



Town of Gorham
PLANNING BOARD WORKSHOP NOTES
MARCH 7, 2011

A workshop meeting of the Gorham Planning Board was held on Monday, March 7, 2011, at 6:30 p.m. in the Municipal Center Council Chambers, 75 South Street, Gorham, Maine.

The Clerk called the roll, noting that in attendance were Edward Zelmanow, Chairman, Thomas Hughes, Vice Chairman, Thomas Fickett, George Fox, Christopher Hickey, and Andrew McCullough. Board member Lauren Carrier was absent. Also present were Town Planner Thomas Poirier and Planning Board Clerk Barbara Skinner.

REVIEW FEBRUARY 11, 2011 WORKSHOP NOTES

There were no comments or corrections to the February 7, 2011 Workshop Notes.

1. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE GORHAM LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT CODE
relating to classification of projects for Site Plan Review.

Mr. Poirier advised the Board that this item is under consideration this evening because at its February 7, 2011 the Board had decided to workshop the question of when major site plan review is triggered with projects having more than 10,000 cubic yards of earth movement or 10,000 square feet of pavement. Certain projects could avoid Board review and proceed through Administrative Review with surfacing other than pavement, and therefore there is a loophole which perhaps should be closed. The Board could recommend to the Council a zoning amendment regarding the provision of a site plan review criterion changing “pavement” to “impervious surfaces” to deal with projects currently proposing gravel surfaces instead of pavement and the effect of impervious areas on stormwater. Staff considered the current language and proposes an amendment that requires any site plan with impervious areas such as pavement, concrete, brick, or stone with fewer than 10,000 square feet of area to proceed through administrative review, and projects with over 10,000 square feet would require site plan review by the Board.

The Board can recommend the ordinance change going to the Board’s ordinance committee to review and perhaps tweak the language before sending it to the Council, or make changes this evening and then forward the language directly to the Council by letter.

Mr. Zelmanow said that the proposed language would close the loophole which would allow applicants to avoid site plan review by the full Board and go through administrative review instead. He said that in his opinion, any site which will have over 10,000 square feet of newly constructed surfacing of any type should come before the Board. The Board discussed whether the terms “disturbed” and “undisturbed” should dictate the type of review, ultimately determining that that distinction is covered already in the ordinance.

Mr. Zelmanow proposed changes to the proposed language as follows:

SECTION II – APPLICABILITY

- A. The requirements of this section shall apply to the following:

“8) The construction or expansion of ~~paved areas~~, an impervious surface such as, but not limited to: pavement, concrete, brick, stone and gravel including access drives and parking lots involving an area of more than one thousand (1,000) square feet; “

SECTION III – CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECTS

- A. Projects subject to site plan review shall be divided into two (2) classes, Administrative Review Projects and major developments.
 - 1) An Administrative Review project shall be subject to Administrative Review and shall include any project which:
 - “i. Involves the construction or expansion of ~~paved areas~~ an impervious surface such as, but not limited to: pavement, concrete, brick, stone and gravel with fewer than 10,000 square feet of area within any three-year period.”

The Board discussed a methodology to prevent an applicant from coming in for Administrative Review with less than 10,000 square feet and then returning the next year with less than 10,000 square feet once again in order to avoid triggering Planning Board review. Mr. Poirier said that should an applicant come in under those circumstances, the previous approval is reviewed, and if an applicant triggers the 3-year limitation, it would require Planning Board review. Sandra Mowery, Zoning Administrator, commented that project phasing might be required.

The Board concurred with Mr. Zelmanow’s proposed changes and decided to keep the three-year limitation in the language.

The Board concurred that the proposed language can be forwarded to the Town Council with no need to be addressed further by the Planning Board’s Ordinance Subcommittee.

Other Business. None

Adjournment.

The workshop adjourned at 6:50 p.m. to proceed to the regularly scheduled meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara C. Skinner, Clerk of the Board
_____, 2011