

Minutes
Planning Board
July 5, 2016

Members Present: Neil Schuster, Chairperson; Don Girouard, Rene Ittenbach, Michael O'Toole, Vangel Cotsis, and Bob Hamblen, City Planner. Absent: Marty Devlin and Peter Scontras

Workshop 5:00 p.m.

Board discussion of Accessory Cottages – Independent accessory living – Mini Houses.

Regular Meeting 5:45pm

1. Minutes of June 7 and June 21, 2016

Mike: last page of the June 21 minutes, regarding the 265 North Street application was not finished. **Mike:** I move to accept the minutes of June 7 and June 21, 2016 with the changes made to the June 21 minutes as discussed, seconded by Don. Motion passes 5-0.

2. Public Hearing: Site plan and final subdivision review of a proposed Multi-Family dwelling at 265 North Street. Applicant Broden Properties, LLC. Tax Map 54, Lot 8. Zoned R-2.

Hamblen: Applicant Broden Properties, LLC, represented at this meeting by realtor Ben Poirier, received approval for a conditional use permit and for preliminary subdivision review from the Board at its June 21 meeting. Tim Madden dba Broden Properties, LLC, proposes to convert the existing 4,200 s.f. structure at 265 North Street into a five unit Multi-Family Dwelling and retain roughly a 1,100 s.f. space for office use. The building was used previously as professional office space, and that use is regarded as grandfathered.

There is a correction to the number of parking spaces. It should be noted that there are 22 spaces, not 20 as previously noted. As discussed at the 6/21 meeting, the parking layout has been clarified: the plan shows twenty two 9'x18' parking spaces between North Street and the building, with a 24 foot wide drive aisle. While there is existing parking to the rear of the building, none is proposed to be used for the current proposed uses.

The required side yard setback in the R-2 zone is 15 feet. The plan indicates a 23 foot setback for the existing building.

Converting the structure into a multi-family dwelling triggers site plan review. Dividing the structure into 3 or more units within a five year period triggers subdivision review.

The existing curb cut from North Street provides access to the site. Existing utilities are all public. No new provisions for stormwater are proposed. No open space, so an impact fee would be assessed for that and recreational facilities for the five residential units. Traffic generation is estimated at forty trips per day.

Mike: commercial use is grandfathered? When did it stop being an office? **Bob:** less than a year.

A. Finding of Completeness

Final subdivision plan – This not being a ‘typical’ subdivision, a few items are requested to be waived:

- Sec. 6.2. 1. Metes and bounds of lot lines
 2. Lots and blocks
 3. reference monuments

Don: I move that the Board grant waivers for the submission items noted, seconded by Rene. Motion passes 5-0.

Don: I move the Board find the application for final subdivision review to be complete, seconded by Rene. Motion passes 5-0.

Ben Poirier, representing the applicant, Tim Madden: Bob has the number of parking spaces as 20, and it should be 22 spaces. Also the acreage left to be developed is noted as 1-1/2., but there is actually 2 acres.

Applications for conditional use, site plan, and preliminary subdivision were found to be complete at the 6/21 meeting.

Nine parking spaces are required for the three one-bedroom and two two-bedroom apartment units. Five spaces are required based on the portion of the building to be occupied by the office use. It appears that ample space is available, as 22 spaces are shown on the site plan. Some additional information provided by the applicant:

- Three 1-bedroom and two 2-bedroom units are proposed.
- Four to seven employees are anticipated, with business hours from 8 a – 5 p.
- The applicant is aware of the size of the parcel and that the possibility of future expansion exists, but nothing beyond the existing building is proposed at this time.

Rene: Are these athletic students? **Bob:** The ice hockey project is gone. These are accessory apartments.

Mike: I move to open the public hearing, seconded by Vangel. Motion passes 5-0.

Philip Prince, 267 North St: there was discussion/debate at the last meeting about the parking spaces being used in the front and the back of the lot. He would rather have the parking in the

back. Even though there is an existing fence there, it is slightly dilapidated. He would rather not see all the traffic going back and forth. It would be nice if the traffic would be hidden.

Ben Poirier: the parking will be in the front. That is what was determined at the last meeting by the planning board.

Bob: the building is close to the westerly property line. The Board discussed whether there would be enough room for 2-way traffic. The plan shows 25 ft from the side property line closest to the building, and when separating out 5ft, that will leave 20ft, which should be fine.

Philip Prince: that will jam all the parking in front, which will be noisy. So there is nothing he can do? There is a stockade fence there now. **Bob:** you always have recourse within the zoning ordinance. There are standards in Sec. 901-4 that the Board finds must be met prior to issuing a building permit, or site plan review. There must be adequate buffering between properties. If you want to have the applicant utilize the back parking lot, so as to lessen the impact on you, then the Board has the ability to make that determination. **Mr. Prince:** That is what he would like the applicant to do. The back parking lot was used by CSI when they were there. He doesn't know why they can't use it for this use. **Al Sicard, 259 North St:** It is a shame that they will be using up most of the grass area in the front, especially when they have a nicely paved area in the back. Twenty two spaces in front is a lot. **Bob:** 15 spaces are required, 2 spaces per 2-bedroom unit. They are providing more than is required.

Ben Poirier: If you want less in the front, he can put 16, and any overflow would go in the back.

Mike: I move to close the public hearing, seconded by Vangel. Motion passes 5-0.

The Board discussed what the best way to buffer the property from the abutter at 267 North St. Don suggested that some plantings, such as some evergreens, be added along the existing fence that abuts Mr. Prince so as to soften that area and provide more buffering.

Ben: He would not suggest plantings, because they wouldn't last with the snow plowing. I would suggest maintaining the existing fence. **Bob:** That could be made a COA to maintain the existing fence on the westerly property line. **Mr. Prince:** A couple of conifers would soften the edge and help with the noise, just like they have at the Fire Station. **Bob:** maybe plant 5 or 6 arborvitae, 8ft center. **Vangel:** maybe the applicant could add parking lot lines on the plan. **Rene:** It is odd that the applicant isn't utilizing the back parking spaces.

Mike: The applicant had a different plan last meeting that showed a shed on the lot.

Don: He would like to send Joe Hirsch to see what would work out there for plantings.

Rene: Move that approval be granted for the site plan for a Multi-Family Dwelling use at 265 North Street, under the provisions of the Saco Zoning Ordinance, Article 11, based on the Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval dated July 5, 2016, with condition that applicant add additional buffering to the grass island area on the northwest side of fence closest to 267 North St, seconded by Don.

Discussion

Vangel: what is defined as "maintain"? Esthetically pleasing and structurally sound, to the satisfaction of the Code Officer?

Motion passes 5-0.

Rene: Move that the Board grant approval under the provisions of the Saco Subdivision Regulations for the final plan submitted for the five unit multi-family dwelling proposed by applicant Broden Properties, LLC based on the attached Findings of Fact dated July 5, 2016.” With the condition that the applicant add additional buffering to the grass island area on the northwest side of fence closest to 267 North St, seconded by Mike. Motion passes 5-0.

3. Public Hearing: Site plan review of a proposed Multi-family dwelling at 93 High St. Applicant is Richard Huot. Tax Map 32, Lot 70. Zoned R-3.

Hamblen: Applicants Richard and Judith Huot propose to convert an existing two-family dwelling to a three-unit. By definition, a third unit results in a multi-family dwelling, which requires both a conditional use permit and site plan review. Likewise, certain parking requirements become applicable and must be complied with.

A number of submission items under site plan review are not applicable, in that no new construction is proposed. Waivers have been requested for topography, utility plan, landscape plan, boundary survey, and soils map.

Don: I move that the Board find the application for a conditional use permit to be complete, seconded by Rene. Motion passes 5-0.

Site Plan: requested waivers of submission items include –

Sec. 1104- 1.2(c) location map
 1.8 utility plans
 1.10 boundary survey
 1.18 lighting plan

Don: I move that the Board waive the submission items as noted for site plan review, in that the project is of such limited size as to make the information unnecessary, seconded by Rene. Motion passes 5-0.

Don: I move that the Board find the application for site plan review to be complete, seconded by Rene. Motion passes 5-0.

As the applicants describe, there is an existing five bedroom apartment on the shared second floor of house and garage. They propose to split this into two units, which with the downstairs house unit will total three, triggering the need for a conditional use permit and site plan review. The plan indicates a sizable driveway/parking area. It appears that 7 parking spaces will be required.

Richard Huot, applicant: There is a 2-car garage, and 2 spaces outside and there are plantings along the fence.

The Board discussed the need for making the parking spaces work. Don: The parking spaces are tight. It would work better if the parking was angled. Rene: do the tenants have assigned parking? Richard: Yes. Vangel: cars could overhang the space by 2-3ft. Don: the parking turns are tough.

**Mike: I move to open the public hearing, seconded by Vangel. Motion passes 5-0.
No comments were made.**

Mike: I move to close the public hearing, seconded by Vangel. Motion passes 5-0.

Don: If we can decide that parking will work on the lot and vehicles can maneuver and drive out, then I am in agreement. **Bob:** Requirement is 16ft. That's all the Board has to do. **Mike:** suggested there be striping designating as a no parking area.

Rene: He doesn't agree with parking in front of the garage, but evidently the zoning ordinance says you can.

Vangel: Move that the Board grant a Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan approval under the provisions of the Saco Zoning Ordinance for the applications submitted by Richard and Judith Huot for the proposal to convert an existing two-family dwelling to a multi-family dwelling at 93 High Street, based on the Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval dated July 5, 2016, seconded by Mike. Motion passes 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 7:45pm

Respectfully submitted by,

Maggie Edwards
Board Secretary