a cluster development is ten dwelling units or more. Ninety-two lots proposed. The applicant has enlisted the aid of Cowles Studio or Yarmouth.
- Lot size may be reduced to as little as 7,500 s.f. with a cluster subdivision in the R-1d zone. Proposed: 7,500 s.f. and larger.
- Lot frontage may be reduced to 75 feet in a clustered subdivision, from the usual 100 feet in the R-1d zone.
- Front yard setbacks may be reduced by half, from the R-1d required 25' as allowed under 602-7.C.
- Side and rear yard setbacks may be reduced from the R-1d required 20' as the Board sees fit, as allowed under 602-7.D at the Board's discretion. Proposed: 10 feet, side and rear.
- Based on an average density per dwelling unit of 41,920 s.f., 5% (4.47 acres) of the parcel must be developed for active recreational facilities, per Sec. 604-12. A fee in lieu may be

paid, which is the applicant's preference: \$1,200 per lot, or \$110,400. The Parks and Recreation Department has stated that it prefers the fee in this case, rather than recreational facilities.

- See Sec. 608 for the procedures to be followed for a cluster subdivision review:
 - 1) Preliminary Clustered Residential Development Review – granted 9/17/14.
 - 2) This is followed by preliminary subdivision review.
 - 3) Final subdivision review.
 - 4) Final Clustered Residential Development Review is conducted contemporaneously with final subdivision review, with the determination for Final Clustered Residential Development Review necessary before a determination on final subdivision review. Procedures are as outlined in the Saco Subdivision Regulations, except where alternative procedures and requirements are set out in this Article.

Donna: I move that the Board find the application for preliminary subdivision review to be complete, seconded by Rene. Vote was 4-0.

Jeff Amos, Terradyn Consultants, LLC: Proposal is a 91-lot single family clustered subdivision on approximately 86 acres, with related public roadways, underground utilities, stormwater management system, landscaping and open space. There are six new city streets proposed, with Bonython Drive to be renamed. The parcels will have a minimum lot size of 7,500sf. And 75ft of street frontage. The project will be accessed by a new set of roads. Approx. 5,650ft of new roadway will be created. All roads will have a 24ft wide driving surface and a 5ft wide sidewalk with esplanade. Within the roadway system, underground power, cable and telephone lines will be installed. Gravity sewer on site per City standards.

The applicant plans to extend public water approximately 6,900ft. from Route 112 end of Jenkins Rd to the development parcels. A sewer pump station connecting to the existing public sewer system will serve this project. Approximately 14,109s.f. of wetlands are proposed. A NRPA Tier 1 Wetland Alteration Permit has been submitted. There are no vernal pools located on the property.

The project will be constructed in four phases. The first phase will consist of Samuel Marshall Drive, Gravel Wetland #1, the pump station and 24 lots. The second phase will consist of Chamberlain Drive, Elias Drive and 20 lots. The third phase will feature Wingate Drive and the first 950ft of Remick Drive and 19 lots. The fourth phase will consist of the final 200ft of Remick Drive and the entirety of Bonython Drive. Gravel Wetlands #2 and #3 and the final 28 lots. Phase 1-3 will all drain to Gravel Wetland #1. The existing driveway that is located adjacent to Camire Drive will be removed in Phase 3 and the existing lot will access Remick Drive. We hope for phase 1, 2 and 3 constructions to start in the fall.

Neil: The first owners will get impatient waiting for phase 4 to finish.

Angela Blanchette, city engineer: The Subdivision Regulations give 3 years to complete the infrastructure. **Aaron Shields, applicant:** Much thought was given to not use Camire Drive. We plan to be out and finished in 3-4 years. **Neil:** times have changed regarding water. Is Maine Water Co. going to build to your property? **Aaron:** we have to contribute per lot to Maine Water Co. in order for them to extend. **Neil:** With Traffic at Rt. 112 and Jenkins Road failing, now it will be a concern. Don't see how a signal can't be a part of this. **Jeff Amos:** A light might not fix the traffic

problem. Other fixes might help more. **Angela B:** Gorrill-Palmer updated the Rte. 112 study that suggested adding a lane at Jenkins Road and a center lane on Rte. 112. Eventually a signal will be warranted, even if it doesn't warrant a signal now. Stopping traffic at that corner may make it worse. **Aaron:** the High Crash Location designation at Flag Pond Rd. end of Jenkins Road is due to specific causes, has been cleared of the need for improvements by PD and city engineer. Rte. 112 end is a LOS "F". We can't bear that cost. It should be handled like Dunstan Corner, that any new development adding to it, pays a fee.

Rene: Move to open the public hearing, seconded by Peter. Vote was 4-0.

Jason Camire, 7 Camire Dr.: they are doing this right. He supports it. **Chad Harrison, 6 Boothby Lane:** You can't ignore IF & Wildlife. It would stifle growth. Sidewalks on Jenkins are atrocious. There are areas of standing water on Jenkins Rd. Has CMP been contacted regarding capacity on Bonython? Any multi-family proposed? **Craig Camire, 9 Camire Dr:** His concern is the traffic it will create. The Board should do a site walk. **Doug Doherty, 8 Kimberly Dr:** He is concerned about traffic as well. **Peter S:** Jenkins Road is busy. What has changed? Was it at capacity last year? **Stefa Normantas, 90 Jenkins Rd:** Traffic is an issue. The Jenkins Road is a straightway for traffic and it won't get any better. His children bike to school. There are 224 houses for sale in Saco. That's a lot of impact on one road. Potholes, plus heavy trucks, standing water. It's a problem.

Chad Harrison: For the construction on Jenkins Rd; will it be posted and how will it be handled?

Aaron: They will follow seasonal road posting rules. They plan on building new sidewalks on their own property (project). Sewer; they are doing as asked. They looked into turnpike crossing, but couldn't make it happen, so now they are back to Jenkins Rd. **Jeff Amos:** CMP has been contacted. Site Law permit is required. Stormwater must be treated to the 95% level. They considered standard ponds, but after discussion with city engineer decided to go with gravel wetlands for better treatment. Streets will drain to these ponds. Only the back 1/3 of turnpike lots won't drain to ponds. They will be no multi-families.

Donna: impervious pavement? **Jeff:** Can't plow down to surface. Can't sand. Not typically used for streets. **Neil:** Issues to be addressed include the water main, condition of sidewalk. Will sewer be installed under Jenkins Rd. sidewalk? **Pat Fox:** Both water and sewer won't fit under sidewalk. They can address the sidewalk issue, also the dollars in the City's budget to address Goosefare crossing. **Neil:** The lots that abut the turnpike; who will maintain the fence? **Aaron:** The individual lot owners. **Neil:** Have you considered other materials? **Aaron:** Landscaping would affect drainage, a fence won't. **Neil:** On another project, Mr. Labonte is using another product for a fence that won't deteriorate. **Aaron:** Maybe 20ft of landscaping/existing vegetation would be retained. A fence will act as a sound barrier. **Peter S:** Will the sewer be able to handle 91 more lots? The condition of the Jenkins Road is a concern. It almost looks like row housing. **Aaron:** You should check out other developments like, Dunstan Crossing, or East Village. They are 20ft apart and 1500-4000 sq.ft.; a more traditional approach. Track record is there. Saco did housing study. We considered that with the zoning ordinance and the Comp Plan. Row houses in Scarborough are

\$400-\$700,000. Traditional plan had 3 miles of road. We feel plan is entirely saleable. The first phase of the project will incur astronomical costs. **Peter S:** Open space, are wetlands suitable for passive recreation? Where will kids play? Would you consider a recreation facility? **Aaron:** We proposed that first time around, but City wasn't interested. **Peter:** Fee is a copout. **Matt:** he liked recreational area because it is more saleable. City wants to encourage fee in lieu of. **Peter:** What is the capacity of Jenkins Rd? How much will the new trips generate? Condition of Jenkins Rd? Is it wide enough? Is the road base adequate? **Aaron:** Your concerns exceed ordinance requirements.

Peter S: the Board should walk the site.

Donna: I move that the Board table further review pending additional information and plan revisions and a site walk of project, seconded by Peter. Vote was 4-0. Motion passes.

Respectfully submitted by,

Maggie Edwards
Board Secretary