

FALMOUTH PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

TUESDAY, JULY 6, 2010, 6:30 P.M.

FALMOUTH TOWN HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Lunt (Chair), David Fenderson (Vice-Chair), Becca Casey, William Brogan (alternate),

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bernard Pender, Stan Bennett, Heddy Snyder (alternate)

STAFF PRESENT: Ethan Croce (Senior Planner)

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 pm.

1. Approval of June Meeting minutes

Becca Casey moved to approve the minutes; David Fenderson seconded. Becca Casey made one amendment to the minutes. Motion carried 4-0.

Administrative Agenda Items

2. Sedgewood Realty, LLC – 22 Northbrook Drive – Request for a site plan amendment to construct a 24' x 26' storage garage. Tax sheet 161; Map-Lot U59-010-A; Zoned RA and RCZO.

3. Strenhoex Assoc. – 202 US Route 1 – Request for site plan amendment for new signage at Foreside Place. Tax Sheet 320; Map-Lot U52-004. Zoned SB-1 & VCO.

4. Leighton Farm, LLC - 75 Leighton Road – Request for site plan re-approval. Tax Sheet 373; Map-Lot U44-017. Zoned VMU & Route 100 Corridor Overlay.

Bill Lunt requested that Item 4 be removed from the administrative list. Item 3 was also moved to the regular agenda.

Item 2 was approved 4-0.

Agenda Items

3. Strenhoex Assoc. – 202 US Route 1 – Request for site plan amendment for new signage at Foreside Place. Tax Sheet 320; Map-Lot U52-004. Zoned SB-1 & VCO.

Bill Brogan requested to recuse himself from Item 3. His request was approved 3-0. The item was approved 3-0.

4. Leighton Farm, LLC - 75 Leighton Road – Request for site plan re-approval. Tax Sheet 373; Map-Lot U44-017. Zoned VMU & Route 100 Corridor Overlay.

Bill Lunt explained that this was a re-approval of an existing site plan. He wanted to make it clear that, if a Certificate of Occupancy was required for this building, the applicant will have to either have the building totally complete or post a performance guarantee for any incomplete site work.

Item approved 3-0 (Fenderson abstained).

5. (Item Tabled) Hundred Acre Woods, LLC - 570-578 Blackstrap Road – Request for preliminary subdivision approval for an eighteen lot conservation subdivision. Tax Sheet 90; Map-Lot R08-059-002; Zoned Farm and Forest & RCZO.

6. The Waldron Group – 215 US Route 1 - Request for site plan approval for redevelopment of an existing 15,100 square foot building. Tax Sheet 320; Map-Lot U11-035-A. Zoned SB-1 & VCO.

Tom Greer of Pinkham and Greer presented the applicants' response to the key issues. Bangor Savings Bank will be the first tenant; they will come back before the Board when the next two tenants come in. He presented the current site plan and discussed the changes they have made since the last time they were before the Board. They have had a scoping meeting with MDOT and have made changes since then. They have changed the entrances to both Route 1 and Fundy Road, and have added a sidewalk to Fundy Rd. The esplanade is five feet wide, except for one area where there is a pole. At that point it narrows to four feet. They have modified the plaza areas and added landscaping along the front. They have revised the lighting plan and reduced the number of poles on site. They have modified the crosswalks on site in several places. They are using concrete pavers at the sidewalk along Route 1 for a difference in texture and appearance. The crosswalks on site are painted. He presented the landscaping plan. There is less landscaping along the back where the overhead doors are. They have softened the architecture in response to the peer review comments, and broken up the roofline. He showed a diagram detailing the need for the proposed aisle widths both along the back and where the future connector road would be located. Truck traffic would be along Fundy Road. This was reviewed with DOT. They have added concrete paving at the Route 1 entrance to give it the look of a smaller entrance. They reviewed the suggested pedestrian island at the Route 1 entrance with a traffic engineer. The crossing will be signalized, and is no different in length than what is on Clearwater Drive already.

The Board discussed the applicant's request to defer consideration of the back portion of the site, where the pavement goes to the property line, until they come back to the Board to install a back tenant. Ethan Croce explained that in Falmouth you either trigger site plan review or not; the Board must consider all aspects of the site to ensure that they comply with all requirements of the ordinance. The Board can consider granting waivers on aspects on the site. No waiver would bind a future Board. However, he wasn't sure that simply installing a tenant into the back portion would trigger a return to the Planning Board. Mr. Greer thought a change of use would trigger it. Ethan Croce said it would be triggered by a change that affected more than 10,000 sq feet of space.

Bill Lunt said the whole premise is that this plan is based on automotive/retail use, and they wouldn't have to come back to the Board to install a new tenant. The Board has to look at this as one whole site. One issue along Route 1 is limiting the amount of impervious surface as much as possible. There is a fair amount of room to cut back on the impervious surface on this site. This site does not conform to the ordinance. If they require the applicant to make the 10 foot strip along the back it serves to bring them into compliance with the setbacks and will reduce the impervious surface and improve stormwater, which was raised as an issue by the director of public works. The applicants are asking for a waiver on that 10 foot strip, and he was not keen on granting that waiver.

Becca Casey agreed with Bill Lunt. She understood the need for flexibility. In looking at the projected turning radii out back, she thought the chance was slim for trucks entering all of those bays. It isn't the buffer that bothered her, but that there is more impervious surface than they need. She wanted to see a compromise.

David Fenderson asked about the parking spaces on Route 1. If they don't grant a waiver they will lose a lot of parking along the back. Mr. Greer said they don't anticipate losing the parking, just the width of the drive aisle.

David Fenderson agreed with Becca Casey. He would be willing to support a compromise.

Mr. Greer said that would mean they would pick certain bays as truck bays and the aisle width would narrow in the middle.

Bill Brogan thought the Board needed to know if the applicants need to put truck into those bays. He felt they needed to demonstrate a hardship to get this, and that they needed as much pervious surface as they could get in the watershed.

Bill Lunt said that, according to the applicants' own figures, they only need 74 parking spaces and they have 94. He felt they have room enough; if they don't have parking they have enough room for the turning radius. He didn't feel it was a hardship for them to create the setback. Cutting some pavement out doesn't cost a lot of money and creates some water treatment.

Becca Casey would prefer to see the first spaces along the turning radius eliminated.

Mr. Greer agreed to the 10 foot buffer. If they have a tenant that needs the turning radius back there they will come back to the Board.

Bill Lunt was hoping to reduce pavement along the property line with Dunkin Donuts. If they can cut the pavement back and vegetate for better drainage he wouldn't require them to install granite curbing along those two sides. These drive aisles are 40 feet, which is wider than Hat Trick Drive.

Becca Casey wondered if the road will ever connect from the other site. Bill Lunt didn't think the State would allow them to fill in that ravine and build a roadway. Mr. Greer said it would be a permitting nightmare. Theoretically it can go in anywhere along that back area. They can't pick a spot. Bill Lunt said they aren't asking them to pick a spot. He still felt they can get it without a 40 foot wide area. Mr. Greer said the connector road couldn't reach any of the nearby businesses due to the brook. It would only connect to Depot Road.

Becca Casey would like to see that area brought down and tightened up and provide a little more buffer. David Fenderson thought it seemed a good place to reduce the impervious surface.

Mr. Greer agreed to move that in 10 feet and reduce the width to 34 feet. They will still have parking along there. They will lose 3-4 spaces in the corner.

Bill Lunt said the Board wanted to make it more pedestrian friendly and to improve the stormwater runoff. He asked if they are going to move the parking out, would they also move the crosswalk.

Mr. Greer said yes, it will come out more. They will have to play with it. There is no crosswalk on that side of the intersection; they eliminated the plaza. There have been changes to the intersection since their meeting with DOT.

Bill Lunt asked if there would be a pedestrian connection between this property and Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Greer said no. The connection is along the Route 1 sidewalk.

Bill Lunt said the width of the entrance along Route 1 for a three business site seems very wide and unfriendly to pedestrians. Mr. Greer said it exactly the width of Clearwater Drive.

Diane Morabito of Maine Traffic Resources said the bank insists that they have two exit lanes. She explained that it had to do with queuing. They anticipate truck traffic for the retail and automotive type businesses – they designed for a large tractor trailer, but not the largest. The width of the turn is

designed to allow a truck to enter: this is a DOT requirement for the truck traffic. The concrete pavers will allow room for the truck to come in; cars will remain on the asphalt. To get a truck out on Fundy Road they will use all the driveway width plus all of Fundy Road. DOT won't let them do that on Route 1.

Bill Brogan asked about accessing the site from Fundy instead of Route 1. Ms. Morabito said that would be worse.

Bill Brogan said they would leave on Route 1 at a signalized intersection instead of at Fundy, which is not signalized. They would have the same turning radius and two exit lanes. Ms. Morabito said Fundy Road doesn't have the width. You have to allow for a car exiting Fundy when a truck comes in. They have designed for trucks coming in at Route 1 and exiting on Fundy.

Bill Brogan observed that you can control truck traffic. They could make the signalized exit a left turn, and make entrance to Fundy a left turn. Ms. Morabito said you can for one truck, making one delivery a week, but not for a hardware store receiving deliveries from many different vendors.

Mr. Greer said there is a utility pole on that corner; it would be a huge expense to relocate a pole.

Bill Brogan asked if they have examined this possibility. Ms. Morabito said they have; they cannot take a right hand turn onto Fundy without significant improvements to Fundy.

Bill Brogan asked how those improvements would compare to the improvements they have proposed. Ms. Morabito said they would be similar, but there is not right of way there on Fundy to make those improvements.

Bill Brogan asked if a hardware store would receive deliveries from one of the larger trucks, a WB-67 or a WB-62.

Ms. Morabito said the WB-62 was the vehicle DOT requested at the scoping meeting. They did not discuss a left turn design with the DOT. Not knowing the use makes this more complicated. Usually a commercial site requires a tractor trailer, that's why they were directed to use that vehicle.

Bill Lunt asked how wide the two exit lanes are.

Ms. Morabito said 11 feet; they lowered it from 12 feet. She talked about the pedestrian refuge island; it would make the pedestrian crossing longer and would offset the alignment with Clearwater. Moving the crosswalk to the south side wasn't a DOT request but a Town staff request to align with the crosswalk across the street. She said the driveway is 4 feet narrower than Clearwater, and 14 feet of that is concrete.

Becca Casey and David Fenderson were fine with the driveway.

Bill Brogan was not in support of the wider entrance. He didn't think there had been enough research into these truck movements.

Ethan Croce said it was represented to him that Mr. Waldron had indicated at the scoping meeting that the WB-62 was potentially excessive for what he was looking at for uses. The idea of designing for a WB-40 instead came up at the scoping meeting. He asked Ms. Morabito about her comment that DOT had mandated that they look at the WB-62.

Ms. Morabito said the asphalt was planned for the WB-40; the flush concrete was to provide for the WB-62. This was what was discussed at the scoping meeting.

Bill Brogan said if they get a use that requires a WB-62 they could come back. Mr. Greer said they wouldn't come back for the intersection; everything has to be installed now.

David Fenderson asked how wide the concrete area is. Mr. Greer said it is 14 feet along the crosswalk; it is roughly 10 feet at the widest point perpendicular to the curb.

Bill Lunt asked if DOT objected to the two exit lanes being 10 feet wide. Ms. Morabito said 10 feet is kind of tight for a right turn lane. For DOT purposes it has to accommodate a WB-40. They could look at it. The left hand turn lane could be 10 feet.

Mr. Greer explained the turning radius at the Route 1 exit. The tractor trailer will use the whole width.

Bill Lunt didn't understand why the radius is greater than the radius on Clearwater Drive. Mr. Greer said the radius on Clearwater is bigger.

Bill Lunt said his issue is that at sketch plan it was two lanes. His issue is the amount of width there. He would like to see the two exit lanes be 10 feet. He didn't like the concrete there; he felt it would provide a false sense of security for pedestrians, and cars will cut that corner. If they want to have that amount of radius, he wanted it to be all asphalt and not concrete.

Mr. Greer said they can do that.

Bill Brogan said he thought a left hand turn on Fundy going southbound would eliminate the need for this extra-wide entrance. It was raised by several people on staff.

Bill Lunt said it is the same width as the one across the street and is signalized. He didn't like it, but he could live with it.

Becca Casey liked the concrete; if it is an inch or two up, she wouldn't drive on it.

Bill Lunt didn't think two exit lanes were required; he didn't think the traffic report supported that. He thought the drive-thru traffic would exit on Fundy Road. He didn't know where this came from. He wanted another traffic engineer to look at it. Ms. Morabito said people will take the shortest, most direct route and prefer signals. That is where it came from.

The Board indicated agreement with the entrance design.

Bill Lunt requested they consider reducing the lanes to 10 feet. Mr. Greer said they will look at it.

Bill Lunt asked about the removal of the pedestrian connection from the Dunkin Donuts site. He felt people are going to go there anyway; he felt they might want to consider some kind of connection and when they install landscaping, they install something that will not erode. Mr. Greer said they would look at that.

Bill Lunt asked about the sidewalk surface along the building front. Mr. Greer said at each entrance there will be a plaza with concrete pavers. There is a continuous asphalt walkway all the way around. They felt a consistent material all along that was acceptable.

Bill Lunt asked if a waiver was required. Ethan Croce said it is a design guideline issue that more formal materials be used along building fronts.

Becca Casey thought they were using raised concrete walks. Mr. Greer said they are using set-in concrete pavers for the crosswalks. There is a raised curb along the walkway, but the walkway is asphalt. They are creating a bump out for the third entrance.

Becca Casey would like to see concrete for the walkway. It looks better and is cooler; the asphalt will contrast with the pavers at the plaza areas. Mr. Greer said this is a budget issue. All the newly installed curbing will be granite; there is some existing concrete curbing which will remain.

David Fenderson is fine with the asphalt; Bill Brogan agreed. Bill Lunt said there are deviations on this site from what they have required elsewhere along Route 1.

Mr. Sengelmann said he spoke with Jeff Jeter of Bangor Savings, and he agreed to pay for the difference to install concrete along the front of the building facing Route 1.

Bill Lunt and Becca Casey agreed with that plan.

Bill Lunt asked about the stormwater treatment issues.

Mr. Greer said trying to put a treatment system on this site doesn't work. It would be a huge expense. It is not required by the ordinance. Reducing the impervious surface will help.

Bill Lunt asked if the ordinance requires stormwater treatment. Ethan Croce said it doesn't.

Mr. Greer addressed the curbing question along Fundy Road. The ordinance states that curbing is useful for stormwater control and to protect the sidewalk from unraveling along areas of on-street parking. They feel the stormwater will travel across the esplanade and into the swale. They have designed a five foot esplanade, except for the location of the pole, and they feel this is sufficient.

Bill Lunt was satisfied with the plan they have. The rest of the Board agreed.

Mr. Greer asked about the waiver request on the 20 foot setback along Route 1.

Becca Casey moved to approve the waiver request for the 4 parallel parking spots to keep them at the 17 foot setback rather than the required 20 feet. David Fenderson seconded. Motion carried 4-0.

Mr. Greer said there are gaps in the landscaping along Fundy Road for snow storage. The widening of the buffers to 10 feet will also allow for more snow storage.

Ethan Croce asked about curbing along the back. Mr. Greer said there is no curbing there. The best way to drain that is to leave it; it is high enough and is at the back of the site. There is less traffic at that part of the site so he isn't concerned with the landscaping.

Ethan Croce asked if they are planning to re curb the existing asphalt area, where they are installing vegetation. Mr. Greer said no; it all drains now, and they will move it forward and landscape it.

Bill Lunt asked if the landscaping will be lower than the parking lot, now that they have moved it back 10 feet, to improve stormwater treatment. Mr. Greer said they can keep it lower. They are ripping the edge where it is eroding and they can put in a swale.

Ethan Croce asked about adding a crosswalk on the northerly side of the driveway. The Board expressed approval of that idea. Mr. Greer said they can add a sidewalk on the northerly side.

Mr. Mark Sengelmann spoke about the lighting. He said their average footcandles are now 1.96; they want to have appropriate lighting for the bank use. They have lowered three of the poles adjacent to the building by four feet. They included can lights on the drive-thru canopy and lowered the wattage on the wall packs to 100w. They have given a well-illuminated site plan that they feel meets all the criteria of the ordinance.

Bill Lunt asked if staff is comfortable with what is now presented.

Ethan Croce said they try to use the Village Center guidelines as the standard instead of the ordinance. The guidelines call for .6 footcandles average in parking lots, and ask that the minimum lighting necessary for safety should be used. The last plan had a 1.3 footcandle average; the current one has a 1.96 average.

Bill Lunt asked why they would go from 1.5 to 1.96.

Mr. Sengelmann said the 1.5 is a minimum average, not a maximum. The .6 is really for a pedestrian. They feel they should follow the ordinance, and not the guidelines. They wanted to make sure they had adequate lighting for the bank use. They went to a different fixture, with fewer poles, for more dispersion. They have a more modern shape.

Ethan Croce said the ordinance recommends an average of 1.5 for parking lots; the guidelines recommend an average .6 for general parking and pedestrian areas.

Bill Lunt asked if they could maintain the 1.5 instead of the 1.96. Mr. Sengelmann said they could reduce it. He may have misinterpreted the ordinance. Ethan Croce clarified that the .6 in the guidelines is a minimum. The 1.5 is an average.

The consensus of the Board was for the project to meet the 1.5 average.

Bill Lunt asked about the pole at the connector road location. Ethan Croce said there is a pole where the connector road is proposed. It would have to be removed if the road were ever built. The Board was not concerned with that pole remaining where it is.

Mr. Sengelmann discussed the changes made to the area along the garage doors. They have installed a number of elements to break up the building in the horizontal and vertical planes. The Board was okay with the design as presented.

Mr. Sengelmann talked about the Bangor Savings entrance. The Bank really wanted that door. They didn't want that to be designed as a main entrance; that is really a back door. Becca Casey agreed; it would compete with a major element next to it. David Fenderson said it faces Route 1 and has a lot of exposure. Mr. Sengelmann said it is in the shadow of the conference room bump out. Ethan Croce said it is unadorned in relation to the other Route 1 entrances.

Bill Lunt was comfortable with it. David Fenderson and Bill Brogan agreed.

Ethan Croce asked about additional lighting of the pedestrian plaza area. Becca Casey asked if they had installed lower fixtures. Ethan Croce said they lowered them to 16 feet along the parking lot. The guidelines speak to plazas lit by lower level, ornamental lighting. Becca Casey asked what is lighting that area. Mr. Sengelmann said the 16 foot pole mounted fixture. It gives lighting to the whole area.

The Board was comfortable with that lighting.

Ethan Croce asked about the location of the connector road. The applicant has stated that they are flexible, but he wondered if the applicants are comfortable with the road going in anywhere, or do they want to narrow it down. Mr. Greer said the connector road shown on the plans is on the stream banking. They can add something to the plan that the connector road can go on either corner at the back.

Ethan Croce asked if the Board wanted different treatment on the crosswalks inside the site, or if they are comfortable with those being painted.

The Board was comfortable with painted sidewalks.

David Fenderson felt those crosswalks were just as exposed as the sidewalks. He asked how they have treated interior crosswalks in the past. Ethan Croce said there has been a mix. They have seen this before. Bill Lunt said there are different crosswalks in the Falmouth Village site.

Bill Lunt asked that all the changes discussed tonight would be formally entered as conditions of approval.

Becca Casey moved to approve the application with conditions as drafted by staff and with the conditions discussed tonight. Ethan Croce read the conditions into the record. Bill Brogan seconded. Motion carried 4-0.

7. Handy Boat – 215 Foreside Road – Request for sketch plan review of proposed renovations to the existing building and parking lot. Tax Sheet 162; Map-Lot U16-091-A. Zoned RA, LR (Shoreland) & RCZO.

Andy Hyland of Port City Architecture, with Tom Saucier of Site Design, presented the application. They are proposing a renovation of the Falmouth Sea Grill. They are not intending to change or intensify the use; they are planning the same number of seats and functions. They are planning some capital improvements. He discussed the current conditions of the building. The restaurant area is on piers over the water. There is some significant damage to the structure under the restaurant. They want to elevate and raise the entire thing; it is a foot lower than the ground. They are decreasing the sq footage of the restaurant. The plan is to stay in the existing footprint. They want to install a new elevator. He discussed the changes in the sq footage of the building. There will be 144 seats in the restaurant with 56 of them outdoor seats. 839 sq feet was formerly an apartment; it is currently storage and is not proposed to be used as an apartment. He discussed the proposed changes to each floor in detail. He asked about the trigger of site plan review.

Ethan Croce said any enlargement of a non-residential building triggers site plan review. Changes to the circulation at the front of the building and renovations of 10,000 sq feet of interior space would also trigger site plan review. If they were not enlarging the building at all, they would still require shoreland review by the Planning Board. This is outlined under the land use table in section 7 of the ordinance, “piers, docks, wharves and other structures extending over the water”. Site Plan would be under section 9.1.

Tom Saucier, of Site Design Associates, discussed the site plan. Boats are stored on a satellite lot in the winter; that lot is used in the summer for cars.

Bill Lunt asked how many parking spaces they are required to have for the restaurant.

Mr. Saucier said according to the ordinance they are required to have 67 spaces. They wondered if the seating for the bar area needed to be included in the calculations for the winter. The other uses are the shop and the showroom. They asked if there is leeway for seasonal parking when they do the parking calculations.

Becca Casey asked if they are talking about summer. Mr. Saucier said in the winter, when the boats are stored in the back lot and the 56 outdoor seats are closed, they will need less parking.

Becca Casey asked about the requirements for the non-restaurant uses. Mr. Saucier said their plan is to have a more detailed, formal parking plan with the site plan application.

Becca Casey asked if there was any plan to delineate parking to have it used more efficiently.

Mr. Saucier said their plan is to use that lot more in the winter months for restaurant parking. Mr. Hyland said they will take a look at where boat storage is stopped, and delineate parking more efficiently. In the winter there is no boat activity on the lower portion, and that is where they would have their ADA parking and accessibility.

Mr. Saucier said the plan in the packets shows a proposed drop off in the turn around. That is being discussed. They need to evaluate the circulation on the site. They are intending to work within the building footprint and not increase impervious surface, unless they come out with a loop and drop off area. They are not increasing the lot coverage. They will likely request a waiver on a lighting plan; they are not intending any changes on what is out there. Regarding overhead utilities, there are not a lot of utilities out there. There is one overhead line that comes down Handy Boat Lane to a pole in the parking area. He wasn't sure if they needed a waiver on that. The parking setback requirement deals more with buffering the residential areas. There is one area called out for buffering for the neighbors from a previously approved plan.

Bill Lunt asked if they would come back with a parking plan for the entire use of the site. Mr. Hyland said yes, and they will probably have two plans, one for summer and one for winter.

Bill Lunt asked if the Board has the authority to waive the setback requirements. Ethan Croce said they do not, but it appears that it is only the spaces at the bottom of the hill that are violating the setback. Boat storage isn't considered vehicular parking.

David Fenderson asked about the setback. Ethan Croce said it is 25 feet. He suggested shifting that parking back to be contiguous with the others, to separate the pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

David Fenderson said that would lend itself to the turn around and drop off, which makes good sense

Mr. Saucier said in considering the turn around they have to consider the state and local limitations on impervious surface that close to the ocean, as well as the mix of the uses and the circulation needs of the restaurant and boat usage.

David Fenderson asked how they prevent people from doing that anyway. Mr. Saucier said there is no path now. Their other option is to dress that area up and make it a focal point.

Mr. Saucier said curb cuts and pedestrians issues are under evaluation. They may not be able to bring the whole site into conformance. They do have a landscape architect on staff.

Bill Lunt asked about the overhead utilities and if the 20% rule applies here. Ethan Croce said that rule applies to the commercial districts. No formal waiver is required.

Mr. Saucier asked about the submission of a stormwater management plan. There are no known problems, but they will evaluate what is out there. He asked if they need to request a waiver on the pre- and post-development plans. Ethan Croce didn't think a full stormwater plan would be required. A drainage plan will be required.

Bill Lunt said an inventory of the existing stormwater system would be helpful. He said parking is going to be a problem. The spaces at the bottom of the hill are not going to be available to them, as the Board can't waive the setback. They can maybe channel the traffic down one side and up the other and move the parking spaces over. He liked the loop at the bottom. That would direct traffic in the right direction and contain the traffic from the boat launch and lift area.

David Fenderson asked about the right, title and interest issue. Ethan Croce said the driveway leading to the site is owned in fee by another entity. They need to provide evidence of their rights with the formal site plan.

Bill Lunt would like them to make sure when they move parking they don't have a buffering issue.

David Fenderson asked about the requirement for lighting. Ethan Croce explained that lighting standards are listed in the ordinance. Absent a waiver from the Board, a full lighting plan would be required.

Mr. Saucier said a full plan is easy with a new site, when you can choose where to locate the poles, etc. It is difficult with an existing site. He felt that if they follow the ordinance standards they might end up with more lighting than is what is out there. Ethan Croce said the ordinance does allow for less lighting in residential areas. There would be more concern with lighting on the walkways, etc.

Bill Lunt thought the right approach would be to evaluate what is out there, and focus on key areas. Mr. Saucier said they would get an expert to look at it.

Bill Lunt opened a public comment period. There was no public comment.

Bill Lunt advised the applicants to be in touch with the abutters.

David Fenderson asked if this required Army Corps approval.

Mr. Saucier said they think it will fall under DEP permit by rule. They have been in touch with DEP. The loop plan may complicate that. There is a threshold in the flood plain ordinance that if there is not a substantial improvement they don't trigger flood plan review; they are not at the level to trigger that at this time.

8. Architectural peer review discussion

Bill Lunt raised the issue that peer review of architecture is currently being done by a landscape architect and not a registered architect. He suggested that building architecture should be peer reviewed by a building architect. The Board agreed with Bill Lunt's suggestion.

Meeting adjourned 10:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Melissa Tryon
Recording Secretary