

**TOWN OF WINDHAM  
STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
September 6, 2016**

The meeting was called to order by Ben Smith, Planning Director. Other committee members present were: Doug Fortier, Public Works Director; Brent Libby, Fire Chief; Tony Plante, Town Manager; and Heather McNally, Code Enforcement and Zoning Administration Officer.

**Approval of Minutes:** August 17, 2016

Tony Plante made a motion to approve the minutes.

Seconded by Heather McNally.

Vote: Four in favor. No one opposed. Brent Libby abstained.

**Continuing Business:**

16-28 Vance Storage Building. Minor Site Plan Final Plan Review. Ralph Vance Land Development, Inc to request review of a 4,975 square foot private warehousing building. The subject property is located at 166 Roosevelt Trail. Tax Map: 10, Lot: 71-B. Zone: Commercial 3 (C-3).

Dustin Roma was present with Mr. Vance.

- The plans had been revised to more clearly show different gravel areas.
- The remaining peer review comments had been addressed.
- The building was now proposed to have a pitched roof.
- Two of the doors facing Route 302 had been replaced with windows. One door had been placed at the end of the building. It would not be seen from Route 302.
- They had identified applicable design guidelines.

Amanda Lessard stated:

- Peer review had no further comments.
- Design guidelines had been met and additional architectural details were added to the plans.

Tony Plante made a motion to approve the application with conditions with the following findings of fact and conclusions.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**Utilization of the Site**

- The project is located on a 3.33 acre parcel. The site is currently undeveloped but 11,240 square feet of wetland has been filled and leveled in accordance with DEP NRPA Permit #L-23835-TC-B-N dated November 20, 2007. The remainder of the site is a forested wetland.

**Vehicular and Pedestrian Traffic**

- Vehicular traffic will access the site via a 24' curb cut on US Route 302.
- An existing gravel entrance is shown on the plan though the property to the north through an existing access easement. The applicant should clarify if this access will be retained.
- The site shows a total of 4 parking spaces. The minimum parking spaces required by the ordinance are 4 parking spaces (0.7 spaces per 4.975 k.s.f) for the private warehousing use. 30% of these spaces must measure 10'x20'.

- In an email dated August 11, 2016, Will Haskell, P.E., of Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers, recommended an overlapping pavement joint detail be provided where the driveway pavement butts to the Route 302 shoulder. He also stated that is unclear whether the area around the building will be paved or gravel.

### **Sewage Disposal and Groundwater Impacts**

- The existing septic system is shown on the Plan.
- The existing system was designed by Norman Harris of Harris Land Solutions, Inc on November 11/21/2008 for 150 gallons per day, to allow up to 10 employees at 15 GPD each.

### **Stormwater Management**

- A stormwater management report prepared by DM Roma Consulting Engineers was submitted with the Final Plan application.
- The development will include the construction of approximately 17,7325 square feet of building and pavement areas on the previously graveled portion of the property.
- A stormwater detention pond will be constructed to manage peak flows from the property to be below pre-development conditions.
- In an email dated August 11, 2016, Will Haskell, P.E., of Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers, states within the NPDES MS4 area and will be subject to Chapter 144 – Post-Construction Stormwater Ordinance. The stormwater management report specifies that the proposed development will not result in an acre or more of disturbed area.

### **Erosion Control**

- An Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan has been included as plan sheet 4 of 5. It is in the form of printed best management practices plan rather than on-the-ground designation of erosion control measures.

### **Utilities**

- The building will be served by public water. Plans show a 1" water line from the main on Route 302.
- In an email dated August 11, 2016, Will Haskell, P.E., of Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers, requested a detail for the pavement restoration of the trench in Route 302.
- A letter from the Portland Water District dated March 21, 2007 indicates that there is adequate pressure and volume of water to serve the needs of the project.
- The building will be served by underground electrical and telephone service.
- The closest fire hydrant on Route 302 is just south of the proposed entrance. The hydrant location is shown the plan.

### **Financial Capacity**

- The applicant has completed several projects in Windham recently, and has demonstrated financial capacity.

### **Landscape Plan**

- Existing landscaping is shown on the plan. No additional landscaping is proposed.

### **Conformity with Local Plans and Ordinances**

1. Land Use
  - This project meets the setback requirements of the C-3 zoning district.

- This project meets the minimum lot size requirements and minimum lot frontage requirements (minimum 100 feet) of the C-3 zoning district.
  - This project must meet the 20 foot landscaped buffer strip and curb cut requirements of the C-3 zoning district.
2. Comprehensive Plan
- This project meets the goals and objectives of the 2003 Comprehensive Plan.
3. Others:
- Design Standards, Section 813. The project must meet the design standards of the C-3 zoning district, along with a minimum of eight (8) of the elective Design Standards.
    - The applicant has supplied a narrative in the July 22 submission addressing the Standards in Section 813.
    - The proposed building will be of steel construction (Patco Construction Inc Elevations dated July 7, 2016). There are no windows shown, and the plane of the street facing wall includes four (4) 14'x16' overhead doors. The elevations show a pitched (12:1) roof with gables on the sides parallel to Route 302. The Guidelines call for roof pitches of at least 12:5

**Impacts to Adjacent/Neighboring Properties**

- No pole lighting is proposed. Site lighting will consist of security lighting on the building over the doorways. Detail of the light fixtures should be submitted.
- Vance has a 60' by 60' access easement over the adjacent property to the north, owned by Tandem LLC. There is a gravel entrance indicated on the plans which runs through this easement. The applicant should clarify how if this entrance will continue use and for what purpose.

**CONCLUSIONS**

1. The plan for development reflects the natural capacities of the site to support development.
2. Buildings, lots, and support facilities will be clustered in those portions of the site that have the most suitable conditions for development.
3. Environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to, wetlands; steep slopes; flood plains; significant wildlife habitats, fisheries, and scenic areas; habitat for rare and endangered plants and animals; unique natural communities and natural areas; and, sand and gravel aquifers will be maintained and protected to the maximum extent.
4. The proposed site plan has sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the site plan.
5. The proposed site plan will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results.
6. The proposed use and layout will not be of such a nature that it will make vehicular or pedestrian traffic more hazardous than is normal for the area involved.
7. The proposed site plan will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal.
8. The proposed site plan conforms/does not conform to a duly adopted site plan regulation or ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan, or land use ordinance.
9. The developer has adequate financial capacity to meet the standards of this section.
10. The proposed site plan will not alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water.
11. The proposed site plan will provide for adequate storm water management.
12. The proposed location and height of buildings or structure walls and fences, parking, loading and landscaping shall be such that it will not interfere or discourage the appropriate development in the use of land adjacent to the proposed site or unreasonable affect its value.
13. On-site landscaping does provide adequate protection to neighboring properties from detrimental features of the development that could be avoided by adequate landscaping.

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application dated July 22, 2016, as amended, and supporting documents and oral representations submitted and affirmed by the applicant, and conditions, if any, imposed by the Staff Review Committee, and any variation from such plans, proposals and supporting documents and representations are subject to review and approval by the Staff Review Committee or the Town Planner in accordance with Section 814.G. of the Land Use Ordinance.

Seconded by Doug Fortier.

Vote: All in favor.

### **New Business:**

16-29 Plaza Project, Phase I. Minor Site Plan Sketch Plan Review. Martin Lippman to request review of a 4,800 square retail/office building. The subject property is located at 881 Roosevelt Trail. Tax Map: 18, Lots: 20, 19A, 21. Zone: Commercial 1 (C-1).

Fred Panico was present representing Mr. Lippman. He explained that:

- Mr. Lippman owned three parcels, 19A, 20, and 21. He owned the Chaffin Pond property and had granted an easement to the town.
- He wanted to combine the three lots and use the easement later on. That would not be part of phase one.
- On the front section, near the hearing aid building he proposed a 4,800 square foot retail building with 15 to 17 parking spaces. Half of the parking would be on the front and half would be on the side. The project was speculative.
- A 40 foot paved entrance had been constructed several years ago to be used as an access with a second existing entrance. There were also two entrances proposed to the back.
- They would move the proposed sidewalk to the left side of the driveway entrance because of the location of the waterline.
- The roof would be flat with two canopies.
- They proposed a wood and stucco exterior.
- Septic would be located out front.

Amanda Lessard explained the properties would need to be combined by the time of final plan in order to determine compliance with setbacks.

Mr. Panico asked what exactly was required for traffic, an impact study or an analysis.

Amanda Lessard explained:

- The impact study was required for more than 50 trips per peak hour.
- The analysis was a general number on traffic generated.
- The Route 302 North Impact fee required that the number of new and unique trips through the Whites Bridge Road intersection may be subject to a fee.
- There was a sidewalk on the site already so the sidewalk impact fee was not applicable.

Ben Smith stated the impact study should show an estimate of how many trips through the intersection and into the building would result in a primary peak hour as a result of the new development. If it wasn't a new trip generated by the business it wouldn't be subject to the impact fee.

There was an existing garage with a driveway. Mr. Lippman said that would be closed.

There was discussion regarding how the properties would be combined in regard to the allowed curb cuts onto Route 302.

Mr. Panico said:

- They would have to keep the properties separate because if they could only have three curb cuts they would need them in the future.
- Stormwater would be out behind the building.
- Snow storage would be on the right side of the building.
- They proposed two old fashioned, low level light fixtures. One would be located in front and the other on the side.

Mr. Lippman said nothing would be combined until the future.

Committee members commented:

- Someone was working to obtain the green house property. How would combining the properties affect them?
- Stormwater would have to be kept on the property. They could not tie into the road.
- There was some concern regarding compliance with design guidelines and the length of the flat roof and the use of stucco siding as opposed to clapboard.
- The next set of plans should include building elevations and a landscaping plan.
- The site was served by public water and the original driveway provided adequate access for the Fire Department.
- Would the septic system be sized for a retail use?
- Consensus of the Committee was that a site walk was not required.

Amanda Lessard stated the property lines had to be clearly shown. Currently development appeared to cross them.

16-30 Landing Real Estate Office. Minor Site Plan Final Plan Review. Jack and Rose LLC to request review of a 2,100 square foot office building. The subject property is located at 79 Tandberg Trail. Tax Map: 67, Lot: 8. Zone: Commercial 1 (C-1).

The application required Planning Board review due to the need for a waiver request from a performance standard that could only be granted by the Planning Board. The Staff Review Committee could not consider it.

#### Other Business

Adjournment.

Tony Plante made a motion to adjourn.

Seconded by Doug Fortier.

Vote: All in favor.