

City of Hallowell
Planning Board Meeting
October 19, 2016
7:00 pm

1. Call to Order

Ms. Obery called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call / Quorum

Ms. Obery took the roll call and established a quorum.

Present: Danielle Obery (Chair), Richard Bostwick, Darryl Brown, Daniel Davis, Judith Feinstein, Andrew Landry (2nd alt.), Rosemary Presnar

Richard Dolby, Interim Code Enforcement Officer; Nate Rudy, City Manager

Excused: Amy Mills (1st alt.), Jane Orbeton

Mr. Landry will be voting.

3. Public Comments (The Board has agreed to limit the time allotted to Public Comment to fifteen minutes.)

None.

4. Approval of Minutes of the September 21, 2016 Planning Board Meeting

Motion to approve the minutes of the September 21, 2016 meeting as presented.

Moved: Feinstein

Seconded: Bostwick

Unanimously approved

5. Historic District Certificate of Appropriateness Application for Maureen AuCoin-Giroux, 3 Middle Street, Map 5 Lot 75

Maureen AuCoin-Giroux, 3 Middle Street, presented an application for replacement windows and replacement of exterior door trim with AZEK trim boards. She said the windows will be six-over-six vinyl replacement windows. The existing trim around the door is falling off and they want to replace it with AZEK material.

Mr. Bostwick asked if the AZEK can be made identical to the existing trim. Ms. AuCoin-Giroux said that only the trim over the door will be replaced and it will be shaped to match the existing trim. The existing roof will remain. Ms. AuCoin-Giroux provided a spec sheet for the windows and told the Board that they are identical to several replacement windows that were previously installed. There was discussion of which windows were to be replaced. Ms. AuCoin-Giroux pointed out that there are two different styles of trim because the house was built in two sections.

Motion to find the application complete with the additional information presented at the meeting.

Moved: Bostwick

Seconded: Brown

Unanimously approved

Motion to find the application in harmony with Historic District standards and approve the application as presented.

Moved: Bostwick

Seconded: Brown

Discussion: Mr. Bostwick mentioned the proposed chart of findings provided by Mr. Dolby. Discussion of the procedural details followed, and Mr. Bostwick withdrew his motion with Mr. Brown's consent.

Motion to accept the draft Findings of Fact, find the application in harmony with Historic District standards and approve the application as presented.

Moved: Bostwick

Seconded: Brown

Unanimously approved

Ms. Obery noted that the Board members have reviewed the Master Plan. She suggested using a worksheet provided by the City's consultant, Mark Eyeran. Mr. Bostwick explained that the worksheet follows the procedure set forth in the Ordinance. Ms. Feinstein suggested going down the list and setting aside any problems for later focus. Mr. Federle requested a copy of the worksheet, which was provided.

Ms. Feinstein stressed that tonight's meeting is to find completeness and that some things will be more appropriate for discussion at the Public Hearing.

Ms. Obery asked Mr. Dolby if he had noted any concerns in his review for provisional completeness; Mr. Dolby said his only concern was the last item regarding a letter from the Hallowell Water District. Mr. Morrill said that he is working with the Water District, which is currently installing water lines.

[Note: in these findings, MP is an abbreviation for "Master Plan."]

Development Narrative

The Board found that Part 1 and Part 2A and C fulfilled this requirement. Ms. Feinstein stressed that this is an overview and that at this point it seems to cover everything necessary.

Site Inventory Plan

The Board found that the full-size plans are at 1"=100' and 1"=50' and are in compliance.

a) Name, North Arrow, Date, Scale

The Board found that these are provided.

b) Boundary survey

The Board found that this is provided on MP-7.

c) Existing restrictions or easements

Ms. Feinstein observed that the Board needs to clarify if there are any easements. Mr. Morrill explained that these are shown on MP-14 by red dashed lines representing 1) the buffer along Pleasant Street that was put in place by the State; 2) a Hallowell Water District easement through that area; 3) a gas line easement running along the northern boundary between the property and The Ridges. Any other easements would be future easements for City-accepted roads with water and sewer easements. Mr. Bostwick noted an easement on MP-7 marked "Ridges Occupancy"; Mr. Morrill explained that that is a line delineating how The Ridges has encroached on the property and is not a true easement. Mr. Morrill pointed out that the buffer is adjustable by both him and the City. Mr. Bostwick noted that on MP-7 the town line shows "City of Hallowell" on both sides.

Mr. Bostwick asked if a joint meeting with the Augusta Planning Board would be necessary; Mr. Morrill said that in this case the land in both municipalities will be conservation land that will not be developed.

d) Topography of site

The Board found that the information is provided under "Site Topography" on page 14 and on MP-8, MP-13, and MP-14. Mr. Bostwick noted that there is no single topography for the entire parcel. Mr. Morrill said that he has such a plan and will provide it.

e) Natural features of the site

The Board found that "Outstanding Natural Features" on page 17 and MP-14 and the letters in Part 3 provided the information. Ms. Feinstein noted that the Board needed to verify that all natural features had been identified. Mr. Bostwick said there appeared to be wetlands missing around the pond. Mr. Morrill explained that wetlands delineation will come into play when that area is proposed for development. Ms. Presnar agreed that there are no endangered wildlife or plant species, but the Conservation Commission thinks there may be a State Champion ash tree that should be preserved. She also pointed out that there is a monument set into one of the trees by the Pre-Release Building. Mr. Morrill said he was aware of the plaques. Mr. Bostwick observed that the map provided by Inland Fisheries and Wildlife shows an intermittent stream from the pond; Mr. Morrill said it's not so much a stream as a depression where water filters through. Ms. Presnar asked Mr. Morrill to make it clear in the fifth bulleted item of Section B "Project Goals" that he will make all due diligence to identify and

permanently conserve those areas during the development phase. Mr. Morrill said he will provide a corrected page.

f) Soils

The Board found that the information was provided under “Soils” on page 14 and on MP-10. Mr. Bostwick questioned the list of soils because they were all listed as well-drained, but one of the soils marked RcA on the soils map is actually a poorly-drained soil. Mr. Morrill asked if it was sufficient just exclude that soil as a well-drained soil and clarify further; Mr. Bostwick said it was.

g) Vegetative cover

The Board found that the information is provided under “Tree Inventory and Site Vegetation” on page 16 and on MP-11 and MP-12. Mr. Bostwick noted that Crimson (or Norway) Maples are an invasive species. Ms. Presnar asked Mr. Morrill to add language about encouraging native species and deterring known invasives that are identified in the Ordinances.

h) Watershed boundaries

The Board found that this information is provided under “Site Watersheds” on page 15 and on MP-13. Mr. Bostwick asked if sub-watersheds had been defined. Mr. Morrill said that the existing built-out areas are utilizing existing stormwater systems. When it is time to design the residential subdivisions they will design drainage retention systems. They have delineated an area where the pond will be located. Mr. Bostwick noted that MP-13 does not show watersheds per se; Mr. Morrill said they will delineate finer watersheds for the new areas. Mr. Bostwick suggested using USGS’s on-line program “Stream Stats” that will delineate smaller watersheds.

i) Existing buildings, structures and improvements

The Board found that this information is provided in the “Site History” on page 11, in the “Existing Buildings Inventory” on page 12 and on MP-8. Mr. Bostwick asked if the building inventory was an eye-ball assessment or if an engineer had examined them. Mr. Morrill said that Erskine Hall has been looked over by Maine Preservation Commission and Row House and will be examined by a structural engineer familiar with historic preservation. He intends to preserve as much of the brick buildings as possible. Hayden Hall and the Farwell House are in poor shape and do not contribute to the National Historic Registry; these may be removed. Mr. Bostwick pointed out a typographical error on page 11 regarding discontinuation of use in the 1920s which should be 1970s.

j) Culturally, historically or archeologically significant sites

The Board found that this information was provided in the “Site History” on page 11, in the “Existing Buildings Inventory” on page 12 and on MP-8. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Morrill to include input from the State Archeologist.

k) Existing utilities and improvements

The Board found that this information was provided in “Site Utilities” on page 22, the “Traffic Analysis” on page 15, and on MP-8. Ms. Presnar noted that the sight lines at the intersection of Coos Lane and Winthrop Street have been mentioned. Mr. Morrill explained that the plan shows the shift of Coos Lane 50’ up Winthrop Street and that MP-5 and MP-20 show both the existing and the proposed locations.

l) Known environmental issues

The Board found that the information that none were identified on MP-7.

Site Analysis Plan

The Board found that the Site Analysis Plan was provided on MP-14. Ms. Presnar observed that on MP-9 the annotation for Permanently Conserved Open Space references dashed lines, but there are no dashed lines. Mr. Morrill explained that the lines are there but did not print out as dashed lines; he will reprint the page.

Site Analysis Narrative

Ms. Obery asked if the Board was satisfied that the narrative addresses all of the issues listed on the worksheet. Mr. Bostwick said the information was scattered throughout the document and there was no single narrative; he said he would not restrict the finding to pages 16–17 as suggested by Mr. Eyerman in his worksheet. The Board found that the Site Analysis Narrative was provided in “Site Opportunities and Constraints” on pages 16–17 and other places in the document. Mr. Bostwick asked if Mr. Morrill has undertaken a marketing study; Mr. Morrill said he has talked about it with the City Manager. Mr.

Rudy told the Board that he sent out an RFP but there was no response, so he is looking at some alternatives.

Conceptual Land Use Plan

The Board found that the Conceptual Land Use Plan was provided by the "Conceptual Use Plan" on pages 18-24, on MP-2, MP-15, MP-19 and MP-20.

Proposed use of various parts of the site

The Board found that this information was provided in "Development Areas and Land Uses" on page 20, in "Master Plan Development Parcels" on page 23, and on MP-2 and MP-15.

Primary road network

The Board found that this information was provided in "Access and Road System" on pages 20-21 and on MP-16.

Primary utility network

The Board found that this information was provided in "Site Utilities" on pages 22-23 and on MP-18.

Overall stormwater management

The Board found that this information was not addressed in the Master Plan. Ms. Feinstein noted that stormwater management provisions are cloudy. Mr. Morrill explained that he will be coming to the Board in a month or two with a plan for the Phase 1 Clustered Residential Subdivision; part of that will be a stormwater study including a quantity and quality study. Mr. Landry asked if in the existing developed area there would be any increase in paved area; Mr. Morrill said there would not and that in fact the paved area might be reduced because some of the road networks will be removed. The new residential subdivision will increase the impervious area, but that will be dealt with through separate detention measures. Mr. Landry said his question was more concerned with reuse of the existing buildings; Mr. Morrill said there could be an increase by adding in new structures. The issue of roads will involve the City's street standards and whether they can obtain variances from the roadway widths. Mr. Davis agreed that it would be impractical to design detailed stormwater plans until the location of the impermeable surfaces is known. Mr. Morrill pointed out that the individual parcels will be broken off and as those new uses come on line there will be site review where those concerns will be dealt with in the parking design and impervious surfaces. Ms. Feinstein asked Mr. Dolby if this discussion addressed the entire property sufficiently for his concerns; Mr. Dolby said it did.

Proposed development areas

The Board found that this information was provided in "Development Areas and Land Uses" on page 20, in "Master Plan Development Parcels" on page 23, and on MP-2 and MP-15. Ms. Presnar noted that on MP-16 there is no difference between the arrows designating alternate private streets vs. privately built streets and asked if it was a printing problem; Mr. Morrill said it was and he would correct it.

Proposed open space areas

The Board found that this information was provided in "Sidewalks, Trails, and Open Space" on pages 21-22.

Proposed buffer areas

The Board found that this information is provided in "Lighting and Landscaping" on page 22 and on MP-7 and MP-21. Mr. Bostwick asked what is planned for buffering the Rowe and Palmer properties to the northwest. Mr. Morrill explained that use determines what happens under the Site Plan Review which calls out what requirements apply to buffering. Ms. Feinstein said that she was uncomfortable with the appearance of the words "gas station" in the plan because it is not a permitted use and recommended against it. She suggested using the phrase "low intensity retail businesses" from page 326 of the Ordinance. Mr. Morrill agreed.

Mr. Bostwick asked about the potential residential access to the Palmer property shown on MP-20. Mr. Morrill said that was included at the request of the property owners.

Ms. Presnar observed that the letter from Kennebec Land Trust dated May 8, 2015, is outdated. She explained that one of their conditions on working with an easement across the property was based on the initial plan that Mr. Morrill was interested only in the North Field area when the State was thinking about selling the property in separate parcels. She suggested that KLT should be informed of the new plan. Mr. Morrill pointed out that portions of this plan are the result of this letter.

Conceptual Infrastructure Plan

The Board found that this was incorporated into the Conceptual Master Plan.

Proposed primary road network

The Board found that this information was provided in "Access Road System" on pages 20–21 and on MP-16.

Public water and sewerage systems

The Board found that this information was provided in "Site Utilities" on pages 22–23 and on Mp-18.

Overall stormwater management

The Board found that only one small stormwater facility is shown on MP-18 and MP-19.

Electric, cable & fiberoptic systems

The Board found that this information is provided on MP-18.

Shared or common facilities such as parking or service areas

The Board found that this information is provided on MP-19.

Interconnected open space network

The Board found that this information is provided in "Sidewalks, Trails, and Open Space" on pages 21–22 and on MP-17. Ms. Feinstein suggested that not discussing sidewalks from the very beginning of the project compromises the idea of connections. Mr. Morrill pointed out that sidewalks are included in the plan.

Pedestrian and bicycle facilities; movement within development; connections to adjacent neighborhoods

The Board found that this information is provided in "Sidewalks, Trails, and Open Space" on pages 21–22 and on MP-17.

Location and typical design of pedestrian and bicycle facilities

The Board found that information is provided in "Sidewalks, Trails, and Open Space" on pages 21–22 and on MP-17; the typical design of pedestrian facilities is not shown, but there is some narrative discussion of these facilities.

Development Standards

The Board found that this information is provided in "Master Plan Development Standards" on pages 25–30 and noted that many items reference the Site Plan Review standards as allowed. Ms. Presnar pointed out a typographical error on page 25 where the reference to Chapter VIIIA should be Subchapter VIIIA. Ms. Feinstein observed that all development will have to comply with the Site Plan Review standards as well as the additional standards in the Stevens School Planned Development District.

1) Location of buildings and relationship of buildings to street

The Board found that this information is found on the Site Plan, but that does not cover the entire property and the text does not address this issue.

2) Location of parking in relation to buildings and streets

The Board found that this information is found on the Site Plan, but that does not cover the entire property and the text does not address this issue.

3) Treatment of areas adjacent to streets

The Board found that this standard is provided.

4) Provisions for vehicular movement within the site

The Board found that this issue is covered by the Site Plan Review Standards.

5) Provisions for vehicle connection between adjacent buildings

The Board found that this issue is covered by the Site Plan Review Standards.

6) Provisions for shared/coordinated access to internal street network

The Board found that this issue is covered by the Site Plan Review Standards.

7) Provisions for pedestrians and bicycles

The Board found that this standard is provided.

- 8) Provisions for landscaping within parking areas and around buildings**
The Board found that this standard is provided.
- 9) Provisions for snow storage and management of runoff**
The Board found that this standard is provided.
- 10) Provisions for screening and buffering parking lots**
The Board found that this issue is covered by the Site Plan Review Standards.
- 11) Location of and provisions for screening service areas**
The Board found that this issue is covered by the Site Plan Review Standards.
- 12) General treatment of outdoor lighting**
The Board found that this standard is provided. Ms. Feinstein observed that the language includes Dark Sky standards and requested that every reference to lighting refer to these standards.
- 13) Location, width and treatment of buffers**
The Board found that this issue is covered by the Site Plan Review Standards.
- 14) Standards for the size of signs to be allowed**
The Board found that this standard is provided.
- 15) Provisions for coordination of signs**
The Board found that this standard is provided.
- 16) Standards for the design of individual buildings**
The Board found that the plan proposes three different standards for different development areas.
- 17) Provisions for maintaining historic character of buildings and grounds of the existing Maine Industrial School for Girls Historic District**
The Board found these provisions were met but may need clarification if historic tax credits are not utilized.
- 18) Provisions for fire protection water supplies**
The Board found that the Site Plan shows water supply for the core area but does not address the issues for the two outlying residential areas D and E. Ms. Obery noted that Mr. Dolby flagged this standard because there was no letter from the Hallowell Water District. Mr. Morrill explained that they had A E Hodsdon Consulting Engineers design the new water main system and the fire suppression system with new hydrants located throughout the campus and new service mains for the buildings being equipped with sprinkler systems. Mr. Morrill said he has a letter from Hodsdon, who was hired by the Water District to do an initial study of the requirements for this campus and what the existing system could provide. The design was based on those requirements.

Ms. Feinstein expressed concern regarding the language in standards 16 and 17. She pointed out that the Board regularly deals with the differences between replication and compatibility and should be aware that it will have to address these issues in regard to these as well.

Ms. Presnar urged the use of historical names as the project moves forward into later phases.

Mr. Bostwick noted that full development will increase traffic and asked if that would require relocation of access from Winthrop Street. Mr. Morrill said that was taken into account in relocating Coos Lane. He added that how much of an increase there will be will depend on the ultimate uses. Mr. Bostwick asked if there would be an increase in use of Overlook Drive; Mr. Morrill said Ms. Morabito's study indicated that there would not be a significant impact.

Mr. Bostwick asked if the duplexes for affordable housing would be cluster development. Mr. Morrill said they have been designed under clustered standards as part of delineating so much conservation space. Mr. Bostwick noted that a cluster development cannot directly access a public street. Mr. Morrill said they brought that point to the Board's and Mr. Eyerman's attention early on and they may need request a waiver.

There was discussion of the Planning Board's part in the process of approval of the Master Plan.

Mr. Landry noted the number of comments regarding corrections and clarifications requested. Ms. Feinstein asked if any of the concerns rose to the level of compromising the completeness of the plan; consensus was that they did not.

Ms. Obery invited the Public to comment regarding completeness.

Jeanne Langsdorf said that she didn't understand how the Board could find the plan complete without specific details about utilities and infrastructure. Ms. Feinstein explained that where the final location of roads is not known, it is a discussion about having sufficient infrastructure as opposed to no infrastructure. Ms. Langsdorf said her concern is with the way it is connected to our existing infrastructure regardless of what is built. Mr. Morrill pointed out that engineers have analyzed the existing systems and new systems have been designed. The only unplanned area is the stormwater retention system for the proposed subdivision. Ms. Langsdorf said her concern was that the Comprehensive Plan Committee felt it was important that there were not going to be any wells, that everything was going to connect with the existing infrastructure. Mr. Morrill said that the proposed plan states that it is the intention that all new residences will be connected to public water and sewer.

Motion to find the proposed Master Plan complete providing the Board's 13 requested corrections and clarifications are made.

Moved: Landry

Mr. Morrill and the Board itemized the list of corrections and clarifications:

1. Natural Features – add language “identify and conserve” the natural features on the site;
2. Soil Types – change RcA to be defined as “not well drained soil”;
3. Page 15 – include language that new plantings will use native species;
4. Deter invasives and spread of invasives during construction;
5. Addition to the watershed mapping by using the USGS “Stream Stat” maps;
6. Page 11 – correct typographical error by changing 1920s to 1970s;
7. MP-9 – fix the dashed line for Permanently Conserved Space which was showing as a solid line;
8. MP-16 – fix the dashed arrows representing privately built streets;
9. Page 25 – change Chapter VIIIA to Subchapter VIIIA;
10. State Archeological site survey;
11. When discussing lighting, refer to the Dark Sky lighting and be in conformance to lighting standards and remove specific references to gas station;
12. MP-7 – correct where “City of Hallowell” appears on both sides of town line; and
13. Update abutter's information on MP-7 – Viola Wilson Bucknam should be Laurie Rowe.

Seconded: Davis

Unanimously approved

There was a discussion about scheduling a Public Workshop. Ms. Feinstein observed that a Site Visit is optional and asked if the Board should schedule a Site Visit. Consensus of the Board was not to.

9. Other Business

Mr. Dolby told the Board that he had received an inquiry about installing a handrail on an existing porch and asked whether it should be brought to the Planning Board or approved by the Code Enforcement Officer. He was advised to bring it to the Board for approval.

10. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn.

Moved: Bostwick

Seconded: Landry

Unanimously approved

Accepted as Corrected on November 16, 2016, by a vote of 7 Yea to 0 Nay.

Attested: _____ s/ _____
Danielle Obery, Chair