



**Town of Gorham
NOVEMBER 21, 2005
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

LOCATION: Gorham High School Auditorium, 41 Morrill Avenue, Gorham, Maine

Members Present:

**HAROLD GRANT
CLARK NEILY
SUSAN ROBIE
MARK STELMACK**

Staff Present:

**DEBORAH FOSSUM, Dir. of Planning & Zoning
AARON SHIELDS, Assistant Planner
NATALIE BURNS, Town Attorney
BARBARA SKINNER, Clerk of the Board**

Members Absent:

**DOUGLAS BOYCE
THOMAS HUGHES
MICHAEL PARKER**

The Chairman opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and read the 6 item agenda. The Clerk called the role, noting that Douglas Boyce, Thomas Hughes and Michael Parker were absent. The Chairman introduced members of the Planning Board of the Town of Buxton, who were present for the second Agenda item, as follows: Keith Emery, Chairman, Chris Baldinelli, Barbara Elwell and Wanda Emery. Mr. Grant explained that State law requires joint meetings when an application crosses municipal boundaries.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: NOVEMBER 21, 2005

Clark Neily MOVED and Mark Stelmack SECONDED a motion to approve the minutes of the November 7, 2005, meeting as written and distributed. Motion CARRIED, 4 ayes (Douglas Boyce, Thomas Hughes and Michael Parker absent). [7:01 p.m.]

2. PRE-APPLICATION CONFERENCE / JOINT MEETING WITH THE TOWN OF BUXTON PLANNING BOARD: SUBDIVISION PLAN – “BLUEBERRY RIDGE SUBDIVISION” - off FINN PARKER ROAD - by STEPHEN A. JOFFE & JULIA C. COLPITTS

Discussion of a proposed plan for a 35-lot residential subdivision on 130+/- acres off Finn Parker Road and Webster/Church Hill Roads in the towns of Buxton and Gorham. Gorham Rural zone; M54/L4.

Andy Morrell, BH2M Engineers, appeared on behalf of the applicants and described the project as having 76 acres in Buxton and 45 acres in Gorham, with 17 lots proposed in Buxton and 18 in Gorham. He said that net residential calculations have been done for each municipality, with soils information as yet not completed. Mr. Morrell explained that two plans have been submitted, one for cluster subdivision and one for conventional subdivision. He said that the cluster plan in Gorham shows 45,000 square foot lots, with 150 feet of frontage and 65 acres of open space, about 52% of the site, and the cluster plan in Buxton shows 60,000 square foot lots with 150 feet of frontage. Mr. Morrell indicated that the conventional subdivision plan provided shows 80,000 square foot lots plus or minus in Gorham with frontage of 200 feet and open space of 26 acres, or 22% of the site. In Buxton, 120,000 square foot lots are provided with 200 feet of frontage. He said that the roadway lengths in both the conventional and cluster plans are about the same, and the only difference in the two plans is the size of the lots and the amount of open space. Mr. Morrell indicated that the applicant would prefer the cluster subdivision plan, and commented that in a preliminary meeting with the Buxton Board the impression was that the cluster subdivision plan was viewed more favorably. Mr. Morrell said that all lots will be served by drilled wells, individual septic systems, with underground utilities in Gorham and overhead utilities in Buxton. He said that the roads will be built to town standards and offered to the town for acceptance; Cobb Farm Road in the proposed subdivision has approximately 1500 feet in Gorham and 900 feet in Buxton, with 14 lots served in Gorham and 3 served in Buxton. The road will be built to Rural Access standards, the greater of the two standards between Gorham's and Buxton's requirements. Mr. Morrell said that Blueberry Ridge Road, running along the town line, is 1200 feet in length, entirely in the town of Buxton with 5 lots served in Gorham and 4 in Buxton, and will also be built to Rural Access standards. Mr. Morrell concluded his presentation by asking if a sitewalk was going to be scheduled for December 3.

Ms. Fossum noted that the purpose of the meeting is to introduce the project to the Planning Board members, that one substantive issue is traffic, and that there will be a need for a traffic study to consider impact on Gorham roads. She said that there will be technical issues about meeting Gorham standards in Gorham and Buxton standards in Buxton. Ms. Fossum also said that the two Boards need to determine if the project should be reviewed jointly by both Boards in its entirety, or whether the two Boards might each agree to review their portion of the subdivision as a separate board under their ordinances. She also said that the Boards need to determine if a joint sitewalk should be scheduled. Mr. Shields commented that the applicants would also like feedback from the Boards on the question of cluster versus conventional subdivision.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OFFERED: None offered.
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ENDED.

Mr. Neily commented about the plan's orientation; Mr. Stelmack concurred, and asked that the orientation be rotated. Mr. Grant asked that the plan also show any public roads in their entirety which abut the parcel. Mr. Morrell indicated that there would be a cover sheet that would show an expanded depiction of both the Buxton and Gorham areas surrounding the project.

After discussion among the combined Board members, a sitewalk was scheduled for 8:30 a.m. on Saturday, December 3, 2005. Keith Emery, Buxton, suggested that it be a joint sitewalk, with both the Gorham and Buxton sites being examined. Mr. Grant commented that usually the Gorham Planning Board favors cluster subdivisions plans, with land being set aside as open space, but that decision should wait until after the sitewalk.

Ms. Robie commented about correspondence from abutters about the gravel pits in the area of the project and associated truck traffic, and asked if any of the trucks now travel on Webster Road. Mr. Morrell replied that there are active gravel pits on Webster Road. Mr. Emery noted that Flaggy Meadow Road is posted for no through trucks, as is Wood Road, but trucks can use Finn Parker Road to Route 112. Mr. Emery said that Buxton will require that there be a plan note stating that there are active gravel pits in the area and active airports as well. Ms. Robie said that a map should be provided at the sitewalk that shows the location of the gravel pits and notes where gravel trucks can drive. Mr. Morrell said that an aerial photo could be provided. Mr. Grant also recommended that the applicant check with both police departments to find out what speed limits are being enforced on the roads and noted that the sight distance on the curve at the Town line by Finn Parker will be impacted by the speed limits.

Ms. Robie said that the present plan does not indicate the location of rights-of-way to abutting parcels on the Gorham side. Mr. Grant explained the ordinance requirement to the Buxton Board members. Mr. Grant asked the Town Attorney about the proposed Blueberry Ridge Road, which is to be in Buxton, and the requirements for the Gorham lots being served by that road. Ms. Burns said that the Gorham lots will have to meet Gorham frontage requirements, and each side has to meet the appropriate standard. In response to a question from Mr. Grant about the possibility of one town wanting cluster and the other not, Ms. Burns said the applicant has to satisfy the zoning ordinances in each jurisdiction, as well as getting subdivision approval in each jurisdiction, so the question becomes if there is sufficient land on either side to cluster on one and not on the other, but if they are relying on open space in Buxton to satisfy the Gorham cluster requirements and it is not clustered in Buxton, that will create a problem.

Mr. Morrell said that the right of way for Blueberry Ridge is shown to be along the town line, and asked if perhaps the town line should be down the center of the road. He said that the standard for that road is not yet set, but the other road in the development, Cobb Farm Road, will be built to Gorham's Rural Access standard. Mr. Emery said that he does not believe there would be adequate sight distance to lay Blueberry Ridge as it is shown on the plan. Mr. Emery also said that the Buxton members believe the project should be the same in both municipalities, either cluster or conventional but not both in the same development. Mr. Morrell said they will check the sight distance and if necessary move it away from the intersection to make it

adequate. Mr. Emery said that a Buxton selectman asked that the lots do not overlap town lines, such as half a lot in Buxton and the other half in Gorham.

Mr. Stelmack commented that he would be in favor of joint meetings to evaluate the subdivision throughout the process, saying that it would be more efficient for the developer as well. He also confirmed that the developer's representative would provide identical submissions for both Boards and that the process to be followed will be the same as that followed by other developers in Gorham. The four Buxton members present concurred with the concept of joint meetings, and Mr. Emery suggested that the meetings be held on an alternating schedule between the two towns.

Mr. Emery told Mr. Grant that Buxton has no length limit on dead-end roads, and in their subdivisions, dead-end roads are allowed to have either a cul-de-sac or a hammerhead. Mr. Grant and Mr. Morrell discussed the length of the roads on the Gorham side of the project, and Mr. Shields pointed out that the 1500 foot distance starts from the intersecting streets of Cobb Farm and Blueberry Ridge. Mr. Grant noted that Buxton has adopted Gorham's standards on sprinkling of houses, and many of the Fire Chief's concerns could be addressed if houses in both jurisdictions are sprinkled.

Mr. Morrell confirmed to Ms. Robie that the utilities are proposed to be underground in Gorham and overhead in Buxton. Mr. Baldinelli asked why not do it the same way in both jurisdictions, and Mr. Morrell replied that if the Boards wish it to be underground in both, they will look into that. Mr. Emery said Buxton encourages undergrounding of utilities in cluster subdivisions. Mr. Neily commented that any proposed open space in a cluster plan must be useable land. At Mr. Baldinelli's request, Mr. Morrell showed the cluster plan to illustrate the open space.

Ms. Robie asked about the nearest public water. Mr. Grant and Mr. Morrell both opined that the distance to public water is significant. Mr. Emery commented that the Boards need to consider dealing with their respective Public Works Directors to see how plowing should be handled. Ms. Elwell suggested that perhaps those responsibilities could be alternated.

It was agreed that Ms. Fossum will work with Ms. Emery about setting up the next meeting once the applicant is ready to come forward with preliminary plans. It was also agreed that the December 3, 2005 sitewalk will be subject to weather conditions, snow permitting.

Julia Colpitts, applicant, expressed her thanks and appreciation to the two Boards. [7:45 p.m.]

Meeting Paused to Permit Buxton Board Members to Leave

**3. SITE PLAN – “COMMERCIAL CONDOMINIUMS” – 3 GORHAM INDUSTRIAL PARKWAY
– by WYER ISLAND, LLC, PAUL DESCHAIES, MEMBER
PUBLIC HEARING**

Request for approval of a 21,600 sq. ft., 13-unit commercial condominium on 4.72 acres in the Grondin Commercial Subdivision. Zoned I; M12/L26.007.

Owens McCullough, Sebago Technics, appeared on behalf of the applicant and explained that the project now involves one single story building instead of two, as originally proposed, and will consist of 13 commercial condominium units, and will utilize 32% coverage of the site. Each unit will have a small office space, an at-grade overhead delivery door with warehouse and storage space. There will be 5 parking spaces allocated for each unit, and 2 handicapped spaces for the site. The entrance closest to Route 25 will be one way into the site, and the other entrance will provide two-way entrance and exit. Mr. McCullough said that a waiver of 50% of the 100 foot perimeter setback from Route 25 is being requested. He said that the building is 145 feet back from Route 25, and the parking area is 65 feet back from the property line. Mr. McCullough described the proposed berm to be constructed and the aggressive landscaping being proposed, such as the

large size sugar maples that will be planted with infill of Colorado spruce and balsam fir. He indicated that the required Site Location Permit has been obtained from MDEP.

Mr. Shields gave the staff comments and discussed the setback waiver request, saying that the Board has the right to waive that 100 foot setback along Route 25 if they believe the required performance standards have been met and the landscaping to be provided is adequate to provide a visual buffer.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPENED:

Joseph Guimond, 680 Main Street, expressed concern about the view from his house across Route 25 at this property's edge into the re-cycling facility. Ms. Fossum said that the end units could be in open view and perhaps the number of trees should be increased at that end. Mr. McCullough said that building a berm at that end would block the drainage for Route 25, but they would take a look to see if more firs should be planted.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ENDED.

Mr. Neily complimented the applicant on the landscaping plan and said he would be amenable to reducing the 100 foot buffer to 50 feet. Mr. Stelmack echoed Mr. Neily's comments and said that the proposed landscaping should help screen out the view of the recycling facility. Mr. Grant and Ms. Robie concurred that the 100 foot buffer could be reduced to 50 feet. Mr. McCullough showed Ms. Robie which sections of granite curbing will remain and which will be removed.

Mark Stelmack MOVED and Clark Neily SECONDED a motion that in accordance with Chapter I, Section XII, E, 2), the Planning Board finds that reducing the 100 foot perimeter setback by 50 feet as shown on the site plan will result in a better plan of development for the project site, and the Board therefore approves the reduced perimeter setback. Motion CARRIED, 4 ayes (Douglas Boyce, Thomas Hughes and Michael Parker absent). [8:15 p.m.]

Clark Neily MOVED and Susan Robie SECONDED a motion to grant Wyer Island, LLC's request for approval of a proposed 21,600 square foot building and associated site improvements on Lot #7 of the Grondin Commercial Subdivision off Gorham Industrial Parkway with conditions of approval as posted prior to the meeting and discussed with the applicant.

Discussion: Mr. McCullough noted that Conditions of Approval #5, #8, and #9 refer to more than one building, whereas the proposal now is for a single building. Mr. Shields changed the relevant Conditions of Approval as follows:

- #5: Change "*That the buildings...*" to "*That the building...*;"
- #8: Change "*That each of the two buildings shall have ...as well as the main fire control panel for each building*" to "*That each building shall have... as well as the main fire control panel for the building;*"
- #9: Change "*That if the buildings are supplied...*" to "*That if the building is supplied...*"
- #13 Correct the typographic error in "*That the buildings alarm system...*" to "*That the building's alarm system...*"

Motion CARRIED, 4 ayes (Douglas Boyce, Thomas Hughes and Michael Parker absent)..[8:17 p.m.]

10 Minute Stretch Break to 8:27 p.m.

4. PRELIMINARY/FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN AMENDMENT – “GORDON FARMS SUBDIVISION PHASE I & II” - off MERCIER WAY - by MGM BUILDERS, INC., DONALD G. McNAMARA & DARIA C. McNAMARA

Request for approval of a subdivision amendment for a proposed lot line change to Lots 10 & 27. Zone R; Map 45/23.310&.427.

Michael Manning, MGM Builders, explained that the lot line change request is to correct a setback problem, amending the subdivision by moving the line between Lots 10 and 27 to convey 3847 square feet of land from Lot 10 in Phase I to Lot 27 in Phase II.

Mr. Shields gave the staff report, saying that the hydrogeologic study initially recommended involving the septic system is no longer applicable, but asked if the Board wanted to impose a time constraint on the removal by Mr. Manning of the septic system on Lot 27. Ms. Burns suggested that if the Board wishes to create a condition of approval involving the relocation of the septic system it would be better not to put in any time limitation in case something happened and the parties were to agree to extend the time.

Ms. Fossum read a proposed new condition of approval #5, as follows: "That the septic system constructed for Lot 10 shall be relocated so that it does not encroach on to Lot 27 and that the area of Lot 27 from where the septic system is removed shall be restored through the grading, loaming and seeding of all areas disturbed during the site work."

Mark Stelmack MOVED and Clark Neily SECONDED a motion to adopt new Condition #5 and existing Condition #5 becomes Condition #6. Motion CARRIED, 4 ayes (Douglas Boyce, Thomas Hughes and Michael Parker absent). [8:41 p.m.]

Susan Robie MOVED and Mark Stelmack SECONDED a motion to waive the procedures leading up to Final Approval required under Sections III and IV of Chapter III of the Gorham Land Use and Development Code due to the nature of the proposed amendment and grant preliminary and final approvals of MGM Builder's request for a lot line amendment between Lot #10 in Phase I and Lot #27 in Phase II of the Gordon Farms Subdivision with conditions of approval as posted prior to the meeting, amended during the meeting and discussed with the applicant. Motion CARRIED, 4 ayes (Douglas Boyce, Thomas Hughes and Michael Parker absent). [8:42 p.m.]

5. PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION / PRIVATE WAY PLAN – "McADAM SUBDIVISION / McADAM DRIVE – off 253 NEW PORTLAND ROAD – by LAURENCE J. & LINDA H. KEEF
Request for preliminary plan approval of a two-lot residential subdivision and 275' +/- private way on 10.68 acres. Zoned R; M29/L4.202.

Les Berry, BH2M Engineers, appeared on behalf of the applicants and explained the proposal to create a 300 foot private way with hammerhead and a two lot residential subdivision on a 12 acre parcel south of New Portland Road.

Mr. Shields gave the staff comments, noting that the lot sizes will have at least 200 feet of frontage and will vary between 40,100 square feet to 206,910 square feet. He said that the private way will require the filling of approximately 11,490 square feet of wetlands and will require a Tier 1 wetlands permit from DEP prior to final approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPENED: None offered.
PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ENDED.

Mr. Stelmack asked Mr. Berry to explain the methodology for the area chosen for the private way. Mr. Shields commented that there is no shoreland zone or flood plain involved with this site.

Mark Stelmack MOVED and Susan Robie SECONDED a motion to grant Laurence and Linda Keef's request for preliminary subdivision plan approval of the proposed "McAdam Subdivision," a 2-lot residential subdivision on 12 acres off New Portland Road, zoned Rural, Map 29, Lots 4.001 and 4.002. Motion CARRIED, 4 ayes (Douglas Boyce, Thomas Hughes, and Michael Parker absent). [8:50 p.m.]

6. DISCUSSION: SUBDIVISION PLAN AMENDMENT – “PLUMMER ROAD” - off 105 PLUMMER ROAD - by ALBERT & DENISE MEROLA

Discussion of the proposal to use a shared driveway to serve three lots. Zoned R-SZ; M86;L6.002.

Tom Greer, Pinkham & Greer, appeared on behalf of the applicants and asked for direction from the Board about the feasibility of using a shared driveway to serve three lots being proposed in this application. Mr. Greer said that the applicant would prefer not to cross the brook to gain access to the building areas for the proposed new lots but would rather use the existing driveway off Plummer Road and build the upper portion of the drive to private way standards. He said that the first 150 feet of the existing drive would be difficult to construct to private way standards because of the adjacent property line, steep grade and proximity to the brook. Mr. Greer addressed the concerns of the Fire Chief in maneuvering the driveway by saying he believes that the Chief went up the wrong drive, and that the Chief has not had any trouble going up the Merola's drive, which is relatively flat

Mr. Grant commented that he disagreed with Mr. Greer's statement about the steepness of the Merola driveway. Mr. Stelmack asked the Town Attorney if there are any legal concerns with regard to the Code about which the Board needs to be aware in considering this proposal. Ms. Burns replied there are some potential Code issues, in particular there is a question as to whether a driveway can serve more than one lot, and she is not confident that the Code allows a driveway to serve three lots where it is the only access to the lots. She said that more research will be required on the issue. Ms. Robie asked about the road width going over the bridge and obtaining a 50 foot right of way easement from a neighbor; Mr. Greer replied that the neighbor will provide a construction easement to allow building side slopes on the neighbor's side. Mr. Greer said that a 50 foot right of way can be obtained from the boundary line toward the brook, and they would ask for a waiver from the road itself being in the center of that right of way. Mr. Greer said that if the Board is looking for the whole road to be built to a private way standard, they will do that, that it might as well be a private way.

Mr. Shields noted that the Board has reviewed a subdivision across the road from this proposal and said there may be offset distance issues involved. Mr. Greer asked if the two roads don't meet the standards, would that be a deal breaker for the Board. Mr. Grant said it is something that the Board would have to consider, based on other circumstances. Ms. Robie commented that if even if the distances between the two roads was narrower than that required by the Code, it is still a better alternative than crossing the brook. Mr. Stelmack asked for a plan that shows both the shared driveway and the alternative which would cross the stream. Mr. Shields asked if the Board would like to see another plan showing the private way and the proposed location of the roadway across the street. Mr. Grant noted that there are 3 Board members not present whose input will be important.

Ms. Fossum asked Mr. Greer to clarify where the other driveway is that they believe the Fire Chief inspected. She said that she thought that at the site walk the Merolas indicated that the Fire Chief had been up their driveway.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Clark Neily MOVED and Mark Stelmack SECONDED a motion to adjourn. Motion CARRIED, 4 ayes (Douglas Boyce, Thomas Hughes, and Michael Parker absent). [9:06 p.m.]

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara C. Skinner, Clerk of the Board
_____, 2005

**3. SITE PLAN – “COMMERCIAL CONDOMINIUMS” – 3 GORHAM INDUSTRIAL PARKWAY
– by WYER ISLAND, LLC, PAUL DESCHAIES, MEMBER**

Approved
Conditions of Approval:

1. That this approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in this application and supporting documents submitted and affirmed by the applicant and that any variation from the plans, proposals and supporting documents is subject to review and approval by the Planning Board, except for de minimis changes which the Director of Planning may approve;
2. That the applicant is responsible for obtaining all local, state and federal permits required for the development of this project;
3. That all construction and site alterations shall be done in accordance with the “Maine Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook for Construction: Best Management Practices,” Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation District, Department of Environmental Protection, dated March, 2003;
4. That the applicant shall provide property line information and site information in auto-cad format to the Town Planner prior to the pre-construction meeting;
5. That the building shall be sprinkled meeting all applicable sections of the Town of Gorham’s Sprinkler Ordinance. The sprinkler plans shall be submitted to the Gorham Fire Department and the State Fire Marshal’s Office for review and permitting. The sprinkler plans shall be submitted to Gorham Fire Department at least two weeks prior to the start of installation of the system;
6. That the sprinkler test papers must be provided before any certificate of occupancy is issued;
7. That the building shall meet all applicable sections of the NFPA 101 Life Safety Code;
8. That the building shall have a sprinkler control room, with an outside door. This room shall hold the sprinkler controls as well as the main fire control panel for the building. The room will have an outside door and shall be labeled sprinkler control room;
9. That if the building is supplied with natural gas, all gas meters shall be protected with bollards;
10. That the fire alarm system shall meet all requirements of NFPA 72;
11. That a listing of any and all hazardous materials on site will be supplied to the Fire Department with the MSDS Sheets for each unit occupied;
12. That a complete set of building construction plans shall be sent to the State Fire Marshal’s Office and the Gorham Fire Department for review. The plans for the Fire Department shall be submitted by the time the building permit is issued;
13. That the building’s alarm system shall be a multiple zone panel that allows the alarm monitoring company to determine which facility a trip is coming from;
14. That before a certificate of occupancy is issued on each individual tenant/owner condo the Fire Department will be supplied a description of what the operation of the business will be, any hazardous materials used or stored, and a certificate from the sprinkler installer that the sprinkler system design meets the requirements for their type of operation;
15. That each unit shall be properly numbered with the numbers being visible from the front and rear parking areas;

16. That prior to the commencement of any site improvements and/or earth-moving activities, representatives of the developer, general contractor, site contractor, and the site design engineer shall arrange for a pre-construction meeting with the Town Planner and other staff members to review the proposed commencement date of the project, the overall schedule of improvements, conditions of approval, and site plan requirements;
 17. That the site improvements shall be completed as shown on the approved plans prior to request for either temporary or final occupancy permits for the building; or a performance guarantee, covering the remaining site improvements shall be established through the Planning Department; and
 18. That the conditions of approval shall be recorded at the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds within thirty (30) of the date of written notice of approval by the Planning Board, and a dated copy of the recorded Decision Document shall be returned to the Town Planner prior to the issuance of any building permits or commencement of any improvements on the site.
-

4. PRELIMINARY/FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN AMENDMENT – “GORDON FARMS SUBDIVISION PHASE I & II” - off MERCIER WAY - by MGM BUILDERS, INC., DONALD G. McNAMARA & DARIA C. McNAMARA

Approved
Conditions of Approval

1. That this approval is limited to specific amendments proposed and is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in this application and supporting documents submitted and affirmed by the applicants and that any variation from the plans, proposals and supporting documents is subject to review and approval by the Planning Board, except for minor changes which the Director of Planning may approve;
2. That the applicant shall provide property line information in auto-cad format to the Town of Gorham Tax Assessor;
3. That the applicant shall submit a copy of the amended DEP Order or be responsible for submitting evidence to the Town Planner of approval of the application for amendment to the Site Location of Development Act Permit;
4. That all previous conditions of approval attached to Gordon Farms Subdivision, Phases I and II, remain in effect;
5. That the septic system constructed for Lot 10 shall be relocated so that it does not encroach on to Lot 27 and that the area of Lot 27 from where the septic system is removed shall be restored through the grading, loaming and seeding of all areas disturbed during the site work; and
6. That the Amended Subdivision Plan and related Decision Document shall be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds within thirty (30) of the date of written notice of approval by the Planning Board, and that a receipt from the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds showing the date, and book and page number of the recorded plan and a copy of the recorded Decision Document shall be returned to the Planning Office.