



**Town of Gorham
February 4, 2008
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

LOCATION: Municipal Center Council Chambers, 75 South Street, Gorham, Maine

Members Present:

**SUSAN ROBIE, Chairwoman
DOUGLAS BOYCE, Vice Chair
THOMAS FICKETT
THOMAS HUGHES
MICHAEL PARKER
MARK STELMACK
EDWARD ZELMANOW**

Staff Present:

**DEBORAH FOSSUM, Dir. of Planning & Zoning
THOMAS POIRIER, Assistant Planner
BARBARA SKINNER, Clerk of the Board**

The Chairwoman called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. and read the Agenda. The Clerk called the roll, with all members present.

1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM JANUARY 7, 2008.

Thomas Fickett MOVED and Douglas Boyce SECONDED a motion to approve the minutes of January 7, 2008 as printed and distributed. Motion CARRIED, 7 ayes. [7:11 p.m.]

2. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ordinance Review Committee – Ms. Robie reported that this Committee has prepared two letters addressed to the Town Council detailing suggested ordinance changes. The letters involve further changes to the chapter on the design of streets and ways, and administrative changes in handling applications. These changes will be sent to the Town Council, who in turn will decide whether or not to forward them to the Council's Ordinance Committee or to return them to the Planning Board for a public hearing.

Sign Ordinance Sub-Committee – Ms. Robie reported that the Planning Board met with the Town Council on January 29 to workshop the proposed modifications to the sign ordinance, and further modifications will be made to the proposal reflecting the feedback from that workshop. It is anticipated that the proposed sign ordinance will be sent to the Council within the next two months.

Private Way Sub-Committee – No report.

3. SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

Ms. Fossum has asked that a slot be provided on the Board's agenda to give the Board an overview of the projects under review or approved by the Minor Site Plan Review Committee, which consists of the Fire Chief, Police Chief, Code Enforcement Officer, Public Works Director, and Ms. Fossum, Planning Director. These minor site plans are handled administratively by staff, and the following applications are currently under review:

1. Biofine, storage units in the Industrial Park
2. Guerin Properties, site plan amendment
3. JARB Properties, paving of parking lot
4. TNT Quickstop, ATM application
5. John Wood, site plan for a lot in the New Portland Parkway Industrial Subdivision

Ms. Fossum noted the following applications which have been approved since July of 2007:

1. Central Maine Power, new section of transmission line
 2. Landmarcs, Inc., landscaping firm on a lot in New Portland Parkway Industrial Subdivision
 3. Buster Gammon, reuse of existing space on Main Street
 4. Julie Gross and Diana Fessenden, two-unit duplex condominium in Harding Bridge Farms
 5. Lee Nason, JTL Oil, home heating oil business
-

4. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, CHAPTER II, SECTION V, MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF STREETS AND WAYS, ADDRESSING PAVING STANDARDS AND OTHER MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES AND CLARIFICATIONS TO THE STREET STANDARDS. PUBLIC HEARING

Recommendation of proposed amendments to the Town's standards for paving and other miscellaneous changes to the requirements for the design and construction of streets and ways, referred to the Planning Board for Public Hearing by the Town Council on December 4, 2007.

Ms. Fossum explained that the ordinance is being amended to provide corrective steps when a road that has been constructed has not met the minimum paving standards required by the code. She further noted that other changes have also been made, such as replacing the phrase "Town Engineer" with "Director of Public Works or the Director's designee" as the Director of Public Works is now responsible for and oversees the entire street inspection and acceptance process. She also said that a section under Dead End Streets and Streets Providing Sole Vehicular Access regarding the separation between two streets has been removed as it was unclear. Ms. Fossum also pointed out that technical requirement changes recommended by the Public Works Director have been made to the graphics illustrating road sections.

Ms. Robie mentioned the section added on page 9 entitled "Base Pavement Correction Table" detailing corrective actions if the base core is not the proper thickness. Robert Burns, Director of Public Works, explained that the corrective action will be for deficiencies up to $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch on the base course is that the measurement will be doubled and added to the surface course. For deficiencies that are greater than $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch, Mr. Burns said that is indicative of a major problem with the paving operation and various options will be considered, perhaps up to and including removal of the pavement or a two-inch lift, basically overlaying the base course with an entire new base course of 2 inches. He said that the thickness of the asphalt dictates how long a road will last, and they want to assure that any road the Town accepts will be the longest lasting product possible.

On page 9, Mr. Stelmack suggested the word "graduation" should be changed to "gradation," and Mr. Parker recommended that the phrase "...tonnage of pavement not placed..." on page 9 should be changed to "...tonnage of pavement deficiency..." The Board and Mr. Burns concurred with both suggestions.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPENED:

Hans Hansen, South Gorham, spoke about engineering review duplication, costs of paving, and said that poor paving jobs should not be permitted to continue.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ENDED.

Michael Parker MOVED and Thomas Hughes SECONDED a motion to recommend adoption of the proposed amendments to Chapter II, Section V, Minimum Standards for the Design and Construction of Streets and Ways, addressing paving standards and other miscellaneous changes to the requirements for the design and construction of streets and ways, with the Planning

Board's February 4, 2008 recommended revisions, including those discussed during the Board's workshop. Motion CARRIED, 7 ayes. [7:36 p.m.]

5. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT CODE, CHAPTER II, SECTION II, PARKING, LOADING, AND TRAFFIC, (a)(7) ALLOWING GRAVEL PARKING LOTS IN LIMITED CIRCUMSTANCES.

PUBLIC HEARING

Recommendation of proposed amendments to the Town's parking standards, referred to the Planning Board for Public Hearing by the Town Council on November 13, 2007.

Ms. Fossum said that the ordinance currently requires paved parking for all commercial, industrial and institutional uses, without exception, no matter the size of the business or the amount of vehicle parking activity. The Planning staff has long felt there are some situations where gravel parking would be appropriate. However, the impetus for this particular amendment was a request to the Town Council by Norman Richardson, a property owner on Route 237, who would like to locate a paintball facility on his property and would like to develop gravel parking. She explained that the proposed ordinance would allow commercial, industrial and institutional uses (excluding retail or service businesses) that will generate no more than thirty-six (36) vehicle trips per business day to propose gravel parking per standards being drafted into the ordinance revision, and also those uses that are proposed Rural Entrepreneurial uses that meet the performance standards of Chapter II in the Rural and Suburban Residential District would also be eligible for gravel parking.

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

Thomas Hughes MOVED and Michael Parker SECONDED a motion to recommend adoption of the proposed amendments to Chapter II, Section II, Parking, Loading, and Traffic, (a)(7) allowing gravel parking lots in limited circumstances, with the Planning Board's February 4, 2008 recommended revisions. Motion CARRIED, 7 ayes. [7:38 p.m.]

6. GRAVEL PIT AMENDMENT – “PARSON’S PIT” – off FARRINGTON ROAD – by GRONDIN AGGREGATES, LLC.

PUBLIC HEARING

Request for approval to the plan notes and conditions of approval for the Parson's Pit April 8, 2002 approval to allow the selective removal of 14 white pine trees located in the southwestern property line's 200' buffer. Zoned: Rural. (M62/L1, 10, 18, 19, and M79/L4)

Larry Grondin, R.J. Grondin & Sons, LLC, commented that he met with the direct abutter, who appears satisfied with the proposal.

Mr. Poirier gave the staff comments, noting that on May 8, 2007 the Town Attorney stated that in the area from 200 feet to the 500-foot no cut/harvesting line as shown on plan note #12, some cutting would be allowed provided it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Code Enforcement Officer that the cutting would not impair the purpose of the extent of the buffer. Mr. Poirier said he believes that the applicant has spoken to the Code Enforcement Officer to request that. Mr. Poirier also stated that the Land Use Code states that natural vegetation shall be retained within the buffer area, except as recommended by a professional forester pursuant to Best Forest Management Practices and approved by the Planning Board. To the extent necessary to protect neighboring uses from dust, noise, and unsightly appearance, the Planning Board may require the applicant to provide screening, berm or a combination where there is an inadequate natural buffer. He said that staff has added some conditions of approval to deal with this requirement,

Condition #4 “That all tree cutting activities shall be done in accordance with the “Best Management Practices for Forestry,” Maine Forest Service, Department of Conservation, latest edition;” and Condition #5, “That prior to the commencement of tree-clearing activities associated with the gravel pit amendment, the applicant shall notify the Code Enforcement Officer and the Compliance Coordinator;” and Condition #6, “That the conditions of approval shall be recorded at the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds within thirty (30) days 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 start of tree clearing activities on the site.”

Ms. Robie asked about the forester’s report and recommendations, requiring that the trees be approached from either the side or rear, and not from the front, and asked if that should be included as a condition of approval. Mr. Grondin replied that the harvest plan indicates that it would be from the side and that the harvester doing the work would do it properly. Ms. Robie said her concern was not to set any precedent in future applications, that the Planning Board does not generally allow cutting in buffers. Ms. Fossum said that Condition #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” insures that the forestry plan must be followed. Mr. Parker noted that Condition #4 “That all tree cutting activities shall be done in accordance with the “Best Management Practices for Forestry,” also covers the issue.

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

Michael Parker MOVED and Douglas Boyce SECONDED a motion to approve Grondin Aggregates, LLC, Parson’s Pit gravel pit amendment request o harvest 14 White Pine trees located in the southwestern property line’s 200’ gravel pit buffer.

Discussion: Mr. Zelmanow announced that as he was unable to attend the site walk, he will abstain from the vote on this issue. Mark Stelmack announced that he too was not at the site walk, but that he does intend to vote on the issue.

Motion CARRIED, 6 ayes, 1 abstention (Edward Zelmanow). [7:45 p.m.]

7. SPECIAL EXCEPTION STANDARDS & SITE PLAN REVIEW- “CHILDHOOD ADVENTURES DAYCARE”- at 341 MAIN STREET- by CHILDHOOD ADVENTURES, INC.
Request for approval to locate a child daycare at 341 Main Street. Zoned: Office Residential.
(M108/L33)

Jon Whitten, Terradyn Consultants, appeared on behalf of the applicant, Jennifer Morrell and Kelly Burkhardt, also present. Mr. Whitten explained that in its current location at 652 Main Street, Childhood Adventures is licensed to care for 20 children and employ 4 to 5 caregivers. They occupy the daycare with 8 parking spaces, to account for employee and visitor parking and the drop off and pick up of the children. Mr. Whitten said that the site currently under consideration is a single family home located in the Office Residential Zone, where a daycare is considered a Special Exception use, which is why the application is before the Board. The applicant also is undergoing site plan review to add some parking spaces for the business. He said that that the applicants are proposing 8 parking spaces for this site: two spaces are in an existing garage, 2 spaces are grandfathered outside the garage, and there will be 4 new spaces on site. He said there is currently a paved portion on site directly connected to Route 25 originally used for residential parking, which constitute 2 grandfathered parking spaces, but the Assistant Planner and Code Enforcement Officer would prefer not to have those spaces directly on Route 25. The pavement connected to Route 25 will be taken out, loamed and seeded, and some bushes will be planted as a visual screening along Route 25.

Mr. Whitten discussed the proposed traffic flow, with an “enter only” sign, and the existing u-driveway will be a drop off zone only. Driveway width will be expanded to ensure proper turning radii for cars. Mr. Whitten said that the front and side doors of the building will be used as primary entrances, and there will be an enclosed playground area at the back of the building. When children leave the building, they will exit by the side door, which will be enclosed within that fenced area. There is an existing sidewalk along the side of the building. He described the established drainage culvert, and said that the applicants will, as requested by the Town Engineer, clean out any overgrown or restricted portions of the driveway culvert along Joseph Drive. He noted that new lighting is proposed to be located at the rear and side doors that will mimic the lighting on the front of the building, and the lighting on the utility poles at the rear of the lot will be removed.

Mr. Whitten noted that at this site, the applicants have the option of increasing the daycare to 30 children, with a maximum of 6 caregivers. Under those circumstances, 6 of the proposed 8 spaces would be used by employees, leaving 2 spaces open for long time visitors, and the u-driveway area for drop off and pick up uses.

Mr. Whitten said that when the applicants were considering the purchase of this property, they hoped that the neighbor to the south of this site would be supportive of the proposed use. Based on conversations between the applicants’ realtor and the realtor for the property to the south, the applicants were given to believe that based on certain parameters, such as fencing, hours of operation, the southern neighbors, Mr. and Mrs. Larry Harriman at 8 Joseph Drive, would not object to the proposed use. Now it is apparent that the Harrimans have some concerns about the proposal.

Mr. Poirier gave the staff comments, noting that if it were not for the special exception use, the project would have been classified as a minor site plan and reviewed by the Site Plan Committee, but the applicant has requested Planning Board review of the minor site plan to expedite the review. Mr. Poirier spoke about the parking concerns, saying that this is an issue that should be discussed by the Board. In addition, Mr. Poirier spoke about the proposed buffer plantings and fencing and proposed lighting. He also referred to the January 25, 2008 review memo from the Town Engineer, recommending the clearing of downstream culverts, which has been dealt with by Condition of Approval #7, that states: “That the applicant will complete the improvements along Joseph Drive detailed in Town Engineer’s January 25, 2008 memo to the Planning Staff prior to final occupancy permit.”

Mr. Zelmanow confirmed with Mr. Whitten that it appears that the daycare anticipates starting out with 20 children and 4 to 5 care givers, and then expand to 30 children and a maximum number of 6 caregivers. Mr. Zelmanow expressed a need for more lighting in the drop off area, particularly in view of the fact that parents will be parking in the driveway to pick up their children.

Mr. Parker expressed a concern about traffic flow, referring to the anticipated trips of 16 in the morning and 17 in the evening peak times, not including caregivers. He referred to a possibility expressed during the site walk of creating a curb cut off Joseph Drive and asked if any consideration has been given to that suggestion. Mr. Whitten said that the 3-foot drop in grade and the turning radius that would be required makes that suggestion infeasible. Mr. Stelmack commented that the u-shaped driveway could accommodate 3 cars, along with 2 other spaces available, so that at peak time for pick up and drop off, with 6 of the total 8 spaces occupied by staff, there is room on site for 5 vehicles. He asked where the 5 additional cars would go, surmising that they would try to park on Main Street.

Jennifer Morrell, Childhood Adventures, said that many of the children who attend the daycare currently are in the same family, there are 6 families currently with more than 1 child attending. She said there are currently no problems, that typically they never have more than 4 parents at the same time.

Mr. Parker suggested that there be a sidewalk created from Joseph Drive to the site so that parents could park on Joseph Drive and walk their children up to the daycare if there is no parking on site at the daycare. Mr. Hughes concurred with Mr. Parker's suggestion about a walkway from Joseph Drive. Mr. Stelmack asked if there are parking restrictions on Joseph Drive. Ms. Fossum confirmed that Joseph Drive is a public road. Mr. Whitten said there is a sidewalk along Joseph Drive, and they could easily tie into that sidewalk across the side yard.

Mr. Boyce confirmed that expansion to 30 children would require re-licensing of the daycare. Ms. Robie asked about the fencing proposed to enclose the play area. Mr. Whitten replied that it would be a 6-foot tall stockade wooden fence but he was not sure about its ability to block noise.

Mr. Stelmack asked about whether there was more than one culvert; Mr. Whitten replied that it the one culvert at the driveway of the Harriman property. Mr. Whitten also confirmed that the firewall is a one-hour firewall on the current plans. Ms. Robie confirmed with Ms. Morrell that there are no events are planned for the daycare as there would not be the parking capacity required.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD OPENED:

Larry Harriman, 8 Joseph Drive, said they found out about the proposed daycare too late. He said that his driveway would end up being used by parents turning around to exit Joseph Drive, indicated that Joseph Drive is too narrow to permit parked cars, he would like to see a taller fence, 8 feet in height. He also expressed concern about his utilities being impacted.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ENDED.

Mr. Whitten pointed out to Mr. Parker where the utility easements are located, which includes part of the parking area. Mr. Whitten said the parking would not be impacted by the easements, nor would a walkway from Joseph Drive.

Ms. Morrell said they are prepared to do whatever the Harrimans want. Mr. Boyce said that it is very disappointing when parties purchase properties for conflicting purposes, such as the daycare and the Harriman's wish for a quiet retirement home. He said that is why a use such as a daycare is a Special Exception use, in order to insure that such uses in certain areas are not detrimental to their neighbors. He said that it puts the Board in an awkward position, and that he would like to hear from the Harrimans exactly how they feel and what they think would make the daycare acceptable under the Special Criteria exception. Ms. Robie said if there are other issues besides the 3 Mr. Harriman mentioned, the Board needs to know what they are. Mr. Whitten quoted from a November letter written by Mr. Harriman, requesting a stockade fence, and expressing concern about the hours of operation of the daycare and saying they would not object to a small daycare. Mrs. Harriman said their letter stressed a *small* daycare, and said had they known it was to have 30 children, they would not have bought their property on Joseph Drive. She wondered if the fencing could lessen the noise.

At Mr. Parker's request, Ms. Morrell discussed the times when the children are outside, with more time outside in the summer.

Ms. Robie told Mr. Parker that it is inappropriate for the Board to recommend Joseph Drive as a pickup point until the Fire Chief has had the opportunity to review the use of Joseph Drive as part of a plan to mitigate traffic on Route 25. She said she would not be comfortable without the Chief's input.

Mr. Hughes asked staff if the applicant has to return before the Board for Special Exception review if they increase the daycare to 30 children. Ms. Fossum said she was going to ask for clarification of whether or not the Board is considering approval that would allow the expansion up to 30, as, based on the license, this was being proposed for 20 children. Ms. Robie confirmed that the Board can restrict their approval for 20

children; Ms. Robie said the Board can, as that was the number that was given for the number in the application.

Ms. Robie said that she would like each Board member to express any concerns they feel the current application would have in meeting the Special Exception criteria. She said that the Board can vote on the Special Exception criteria, and if one of those criterion fails, the application is denied. Or, the Board can continue the application and it can be modified, agreement can be reached with the Harrimans, and the applicants can return at a later date. Mr. Zelmanow noted that the burden of proof is on the applicant that they meet each and every Special Exception, and the Board can only consider what is currently before it tonight. Ms. Robie also noted that she did not see the applicant's narrative on how the Special Exception can be met.

The Board members referred to the Special Exception Standards below:

Standard 1. The proposed use will not create or aggravate hazards to vehicular or pedestrian traffic on the roads and sidewalks, both off-site and on-site, serving the proposed use as determined by the size and condition of such roads and sidewalks, lighting, drainage, and the visibility afforded to pedestrians and the operators of motor vehicles on such roads.

Standard 2. The proposed use will not cause water pollution, sedimentation, erosion, contaminate any water supply nor reduce the capacity of the land to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results;

Standard 3. The proposed use will not create unhealthful conditions because of smoke, dust, or other airborne contaminants;

Standard 4. The proposed use will not create nuisances to neighboring properties because of odors, fumes, glare, hours of operation, noise, vibration or fire hazard or unreasonably restrict access of light and air to neighboring properties;

Standard 5. The proposed waste disposal systems are adequate for all solid and liquid wastes generated by the use;

Standard 6. The proposed use will not result in damage to spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird, or other wildlife habitat, and, if located in a shoreland zone, will conserve (a) shoreland vegetation; (b) visual points of access to waters as viewed from public facilities; (c) actual points of access to waters; and (d) natural beauty.

Mr. Parker said that as currently designed, there is a safety issue with regard to Standard 1. He said there is a potential solution if approved by the Fire Chief, but as the application currently stands, he could not offer agreement with Standard 1.

Mr. Hughes noted that it would be easier to find affirmatively for Standard 1 if the potential solution could be achieved, and said that Standards 2, 3, 5 and 6 are easy to affirm, but as for Standard 4, nuisance to neighboring properties, he would like to see that better resolved than it is now.

Mr. Fickett concurred about Standards 1 and 4, saying that noise under Standard 4 would be the most important issue. He said he believes that increasing the height of the fence might resolve the issues with #4, and the Fire Chief's decision will have to determine Standard 1.

Mr. Boyce spoke to Standard #1, saying that how the current operation will relate to this site, he has no concern with the 20 children size, but he would like the applicant to come back before requesting any increase in the number of children, which might also increase the amount of traffic. With respect to Standard #4, he feels that nuisance to neighbors in the form of noise is the most important consideration and in his opinion there isn't any fence of the stockade variety that will have a significant noise attenuation property to it. He said it would take a commercial type of fence to mitigate the noise. He said he really needs to hear that the neighbors are satisfied with something before making an affirmative finding relative to noise.

Ms. Robie said she is concerned about Standard #1, even with the current proposal of 20 children, because even though currently there are multiple children in multiple families, the potential exists, if the plan is approved, over time there could be 20 children from 20 individual families in 20 individual cars over a 15 to 20 minute period. She said she is not convinced that the approach or space is safe for the children. She said she concurs with Mr. Boyce's comments about the lack of acoustic properties of wooden fences, and commented that there are alternatives that could be considered, such as increasing the density and thickness of the buffering shrubs and plants between the fence and the property line, as well as small berming which can cut down on noise.

Mr. Zelmanow said he concurs with Ms. Robie's comments on Standard #4 on noise issues. As far as Standard #1, Mr. Zelmanow said that Joseph Drive is not the solution to this situation. He said that the daycare center is on the opposite side of the flow of traffic, meaning that a parent will either have to turn around in the first available driveway to park on the right hand side of the road next to the daycare center, or the parent will simply pull over next to the daycare center facing the wrong direction. Either way, it will create hazards on Joseph Drive. He also expressed concern that there needs to be additional lighting on the drop off area.

Mr. Stelmack said that he believes the application should be restricted to 20 children. Using Joseph Drive needs to be reviewed by the Fire Chief. The noise issue will be a problem, although the fence may do more than most people expect, and wondered about the existing noise level from traffic on Route 25. He said that the noise issue would prevent an affirmative finding to Standard #4.

Mr. Whitten said he take the application back and talk to the Fire Chief and the Harrimans. He said that the Special Exception narrative was dated October 5, 2007 and was also part of the January 15, 2008 package, but indicated that he will resubmit it.

Thomas Hughes MOVED and Edward Zelmanow SECONDED a motion to reopen the public hearing. Motion CARRIED, 7 ayes. [8:44 p.m.]

Edward Zelmanow MOVED and Michael Parker SECONDED a motion to continue the public hearing to a date to be determined by the applicant and staff. Motion CARRIED, 7 ayes. [8:45 p.m.]

8. SCHEDULE OPTIONAL MEETING IF NEEDED.

The Board concurred that no second meeting in February was needed.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Thomas Fickett MOVED and Thomas Hughes SECONDED a motion to adjourn. Motion CARRIED, 7 ayes. [8:50 p.m.]

The meeting was adjourned to continue the workshop which preceded the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara C. Skinner, Clerk of the Board
_____, 2008

6. GRAVEL PIT AMENDMENT – “PARSON’S PIT” – off FARRINGTON ROAD – by GRONDIN AGGREGATES, LLC.

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;
1. That all other applicable conditions of approval attached to the original gravel pit approval shall remain fully in effect;
2. That the applicant is responsible for obtaining all local, state, and federal permits required for the project prior to the start of tree clearing;
3. That all tree cutting activities shall be done in accordance with the “Best Management Practices for Forestry,” Maine Forest Service, Department of Conservation, latest edition;
4. That prior to the commencement of tree-clearing activities associated with the gravel pit amendment, the applicant shall notify the Code Enforcement Officer and the Compliance Coordinator;
5. That the conditions of approval shall be recorded at the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds within thirty (30) days 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 start of tree clearing activities on the site.