

**MINUTES  
FREEPORT PROJECT REVIEW BOARD  
FREEPORT TOWN HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 2019**

Prior to the meeting, the Board held a site walk of the proposed Casco Bay Ford on US Route One.

**PRESENT:** Geralyn Campanelli (Chair), Gordon Hamlin, Guy Blanchard, Adam Troidl, Suzanne Watson and Caroline Pelletier

**EXCUSED:** Ford Reiche and Drew Wing

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Campanelli called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m. and noted that Mr. Reiche and Mr. Wing are excused this evening but we do have a quorum.

**ITEM I: Informational Exchange**

a) Update on Staff Approvals

Ms. Pelletier pointed out that staff approval was given for a wood shed at First Baptist Church which will be behind the church with junipers planted along the side. She noted that the Board has discussed what the Planning Board is working on. The Planning Board's May meeting has been scheduled for April 24 at 6 p.m. and they will be having a discussion and public hearing on the overhead door provision in the Commercial I District. They will also be talking about a parking lot redevelopment overlay district in the Village Commercial area because the parking lot requirements just changed. She plans to report on what the Planning Board is up to monthly.

Chair Campanelli pointed out that both of these potentially affect the Board and she is not sure how to bridge the gap between what they are doing, how it changes the Ordinance and how it affects our decision making. Ms. Pelletier explained that this Board typically has not done a lot of Ordinance work unless it is something that originates from this Board or we are asked. They are all public meetings and this Board can attend. When we have new staff in place and the boards are settled and we can workshop, we can show the Planning Board this Board's willingness to weigh in and help them with some of these ordinances that this Board applies on a daily basis. Chair Campanelli referred to the overhead door provision and asked when the Board would get that language and how that will be changing. Ms. Pelletier advised that when she receives the language, she will forward it on to the Board. She explained the process and that it could take a while to see it. Chair Campanelli noted that any Board member could go to the Planning Board or Council to say we might not be comfortable with some of the changes.

**ITEM II: Approval of the Minutes from the Wednesday, February 20, 2019 and Wednesday, March 20, 2019 Project Review Board meetings.**

Chair Campanelli explained that she would take a motion on the February 20 Minutes but we don't have a quorum of the members that were at the March 20 meeting so those minutes will have to be tabled.

**MOVED AND SECONDED:** That we have reviewed the Minutes from Wednesday, February 20, 2019 Project Review Board meeting and accept them as printed. (Blanchard & Watson) **VOTE:** (5 Ayes) (2 Excused-Reiche & Wing) (0 Nays). Chair Campanelli explained that the Minutes from the March 20, 2019 meeting will be tabled until the quorum that attended is present.

**ITEM III: Reviews**

**Casco Bay Ford – Site Plan**

The applicant is presenting final site plans for Casco Bay Ford for a new 7,200 s.f. building and associated site improvements on Lot 2 of the recently approved CF Cousins River Subdivision on Route One. Zoning District:

Commercial I (C-I). Tax Assessor Map 25, portion of Lot 2. CF Cousins River, LLC, applicant and owner; Jason Vafiades, Atlantic Resource Consultants, LLC., representative.

Chair Campanelli apologized for the three absences the Board had last month and we have a couple more this month so there is a bit of inconsistency in the Board members present. She did review the Minutes to catch herself up. Mr. Blanchard and Mr. Troidl advised that they also read the Minutes. Mr. Troidl disclosed that he was also at the December site walk. Ms. Pelletier noted she received a hand delivery of a sign-off capacity letter from the Freeport Sewer District. She will update the Staff Report for the Board if it goes forward with a motion tonight. There was a condition referenced in them getting that letter but it has since been obtained. The Board also has a memo from the Town Engineer signing off on the storm water review of the project. Tonight, the Board got an updated landscaping plan for the project with some minor changes that were made based upon the peer review by Terrence DeWan and Associates. The site plan has pretty much stayed the same since the last meeting. The peer review was done as requested by the Board at the last meeting by Terrence DeWan and commented how the landscaping works with the visibility or lack thereof. They still don't have their signage and know that they have to come back at a later date and submit that as a separate application to get that signed off on. Chair Campanelli advised that a site walk was done tonight before this meeting.

Jason Vafiades introduced Mike Cianchette and explained the only thing that changed was the plantings and the building elevations were adjusted. There was some conversation last month that the white doors would be too stark a contrast with the Harbor Bay blue siding. Now the doors have been changed to a Sea Gray color which is a little less shocking when viewed on the plan. He pointed out where the predominance of the landscape buffering is going as well and where all the vegetation will be staying. He feels they have done a pretty good job of blending the building in and planting around it.

Chair Campanelli asked about lighting. Mr. Vafiades had a lighting plan that was submitted previously. The wall packs will be at 18' with the light shining down. The parking lot lights are LEDs with full cut-offs. No lights will shine upward. Ms. Pelletier pointed out that the notes are on the landscaping plan.

Mr. Troidl noted that the Board is looking at what is presented to us and we are talking about breaking up the view. It is going to be visible so we are really talking about buffering and screening, sort of the letter of the law versus the spirit of the Ordinance. Evaluating what we have, if the building were rotated more, you would probably see those five doors less but a fairly good effort has been made with screening although it will start out small. He feels the Board will have to ponder that one. His biggest disappointment is that there has not been any change in architecture, especially the couple of provisions in the Ordinance making anything taller than 20 feet look like a two-story building as well as single direction of siding which still remains. He mentioned the DiMillo's building which he feels is successfully broken up and looks like a two-story building and has more features to it. The north side is the side that will be seen the most for probably 100 yards.

Mr. Cianchette advised that he believes the standard governs things visible from Route One. Based upon the comments from the last meeting, they darkened the hues by adding gray to the doors. With the windows and the overhang, he feels it created a metrical break up. They would be amenable to doing some other type of siding below that band but he had not heard that specific point which is part of the reason it never changed. The doors are an operational need based on the use.

Chair Campanelli added that it appears they have broken up the solids. It is not big solid things. It is broken up visually. The discussion that took place before is to try to make the doors read as part of the walls and that there is some rhythm through there. The entrance part was not as much of a discussion as the doors or the other side facing the woods.

Mr. Blanchard mentioned that the original submission was back in November. He asked if the building has been rotated at all or has it been tucked in further into the lot. Mr. Cianchette advised that it has not been rotated. Mr. Vafiades explained that they looked at rotating it but found it had more impact on the wetlands, grading and turning radiuses. Chair Campanelli mentioned that these doors really read as garage doors and even DiMillo's doors are the same color as

the walls so they don't jump out. Mr. Cianchette mentioned that gray was the feedback they got last month but he would be amendable to changing the color of the doors again. Mr. Blanchard noted for him; it is more than just the color of the doors. He believes there is a large lot that is involved here and it is hard to see how the exception that is permitted in the Ordinance is really in play here. Ms. Pelletier read the standard in the C-I District of the Ordinance and asked the Board, based on the site walk, if it is in agreement that either of those two facades are visible from Route One? If in agreement, the Board needs to look at the second part. Two of the three were talked about extensively at the last meeting which is why we got the landscaping letter that adequate screening is provided and then the doors are designed to not stand out from this façade. They changed them to gray trying to meet that standard but if the Board feels it is visible, the burden of proof is on the applicant for the Board to decide if it has been met. Question One is are all Board members in agreement that it is visible and if so, it needs to break it down in three parts. The whole second section the Board is talking which would be further discussion, is the building design in relation to Section 527 of the Ordinance, which was amended in January of 2018. She read the introduction to that.

Mr. Troidl mentioned that in relation to the first standard of the doors, the screen, the whole deal, could the building be rotated more and would it help? Probably, the west façade is visible from Route One and potentially adequate screening is provided but obviously the problem is that the trees are not going in at 40 feet tall. We did have a peer review done to get a professional opinion. They have agreed that it seems to be adequately screened. He can go along with that and agrees choosing the gray doors helps with that as well. Going to Section 527, the north side is visible from Route One and is the most visible. We are 12 feet to the top of the canopy and have 18 feet clear of vertical metal siding that is the same color and direction as below with no second story windows, etc. For him, the doors are close to there and maybe could have been done a bit better but that is what the Board is evaluating what it gets. The north side making it similar to DiMillo's, the long side facing Route One, that could be broken down better with some two-story windows up there.

Ms. Pelletier referred back to Section 527, and read Building Design. Mr. Troidl noted for him, the north side is visible and is not 50 feet long but it brings in the two-story greater than 20 feet and we are at 30 feet at the ridge and 24 or 26 at the eaves.

Mr. Cianchette, trying to understand the Board, asked about adding more detail on the north side. Mr. Troidl explained that in his opinion, the north façade needs something above the canopy. Ms. Watson noted that she is still bothered by the five doors. She appreciates the effort made today but in one of the photos provided, the doors were shown in the same color as the siding and she feels it really recesses the look and feel of the whole building. Mr. Cianchette stated he is amenable to changing the color of the doors to blue.

Mr. Hamlin pointed out that based on the conversation and discussion we had at the last meeting, they have moved forward in the direction to address those issues and one of the things we requested was a peer review of the landscaping and it was done. That review indicates that what they are proposing would be successful and acceptable. We are also talking about a building that will be 490 feet off of Route One and it seems to him that we are adding additional conditions at this time beyond what was discussed at our prior meeting.

Chair Campanelli noted this is a difficult situation since three members were not at that meeting. They have met what was asked of them at the last meeting. She mentioned the Board has options, we could make a motion and accept it, we could ask them to make a few changes, we could do staff approval on those changes or table it again. If the Board feels it cannot approve it as is, we will need to go through every finding and say why we are not accepting this as is because as of the last meeting, they did do what they were asked to do.

Mr. Cianchette explained that they could add some false windows to the north and would be happy to have that as a condition subject to staff approval. Mr. Blanchard noted that for him, the façade facing Route One is the most visible, and without something above that canopy, it does not meet Section 527. He is trying to respect the peer review process which is set up for the Board to be able to request that, which they did last month. The peer review was provided and does agree that it is adequately screened so he does not want to be difficult for the process in disagreeing with them. At some point, he feels the Board needs to get to a motion or not a motion. Adding detail to the north facade with

windows above there would probably get him there. Chair Campanelli explained that they have not submitted the signage so they will be coming back. If this were to be approved, the signage is not part of this package. Ms. Pelletier pointed out that if the Board is clear so that the applicant knows what is expected and she knows what is expected, she would have no problem working with it, knowing that we can't design the building for them. If they make modifications that she is not comfortable with, but everything else is approved, they could always bring it back when they come for their signage. If they get into it, they may find something else that works better for them. Mr. Blanchard reiterated that he doesn't feel 527. 6-A is being met here. Only the screening is being met.

Chair Campanelli asked if there were members of the public that would like to make comments. Erin Clough of Shady Ledge Lane agreed that the ordinance has not been met with respect to the five overhead doors. She feels there are other reasonable alternatives and does not agree with the peer review. If one looks at it now, the screening is not adequate when the trees are not leafed and there is nothing grown. The overhead doors are not designed to blend visually. Even though it is more than 400 feet back from Route One, it is still a behemoth of a building on Route One and is visible from two or maybe three sides depending on what direction you are coming from. This is the same building the Board has been seeing since last year and they have done nothing to make it more interesting or to comply with the ordinance. She urged the Board to not approve it.

Keith McBride, Executive Director of FEDC wanted to respond to the interpretation of the Ordinance here. The Ordinance does not say "overhead doors shall not be visible from Route One." It says on the side of the building that is visible from Route One, you get one and if you need more than one on the side of the building that happens to be the side that is visible from Route One, which allows you to look at more than one side. When you have a building that is angled, there are technically two sides of the building you need to take that into consideration so instead of saying the side of the building parallel to Route One, it says visible. The standard is if you are going to have more than one, there needs to be no reasonable alternative and the alternative in this case would be that the project would not happen at all which is not reasonable. It is 490 feet back and is as far back as they can go into this lot on that side. This is a lot not property. This is a subdivision and they are not required to move the project from one lot to another lot. That is unreasonable. If the Board gets a peer review that says this is adequately screened, it has to be given a great deal of weight and the applicant needs to rely on that.

**Proposed Findings of Fact: (Section 602.F. of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance)**

**a. Preservation of Landscape:**

*The site is currently undeveloped and mostly cleared. The project is in the Commercial I District (C-1) and complies with the space and bulk standards of Section 409 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. The project also complies with the standards of Section 527. Performance Standards for Commercial Districts (of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance) in regards to signage, building design, vehicular access, pedestrian access and the front landscaped setback. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**b. Relation of Proposed Buildings to the Environment:**

*The parcel is not within the Freeport Design Review Districts. The scale of the building has been minimized on the visible facades through the use of architectural features, doors and windows and landscape to soften the appearance. There will be a fire hydrant within the overall development which will serve this building. The project is in the Commercial I District (C-1) and complies with the space and bulk standards of Section 409 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. The project also complies with the standards of Section 527. Performance Standards for Commercial Districts (of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance) in regard to signage, building design, vehicular access, pedestrian access and the front landscaped setback. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**c. Vehicular Access:**

Access to the site will be from a new entrance off a previously approved private road (that has not yet been constructed). Since the site entrance will be off of a private road, an entrance permit for this driveway will not

be required, (Note: Any conditions regarding the subdivision road entrance and any applicable permits would still be valid). The width of the driveway will be 30 feet which is greater than the minimum width requirements of Section 512.D.10 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. A driveway entrance permit will not be required for the entrance off of Ford Drive as it is a private road. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**d. Parking and Circulation:**

The applicant is proposing 69 parking spaces with two being ADA and which will be striped and signed accordingly. Per Section 514.B.8 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance, in the Commercial I District the “parking requirement shall be based upon a parking analysis submitted by the applicant”. This information is shown on Sheet C-101 of the submitted plan set. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**e. Surface Water Drainage:**

*A Chapter 500 stormwater permit from the Maine DEP is required since the proposed site improvements will create more than 1 acre (43,560 square feet) of impervious area. The submission was reviewed by the Town Engineer for its compliance with the Town’s Zoning Ordinance Section 529, and MEDEP Chapter 500 standards. His review comments are included in a memo dated 04/04/19. His review of the project design confirms that the stormwater management system has been designed under the Maine DEP Chapter 500 rules and is generally in compliance with those rules and the Town’s Zoning Ordinance. It is also recommended that the applicant enters into a Maintenance Agreement for a Stormwater Management System with the Town of Freeport and to be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**f. Utilities**

*The building will be served by MaineWater and the Freeport Sewer District. A capacity letter from Maine Water, dated 03/11/19 was submitted. The applicant did obtain a capacity letter from the Freeport Sewer District dated 04/18/19 which is included.*

**g. Advertising Features:**

*No signage has been included with the submission. Any future new ground signs will require review and approval by this Board as a separate application. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**h. Special Features:**

*Solid waste will be stored inside the building and there will be no outside dumpsters. The applicant is aware that commercial users in Freeport are required to sort their cardboard from other waste per Chapter 28: Town of Freeport Solid Waste Disposal Ordinance. No outdoor storage of good or materials other than vehicles is proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**i. Exterior Lighting:**

*Information on lighting has been included with the submission with the location of parking lot fixtures being noted on the plan. Full cut-off fixtures are proposed. A photometrics plan has also been submitted and meets the standards of Section 521.A Lighting of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**j. Emergency Vehicle Access:**

*All public safety department heads have reviewed the plans. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**k. Landscaping:**

*The landscaping plan was prepared by Land Design Solutions, dated January 2019 and revised through 03/25/19, and shows landscaping along the roadway, in the setbacks and throughout the site. A peer review of the landscaping plan was done by tdj&a (Terrance DeWan and Associates) from Yarmouth Maine. A letter dated April 3, 2019 from tjd&a provides guidance on how the proposal complies with the standards of the Ordinance and does include a few minor corrections/suggestions. Section 409.D.2 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance has provisions for landscaping and the Board has reviewed the plans for compliance with that section of the Ordinance. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

#### **I. Environmental Considerations**

*This parcel is not within the Marine Waterfront District or the Shoreland Zone. The lot will be connected to the public water and public sewer system. Letters from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission (dated 02/20/18) and Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (dated 05/17/18), Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry (dated 02/13/18) and US Fish and Wildlife (dated May 17, 2018) were obtained and have been submitted.*

**Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance.**

**MOVED AND SECONDED:** That we accept the proposed motion as printed in the Staff Report with the following changes: We need to strike F and amend Finding F striking the language about the capacity letter and note for Finding F the letter from the Freeport Sewer District dated 4/18/19 is included. Add another condition of approval that the north façade needs to be altered to comply with 527. B.1-A in reference to the two-story building with wall height greater than 20 feet and the north façade should come back to this Board prior to applying for a building permit but assume it is approved and they can break ground. Dealing with that north façade with the single door and the windows is Mr. Blanchard's intention. (Blanchard & Hamlin) **VOTE:** (4 Ayes) 1 Nay-Blanchard) (2 Excused-Reiche & Wing)

**Proposed Motion:** Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact and Site Plan for CF Cousins River LLC, for a new building and associated site improvements for a truck facility (Casco Bay Ford), on US Route One (Tax Assessor Map 25, portion of Lot 2), more specifically referred to as Lot 2 in the recently approved CF Cousins River Subdivision, to be substantially as proposed, site plan dated January February 25, 2019, revised through 03/12/19, finding that it meets the standards of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance, with the following Conditions of Approval:

- 1) This approval incorporates by reference all supporting plans that amend the previously approved plans submitted by the applicant and his/her representatives at Project Review Board meetings and hearings on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated conditions.
- 2) Prior to any work on the building, the applicant obtain a building permit from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer.
- 3) Prior to any site work, or a building permit being applied for, the applicant do the following:
  - A. Enter into a Maintenance Agreement for a Stormwater Management System with the Town of Freeport, to be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, with yearly stormwater reporting to the Town of Freeport being required.
  - B. Establish a performance guarantee in the amount to cover the cost of all site work associated with the project, in the amount of \$454,060.00 and in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney. The performance guarantee shall cover the cost of all site work, including the road, landscaping, erosion control, and stormwater management etc. Along with the performance guarantee, a non-refundable administrative fee of 2% of the performance guarantee, in the amount \$9,081.00, be paid.
  - C. Establish an inspection account, in the amount of \$3,000.00, for inspection of the site improvements by the Town Engineer.

- D. The developer has a pre-construction meeting with the Town Engineer.
- E. At the time that a building permit is applied for, the applicant pay a Pavement Maintenance Impact fee to the Town of Freeport based upon the size of the proposed structures and the impact fees effective at such time.
- ~~F. The applicant obtain an updated written capacity letter from the Freeport Sewer District with a copy being forwarded to the Freeport Planning Department.~~  
The letter from the Freeport Sewer District dated 4/18/19 is included.
- G. The applicant file for a Maine Construction General Permit with the Maine Department of Environmental Protection.
- 4) The conditions of approval from the October 17, 2018 Project Review Board approval for the CF Cousins River Subdivision are still applicable.
- 5) Add another condition of approval that the north façade needs to be altered to comply with 527. B.1-A in reference to the two-story building with wall height greater than 20 feet and the north façade should come back to this Board prior to applying for a building permit but assume it is approved and they can break ground

### **DotCom Comics –Signage**

The applicant is seeking approval of a Design Review Certificate for new business signs at 140 Main Street. Design Review District I – Class C. Zoning District: Village Commercial I (VC-I). Tax Assessor Map 13, Lot 19. Sean Goodrich, DotCom Comics, applicant; E&R Maine Properties, LLC., and MSSM LLC, owners; Tami Goodrich, representative.

Chair Campanelli introduced DotCom Comics. Tami Goodrich explained that she is representing her husband, Sean Goodrich this evening. He started his business in his basement and it has grown. They are excited to take the space at 136 Main Street which is the downstairs portion. It is growing in popularity of bringing in more retail to this space. She explained that their sign was designed taking into consideration the signs around it. He has an extra challenge of not only being in the basement spot but trying to get people down the stairs. This is why he has this specific sign to attract their eyes and make the space successful. The sign materials and illumination are the same as what is existing there. The colors are similar to Subway and the red is similar to what is used on Olympia Sports. The lettering style is conservative because they could have gone crazy with comic books. The sign will be located on the side of the building where the existing signs are located. The scale will be the same. Her husband now has six employees. It is the third largest customer of the Freeport Post Office following L.L. Bean and Wilbur's. He recently purchased another comic shop in Lewiston and is moving all of their customers and the potential of that business into this Freeport space.

Mr. Blanchard noted that it is a cool sign. Chair Campanelli mentioned that it is a tough spot and she hopes it goes well.

Ms. Pelletier explained that this will relate to a later agenda item and that this is in Design Review and the Ordinance is very specific about what staff can and cannot approve. This came in and it was a vibrant design for the space and she and Donna Larson looked at it together and felt that for the specific language that is in there currently, they couldn't sign off on it at the staff level. That is why they are here to add the additional panel. It is something to tie into the later conversation as well. Chair Campanelli noted that she likes the sign. She agrees it is good graphics and gets attention. It is not so busy. You can read it.

### **Design Review Ordinance: Chapter 22 Section VII.C.**

#### **1. Scale of the Building**

*No changes to the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

#### **2. Height.**

*No changes to the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**3. Proportion of Building's Front Facade.**

*No changes to the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**4. Rhythm of Solids to Voids in Front Facades.**

*No changes to the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**5. Proportions of Opening within the Facility.**

*No changes to the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**6. Roof Shapes**

*No changes to the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**7. Relationship of Facade Materials.**

*No changes to the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**8. Rhythm of Spaces to Building on Streets.**

*No changes to the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**9. Site Features.**

*No changes to the building are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- 10. In addition to the requirements of the Freeport Sign Ordinance, signs in the Freeport Design Review District shall be reviewed for the following: materials, illumination, colors, lettering style, location on site or building, size and scale. Minor changes that do not alter the dimensions or lettering style of an existing sign need not be reviewed, i.e. personal name changes for professional offices, or changes in hours of operation. See Special Publication: "Sign Application Requirements".**

*There is an existing ground sign located on the front of the property abutting Main Street. The applicant is proposing a new sign panel on the existing ground sign which is two sided. Each sign face will be about 1'x10' and made of aluminum with printed vinyl graphics and letters, as shown in the submission. A building mounted sign of a slightly different design is proposed and will be about 1'6" x 8'. This sign will be mostly visible to pedestrian traffic. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

***Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of the Design Review Ordinance.***

**MOVED AND SECONDED:** That we accept the motion as printed in the Staff Report. (Troidl & Hamlin) **VOTE:** (5 Ayes) (0 Nays) (2 Excused-Reiche & Wing)

**Proposed Motion:** Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the Findings of Fact and a Design Review Certificate for Sean Goodrich, for new signs for DotCom Comics at 140 Main Street (Tax Assessor Map 13, Lot 19), to be built substantially as proposed, submission dated 03/25/2019, finding that it meets the standards of the Freeport Design Review Ordinance with the following Conditions of Approval:

1. This approval incorporates by reference all supporting plans that amend the previously approved plans submitted by the applicant and his/her representatives at Project Review Board meetings and hearings on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated



conditions. Prior to installation, the applicant obtain a Sign Permit from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer.

### **Arrowhead Ridge – Subdivision Amendment**

The applicant is seeking approval for a Subdivision Amendment in the previously approved Arrowhead Ridge Road Subdivision. A small land swap between Lot 8 and the open space lot is proposed. No additional lots are being created. Zoning District: Rural Residential I (RR-I). Tax Assessor Map 19, Lots 24-8 and 24-COM. Michael Barry & Holly Doherty, applicants; Michael Barry & Holly Doherty and David and Pamela Argereow, owners; Michael Barry, representative.

Ms. Pelletier explained that this is a subdivision that has to come back to the Board for lot line modifications a few times. In 2011 they came for an after the fact lot split. Most recently in 2016 they came back because they wanted to alter the lot line between the open space and lot 8 to avoid wetlands. They put the driveway in and apparently just had a survey done and discovered that it was over the line. They are here again to alter that single lot line between the open space and Lot 8 so the driveway can be entirely on their property. If the Board takes action tonight, she understands the mylars will have to be signed at a subsequent meeting and under an Info Exchange at the beginning. Otherwise, it is straight forward as no new lots are being created.

Michael Barry explained that he has been building a house in Freeport for the past nine months and is excited to become a community member. Basically, the driveway was misplaced before he bought the lot so he inherited this. He explained that to move the driveway would include tearing up the gully and cutting down trees and it would not serve anybody well. It is his understanding that if the lot line can be moved a little bit, then they preserve everything that is there and the open space goes back on the back and there is no change in acreage. It is no cost for him to move the driveway because it was someone else's mistake but he doesn't want to cut down any trees on that beautiful lot. The mistake was missed by two mortgage surveys. He offered to answer questions for the Board.

Chair Campanelli pointed out that the other owners are not here but sent a letter stating they agree with the proposed changes. Ms. Pelletier added that they co-signed the application and were asked to submit something that Mr. Barry can represent them. Mr. Barry owns Lot 8 and the open space is owned by Lot 7 and 8 so that is why they both had to be okay with the change because they are joint owners in that open space lot so they both signed the application. Mr. Barry advised that he is sure the line is correct at this time.

Chair Campanelli asked if there were any public comments. Matt Cheney of 173 Flying Point Road mentioned he is a neighbor and his wife is on the Freeport Conservation Trust Board. He noted that when one looks at the revised subdivision plan in 2011, there is an easement to the Freeport Conservation Trust consisting of two 10-foot wide walking paths. One goes from the end of the road to the path and travels through the middle of the open space, and those easements are there in Mr. Barry's deed and in Lot 7's deed and referenced in the open space but the documentation is a little unclear. Freeport Conservation Trust would like to clarify the terms of that easement with a separate document that is added to this.

Ms. Pelletier advised that the easement has been historically shown as coming across the open space and it is reflected on the plan and shows it going over the lot. As far as the easement language itself, it would be a private agreement between the two parties. Katrina VanDusen came in and it doesn't appear to be a clear paper trail history but we don't do legal research on that. Mr. Barry noted he knew the easement was there and is excited that it exists. It sounds great to him that there is a well-managed trail at the end of his driveway. He and his wife do not object to the easement but he cannot speak for his neighbors. For him, where the easement existed, it will be how it is now. Ms. Pelletier noted that it is on the mylar but the two parties would have to work it out and record the language. It is closer to the edge of the Lot 8 property boundary. Mr. Barry explained that the issue is moving the property line now and making sure the easement stays exactly where it is which he is perfectly fine with. Ms. Pelletier advised that it will be on the recorded plan and that should be sufficient. If the Board takes action on this tonight, it will not record it until the next month so don't panic if you look on line in a couple of days and you don't see this new plan. They won't sign it for another month.

**Proposed Findings of Fact:****11.0 Pollution**

*This parcel is not within the Shoreland Zone. No streams have been identified on the plan. The proposed amendment only involves alteration of the lot line between lot 8 and the open space and no new development is proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.1 Sufficient Water**

*No additional building lots are being created by this amendment. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.2 Impact on Existing Water Supplies**

*Each lot in the development is currently served by a private well. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.3 Soil Erosion.**

*An erosion control plan was not submitted, however the driveway is existing and no new development is proposed at this time. The amendments only pertain to the alteration of a lot line. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.4 Traffic Conditions**

*No additional building lots are proposed at this time. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.5 Sewage Disposal**

*The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.6 Solid Waste**

*The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.7 Impact on Natural Beauty, Aesthetics, Historic Sites, Wildlife Habitat, Rare Natural Areas, or Public Access to the Shoreline**

*The site is already within a developed subdivision and appropriate setbacks to the wetlands will be maintained. The applicant previously obtained approval (dated 11/12/10) from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission and no historic or archaeological sites have been identified on the property. The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.8 Conformance with Zoning Ordinance and Other Land Use Ordinances.**

*The proposed subdivision amendment complies with space and bulk standards of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance and the open space requirements of the Freeport Subdivision Ordinance. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.9 Financial and Technical Capacity**

*The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. The plan was prepared by Hugh Gilman, Professional Land Surveyor. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.10 Impact on Water Quality or Shoreline**

*This parcel is not located within the watershed of a great pond or lake. The location of wetlands has been shown on the plans. Wetlands were delineated in 2010 by Albert Frick Associates. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.11 Impact on Ground Water Quality or Quantity**

*The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.12 Floodplain Management**

*The land is in Zone C (areas of minimal flooding) on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.13 Identification of Freshwater Wetlands**

*Wetlands were delineated in 2010 by Albert Frick Associates and the locations are shown on the recording plan. The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.14 Rivers, Streams, and Brooks**

*No rivers, streams, or brooks have been identified on the plan. The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.15 Storm Water Management**

*Based upon the size and nature of the development, information on stormwater management was not submitted. The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.16 Spaghetti Lots**

*No spaghetti lots are proposed with this development. The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.17 Phosphorus Impacts on Great Ponds**

*The development is not within the watershed of a great pond. The amendment only pertains to alteration of a lot line and no additional building lots are being created. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**11.18 Impacts on Adjoining Municipalities**

*This development is not within or does not border an adjoining municipality. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**Conclusion:** Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of the Subdivision Ordinance.

**MOVED AND SECONDED:** That we adopt the Findings of Fact and read and accept the proposed motion in the Staff Report. (Blanchard & Troidl) **VOTE:** (5 Ayes) (0 Nays) (2 Excused-Ford & Wing)

Proposed Motion: Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact and subdivision amendment, for Michael Barry and Holly Doherty, for a lot line amendment between Lot 8 and the open space lot (Tax Assessor Map 19, Lots 24-8 and 24-COM), in the previously approved Arrowhead II Subdivision, plan dated March 31, 2019, to be built substantially as proposed, finding that it meets the

standards of the Freeport Subdivision Ordinance with the following conditions of approval:

1. This approval incorporates by reference all supporting plans that amend the previously approved plans submitted by the applicant and his/her representatives at Project Review Board meetings and hearings on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated conditions.
2. The final signed mylar of the recording plan shall be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds within ninety (90) days of the date upon which the plan is signed otherwise the plan shall become null and void.
3. Prior to the sale of any lot, the applicant shall provide the Town Planner with a letter from a Registered Land Surveyor, stating that all monumentation shown on the plan has been installed.

#### **Regional School Unit #5 – Holbrook Street / Morse Street**

The applicant is seeking approval for a Site Plan Amendment at Freeport High School. An outdoor PA system is proposed. Information on amended use guidelines will also be presented. Zoning District: Village I (V-I). Tax Assessor Map 11, Lot 24. Regional School Unit #5, applicant and owner; Pat Carroll, Carroll Associates, representative.

Chair Campanelli introduced this item. Ms. Pelletier explained that a number of years ago Freeport High School did a large addition and came back and got approval for the Joan Benoit Samuelson Track and then came back for lighting of the track. There was much discussion on many things such as sound, noise and standard site plan things. As part of the track approval, she explained the unique conditions that were attached. What the Board needs to be looking at tonight would be the standard for special features. They are not changing any of the standard site features we look at. It really comes down to noise which is regulated by Section 515 of the Ordinance and that section is all about average decibel levels. She asked the Board to keep in mind the word “average” because when they go into their drawings and look at all the colors, they will see the higher decibel levels. They are not “average”. The RSU has a private document that regulates the use of this facility and incorporated some of the Board’s conditions such as no artificial noise makers and no games after six. They are proposing a couple of modifications to the conditions. Right now, it says no games can begin after six which was a condition of that past approval. They would like the ability to switch triple header soccer games which is about a handful a year, to start at seven and would alter that condition. They are not proposing to change the condition on limitation of sound-making things. A condition was added that the speakers should be placed away from the adjoining neighborhood so they would be on the neighborhood side facing the bleachers. When they did their sound analysis for the system in front of them, it is actually the loudest right underneath those speakers. They are looking to get that condition modified. After they present their information to the Board, you will see in the Staff Report the proposed motion was really modifying those couple of conditions that apply and updating any applicable findings, the majority of that under the special features. Notices were sent but she only heard from one single person.

Pat Carroll reported that he spent years coming back and forth on the high school project and he did not recognize any Board members tonight. When the project was first approved and even when it was modified for the lights, there was no money in the budget for a PA system. The neighbors were concerned about noise then and we decided to hold off and say when we get money for a PA system, we will be back. They now have some money in the budget that will fund the PA system. It is the last piece of the puzzle. They started looking at this in December or January. He displayed a plan showing the school, the bleachers, the track and game field. Long jump and triple jump events occur on the far side. There are condos that were vocal about the project when they went through the original site plan. He has reached out to them and there is a member of the committee that has been the liaison. At the neighborhood meeting a few weeks ago, two folks showed up which says a lot as far as the level of support and the relationship that has occurred between the school and the neighbors over this project. They looked at different options for the PA system and the focus is on the bleachers area because that is where the majority of the spectators will be. There has to be some sound that gets across the field to the field events for the track teams which meet three or four times a year in the daytime. There is a need to announce that the next event will start in five minutes. There is a total of four speakers all mounted on the press box. Three face down toward the field and a fourth speaker is faced toward the baseball field. They put this out to bid and received three proposals and two of which showed speakers mounted on the opposite side because it was in the guidelines to do that. He introduced Max Larue of Pro A.V., a representative for the vendor that designed the speaker system and noted he is here to answer questions for the Board. There are programs that record sound and are a part of the application. It started telling them that mounting the speakers on the opposite side really increased the

sound level at the property line. They realized they needed to come to the Board and communicate that the condition approved previously doesn't really make sense and that is why they are trying to get approval of the new design now. He pointed out where the speakers would be mounted. All the equipment is mounted inside the press box which is a controlled environment and the public and students are not allowed in there. A trained operator will be designated by the RSU. Once the system goes in, the levels will be tested at the property line and the instruments will be set so they will meet the Town's standards of a maximum 85 decibels in the day and 70 in the evening. Those standards are easily achievable with this sound system. They will not play music or have rock concerts.

Mr. Carroll displayed a diagram showing the level of the light and how it is directed down towards the field and not out. It really concentrates the sound in the bleacher area. The turf field will absorb quite a bit of the sound. At the property line, they installed a solid wood fence both for visual concerns and sound concerns. There is some landscaping there too. As Ms. Pelletier has indicated, there were several guidelines done relating to the sound system that were put in because at the time it seemed like the right thing to do but once they started designing the system, they realized they really needed to be tweaked. The guidelines have been reviewed and approved by the RSU Board. They are fairly detailed and cover everything from sound and lighting to timing of games and traffic and everything else that relates to events that happen on this track and field. It was done by the RSU to be good neighbors. Chair Campanelli noted the guidelines are not really under the Board's purview. Ms. Pelletier noted it is part of the Zoning Ordinance, Section 515 so it ties into the Section 602 Standards but they are definitely unique and challenging to the average person. They did meet with the Codes Officer but it is 602 per say. There were clear conditions and the best she could come up with were kind of like covenants to make sure certain things are incorporated. The changes they have before us could be tweaked a little bit so she does not see this as a document that as long as they meet the conditions of approval, would come back every time they make a modification. As far as the sound system goes, it is a little funny in our Ordinance. A lot of towns have maximum decibel levels and we don't have that. We have an average which makes it more interesting. One has to average the day's worth of decibels. There were no questions raised about the sound system by the Board.

Chair Campanelli asked for input from the public. Tim Rich of 46 Elm Street and advised that he did not receive a notice. Ms. Pelletier explained that the Town has to go out 200 feet and some of Elm Street was picked up but did not know how far Mr. Rich is in relation to the 200 feet from their property. Mr. Rich was on the Track and Field Committee and has a lot of the neighborhood e-mails that reached out. The RSU has been a good partner in this. They met back in January to look back at the guidelines to do a check-in and see what issues they may be having. The main concern for the neighborhood is parking and speeding but the clarification on the sound and the RSU is committed to saying that at the property line and when this is dialed in it will be under 85 decibels and they were going to have a max and not an average realizing with an average they could have louder decibels. He wanted the Board to clarify that it really is going to be looking at the property lines and say this volume is set at this level of 85 or below. Mr. Carroll advised that this is the direction that was given to Pro A.V. and is the direction they designed the system for.

Craig Sickles, Athletic Director at Freeport High School, advised that there are more changes that they came up with when they met with the neighborhood which were submitted to the Board. After that meeting the changes were given to the School Board and they looked at them and saw some inconsistencies in language and in grammar. He took the Board through the changes and answered questions for Board members.

**Proposed Findings of Fact:** (Section 602.F. of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance)

**a. Preservation of Landscape:**

*The site is currently developed and used by Regional School Unit 5 for the Morse Street School, Freeport High School and the Joan Benoit Samuelson Track and Field. The project is in the Village I District (V-1). The parcel abuts the Village Commercial I (VC-I) District and 295 on one side. The amendment only pertains to installing a public address system and no other site changes or structures are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**b. Relation of Proposed Buildings to the Environment:**

*The parcel is not within the Freeport Design Review Districts. No new buildings are proposed at this time. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**c. Vehicular Access:**

No changes to vehicular access are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**d. Parking and Circulation:**

No changes to parking and circulation are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**e. Surface Water Drainage:**

No changes affecting surface water drainage are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**f. Utilities:**

No changes to utility connections are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**g. Advertising Features:**

No changes to any signage are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**h. Special Features:**

The applicant is proposing a PA system which has been designed to work in accordance with Section 515. "Noise Regulation" of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. After installation of the PA system, the installer will test the decibel levels at the property line. The RSU 5 Guidelines for Use of the Joan Benoit-Samuelson Track and Field have been updated to reflect the conditions of this approval. The Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**i. Exterior Lighting:**

No changes to any exterior lighting are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**j. Emergency Vehicle Access:**

All public safety department heads have reviewed the plans. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**K. Landscaping**

No changes to any landscaping are proposed. Existing landscaping and buffering will be retained. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**L. Environmental Considerations:**

This parcel is not within the Marine Waterfront District or the Shoreland Zone. The lot will be connected to the public water and public sewer system. There is an existing Site Location of Development Permit from the Maine Department of Environmental Protection for this property. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.

**Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance.**

**MOVED AND SECONDED:** That we accept the proposed motion as written in the Staff Report. (Watson & Hamlin) **VOTE:** (5 Ayes) (2 Excused-Reiche & Drew)

**Proposed Motion:** Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact

and Site Plan Amendment, for Regional School Unit # 5, to allow the installation and use of a public address (PA) system at the Joan Benoit-Samuelson Track and Field (Tax Assessor Map 11, Lot 24), submission dated 03/20/2019, to be built substantially as proposed, finding that it meets the standards of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance with the following conditions of approval:

1. This approval incorporates by reference all supporting plans that amend the previously approved plans submitted by the applicant and his/her representatives at Project Review Board meetings and hearings on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated conditions.
2. Upon installation, but prior to use during an allowable athletic event, the applicant shall submit verification from a qualified professional that the system has been installed and complies with the applicable decibel levels as presented in the submission and in accordance with the current standards of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance.
3. No athletic event shall begin later than 6:00 p.m., with the exception of Freeport High School triple-header soccer games which shall start no later than 7:00 p.m.
4. The applicant will not permit non-school officials from using artificial noisemakers, including but not limited to, air horns, blow horns, sirens, cow bells and other artificial means of noise generation.

Chair Campanelli thanked the applicant for his detail and explanation.

#### ITEM IV: Continued discussion on possible updates to the Freeport Design Review Ordinance

Chair Campanelli noted that what the Board is looking at is from Donna Larson and Ms. Pelletier advised that she included it in the last packet. She explained that Donna did send out the rfp before she left and the requests are due back the 18<sup>th</sup>. She is still working on that project for the Town. Once they come back, we will see what we get and will keep it moving forward. She spoke with the Chair about the language and noted that it won't be worked on until we get a new Planner. She feels it is good while we have time to talk about these things and fine tune the outline so when we have new staff in place, we can workshop with the appropriate boards. Chair Campanelli had questions about the forms. Mr. Blanchard advised that he made the form based on information that is in the State form. He felt the State form did not give us enough of what we needed. She asked if the State office in Augusta would accept these forms if we don't use their form. Mr. Blanchard saw no reason to send them to the State. These are Town records and he feels the State surveys historical properties in anticipation of projects. He does not see these forms as great for what we are trying to do here. A large segment of Route One North in the Design Review District is already surveyed and is in the State data base. The surveys were done fairly recently. He feels any volunteer could move the information onto this form and submit it to the State data base if they have the access to that data base. He has it but is not volunteering.

Chair Campanelli feels we haven't been consistent in town and should know that it has not been well coordinated because we can't find the documents for the different surveys and they are not together in any kind of logical order. Mr. Blanchard explained that Donna has been to the Historical Society and made copies of all the files of buildings located in the Design Review District so the Town has copies of all those files. The Historical Society will keep their records. Ms. Pelletier explained when we did Design Review II, she kept a copy of the State form and the Historical Society got a copy. We are slowly in the process of digitizing our Town records and have 4,500 folders set up to put digital files in. She does not see why we couldn't put these in our property records files. More discussion followed.

Chair Campanelli explained that Ms. Watson went to Yarmouth and found they just did a big survey and brought back information if anyone would like to look at it. Ms. Watson noted that there was a lot of interest in preserving the integrity and the sense of place. She thought that this is where we want to go with this. She suggested inviting the woman that actually did the historical survey to come in and give us a half hour on what they learned. Mr. Blanchard noted that it was done with a grant from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission and they used volunteers to upload the information. Ms. Watson explained that Yarmouth did dams, bridges and other

structures, not just buildings. It did make her question the wisdom of going with a \$7,000 amount of money and what we could really accomplish with that. She is concerned we are trying to do something fast and not sure it will be hugely valuable. Others agreed that they, too, share that concern. Ms. Pelletier pointed out that \$7,000 has to be spent wisely in this fiscal year. There is no guarantee that we will have that money after June 30. At this point, the rfp is out there. Yarmouth had \$26,000 and it was matched. They had a lot of volunteers.

Ms. Pelletier mentioned that a couple of Board members had said that we would have the Ordinance outline finetuned before we do the survey so we are really getting what we want. That is incentive for us to keep plugging away at that outline. She will get an update from Donna for the next meeting. Mr. Blanchard asked if the Town could provide more money if we get responses on the rfp and their budget is \$10,000 to do the survey. Ms. Pelletier did not know but explained if the new Planner has a huge historic background, that could be a really big asset to us.

Chair Campanelli asked what happens to the "C" buildings that fall off the list. Mr. Blanchard explained they still have to come before the Project Review Board. Chair Campanelli advised that she needs a big picture idea. Ms. Pelletier mentioned that she is concerned that the rfp is not surveying "C" Buildings because there may be some buildings that were miscategorized. Mr. Blanchard explained that the idea is that they are going to look at the entire district. If any buildings were missed, and didn't have a designation, they would be classified one way or another through the survey. Ms. Pelletier would like to look at the district boundaries on the outskirts because of a property she has received a lot of inquiries on where the building itself is cut by the district boundaries. Mr. Blanchard mentioned having a discussion about a parcel-based approach versus a buffer for Design Review. This is a property by property ordinance that we are using here so we probably should take a parcel-based approach. He mentioned that there is an arbitrary cut-off on Holbrook Street which doesn't make any sense. Mr. Blanchard feels there may be something in the rfp about reviewing the district boundaries.

Ms. Pelletier will check with the Town Manager to see if the dollar amount needs to be awarded by the Council. Mr. Troidl feels any information we develop out of this is better than what we have now. When we key in on the results as we get at the end and determine this is a really good document for the public and decide if it should get mailed to every person in the district if their house changed. He questioned how many people know where they are and they have to come before the Board. Chair Campanelli stated that the Board will keep on this. Mr. Hamlin explained that he and Mr. Blanchard have already gone through Donna's memo so he feels it would be helpful if the Board could go through and spot check things that should be clarified or expanded. Mr. Troidl suggested that each Board member go through it and send their comments in and then they can be included in next month's packets. Everybody will be able to read them ahead of time and when the Board gets together, it can talk about the thinking. Other Board members agreed that it made sense. Mr. Blanchard explained that even the form could be changed.

Ms. Pelletier has concerns about having too many applicants next month so she suggested looking at a potential tentative date for a second May meeting if we need it. If she is wrong, the second date could be used to workshop and have this be the only thing and crank up a Design Review Ordinance and get it done. Mr. Blanchard asked if Ms. Pelletier still believes we should be submitting an outline to the Planning Board or should we be submitting something more substantive like an actually altered ordinance with language. Ms. Pelletier noted that was the approach Donna was taking once we made staff changes when she was focusing on the Planning Board. It made sense since we are not the Ordinance Board. With the lack of a staff person to see that ordinance change move forward, she suggested continuing on the same path. If we have a different person in place, she would welcome their approach. If they want this Board to make an ordinance recommendation, it sounds like this Board would be open to that. She is torn about changing the path at this point with the lack of staffing.

Ms. Campanelli mentioned that the Board also talked about doing a workshop with the Planning Board.



They have a new chair and we never have done any kind of workshop with them. She feels it would be a really good idea so we can understand what they do and also what we do. There is a lot going on and this would be a really good time but we should wait until the new staff person is in place.

Ms. Pelletier envisions two workshops. Design Review would be one whole workshop on its own and then there is all the other stuff that this Board feels passionate about but she envisioning that we wouldn't do that until we have a new staff person in place. Applications are due at the end of the month. At minimum, we need to have the outline so everybody here is on same page as to where we are heading because she would be hesitant to meet with those committees and have them ask us questions and have a person say one thing and another say something else. Mr. Troidl does not sense a massive sense of urgency and feels it would be best to have the new person here. Others agreed. Maybe in the June-ish timeframe the Board will have something it is comfortable with in writing and then we can move to the next step.

Chair Campanelli mentioned the next meeting is scheduled on May 15 but after discussion, it was decided to schedule the second meeting on May 22 at 6 o'clock. Chair Campanelli noted that the map bugs her and she feels it needs work and focus. Ms. Pelletier noted that in the meantime, the rfp will come in and she will find out more about the funding and she will send out an update on where we are with the rfp. Ms. Pelletier mentioned she can show the Board what Donna did collect from the Historical Society since it is now all in house. Mr. Blanchard feels that information would be great because the historical data section is almost done in those files but it needs to be on this form.

Mr. Troidl mentioned that site walks are good but for future condition, it is still tough, especially when there are members of the public with less experience looking at things. Most architects work in a 3D software and can produce views for us a lot more easily than in the past. He worries about if we ask for that and it gets to be unfair depending upon the size of the project and who is doing it, but we have that problem anyway when somebody comes with a napkin and others with an architect. He wants to think about requesting some of that stuff in some of the larger projects. It might make it easier for everybody to understand. Chair Campanelli stated it is not in the ordinance and is not a requirement as a submission. Ms. Pelletier advised that that was discussed for Casco Bay Ford and she raise a concern. Sometimes we get them and they are awesome and sometimes they are not so the Board decided to go with a peer review. Mr. Troidl just wanted to throw that out there that requesting that sometimes, especially for that subdivision since we have had very interested neighbors. Maybe at the next project, we should ask what they are designing in and is it easy for them to throw some 3Ds at us if we want them. Maybe that would come in the first packet instead of months down the line. Chair Campanelli agreed it is tough in the final when the Board is still working on stuff that should have been worked out in the concept. Ms. Pelletier noted the Board can recommend a lot of things and found this to be good feedback. She would like to see an introduction before the site walk and then give the applicant feedback. Mr. Troidl explained that we can only go on with what they present us. We can't design it for them.

Chair Campanelli thanked the Board for all their comments, she feels everybody is doing a great job.

ITEM V: Review of draft language from the Planning Board regarding updates to the Vision statement of the Freeport Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Campanelli explained that with the Town Planner and Planning Board Chair changes, the Vision Statement will be put on hold until we get a new Town Planner. She is not sure how that will proceed so the Board doesn't need to discuss it right now. There were redundancies in it and it needed to be condensed and cleaned up because it is kind of an outline for the Comp Plan and it could be better. She doesn't think revising it is a good idea since there are changes in the town and it needs to be rewritten.

ITEM VI: Persons wishing to address the Board on non-agenda items.

There were none.

ITEM VII: Adjournment

**MOVED AND SECONDED:** To adjourn at 8:35 p.m. (Troidl & Blanchard) **VOTE:** (5 Ayes) (2 Excused-Reiche & Wing)

Recorded by Sharon Coffin