

A regular meeting of the Bath Planning Board was called on 2-7-12 for the purpose of conducting regular business.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Oxtan, Chair
James Hopkinson, Vice Chair
Paul Fraser
Carolyn Lockwood
Andy Omo
Cal Stilphen
John Swenson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Haley Grill (non-voting student member)
Megan Hixon (non-voting student member)

STAFF PRESENT

Andrew Deci, Planning Director
Thomas Hoerth, City Arborist

Mr. Oxtan, Chair, called the meeting to order in the third floor Council Chambers at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 7, 2012.

Minutes of January 3, 2012, meeting

MR. HOPKINSON MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. SWENSON, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 3, 2012 AS SUBMITTED.

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL**Old Business****Item 1**

Request for Site Plan and Subdivision Amendments – 6 Oak Grove Avenue (Map 25, Lot 110); 53-57 Allen Ave LLC, applicant.

Mr. Deci described the 2007 approval for this site and the request by the applicant to divide a lot. Mr. Deci stated that much of the approval criteria had already been addressed by the 2007 approval; the applications had been tabled from the previous meeting to address several issues that were raised by the Planning Board.

Ms. Amy Bell Segal, representing the applicant, pointed out the location of the lots to be divided, the separate uses of the structures on the current lot, parking, proposed increased green area, snow removal and storage, proposed plantings, buffering, and proposed increased erosion control.

Ms. Segal noted the revisions that had been made to the subdivision plan amendment. She had added notes to the plan identifying the snow storage locations and modifying the identification of lots from 'A-1' and 'A-2' to 'A' and 'D'. The site plan information that was previously noted by the Planning Board on the subdivision plan was removed. Additionally, the new lot line was shifted to increase the lot coverage issue on the non-residential lot.

Ms. Segal described the revisions made to the site plan. She revised the plan to add additional plantings (a tree) to discourage the storage of snow from a particular area south of the residential building. The site plan was also revised to change the lot identification from A-1 and 'A-2' to 'A' and 'D' and note the new revised lot line.

Mr. Deci noted that the covenants and declaration would need to be updated and submitted to reference the new lot names, now identified on the site plan and subdivision plan.

Ms. Segal requested waivers for Subdivision approval conditions that were met in the 2007 approval and lot coverage requirements.

Mr. Hopkinson asked if, besides the lot coverage ratio, if all the other space and bulk regulations were met.

Ms. Segal indicated yes.

Mr. Deci confirmed that the Code Enforcement Officer had reviewed and noted the space and bulk regulations were met, except for the lot coverage requirement for the non-residential lot.

Mr. Oxtan opened the floor to members of the public who wished to comment. No members of the public commented. Mr. Oxtan closed the public hearing.

Mr. Oxtan opened the floor to further discussion by the Planning Board.

Mr. Hopkinson advised the applicant, in preparation for his recommended conditions, to revise the declaration to note the specific date of approval and include an attachment that shows a copy of the approved subdivision plan.

Ms. Segal and Mr. Deci noted the advisement and indicated he would insure that it was included.

MR. HOPKINSON MOVED, SECONDED BY MS. LOCKWOOD TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN AND SUBDIVISION AMENDMENTS AT 6 OAK GROVE AVENUE (MAP 25, LOT 110) FOR 53-57 ALLEN AVE LLC, APPLICANT, WITH APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

- 1. A REVISED SUBDIVISION DECLARATION BE PROVIDED TO THE PLANNING DIRECTOR, WITH A SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THE APPROVED PLAN AND PLAN DATE AND THE ATTACHMENT OF A COPY OF THE SUBDIVISION PLAN.**

AND WITH APPROVAL OF THE REQUESTED SITE PLAN WAIVER OF LOT COVERAGE RATIO FOR THE NON-RESIDENTIAL LOT, WITH THE FINDING THAT THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGE TO THE EXISTING CONDITIONS AND SUCH REQUIREMENTS ARE NOT NECESSARY AND WOULD NOT SERVE THE PURPOSES OF THE ORDINANCE.

AND WITH APPROVAL OF THE REQUESTED SUBDIVISION WAIVER OF REQUIRED SUBMISSION MATERIALS, INCLUDING TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION, HYDROGEOLOGIC SURVEY, TRAFFIC IMPACTS, STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN, EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL PLAN, WITH THE FINDING THAT THERE IS NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGE TO THE EXISTING CONDITIONS AND SUCH REQUIREMENTS ARE NOT NECESSARY AND WOULD NOT SERVE THE PURPOSES OF THE ORDINANCE.

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

Item 2

Request for Site Plan Approval – 616 High Street (Map 31, Lot 22); Hyde School, applicant.
(Continued from the November 15, 2011, meeting)

Mr. Hopkinson noted that his office was the registered agent for Pinkham and Greer, the engineering firm that developed the plans for this application. Mr. Hopkinson noted that his capacity as registered agent was limited to sending an annual letter to the engineering firm advising that their corporate status is in good standing. He indicated that he did not believe that his role with the firm would not impact his role on the Planning Board or impact his ability to make a decision on this application.

Mr. Oxton thanked Mr. Hopkinson for explaining his relationship with the applicant's consultant and asked the Planning Board to raise any objections to the continued involvement of Mr. Hopkinson in the deliberations of the application. No Planning Board members objected to Mr. Hopkinson deliberating the application.

Mr. Deci summarized the previous review of the case in November. At that time, the sole concern of the Planning Board and staff was the increased contribution of storm water to the sanitary sewer system. Since then, the applicant worked with staff to develop an off-site project to remedy the increase. Mr. Deci noted the memo included in the packet described the improvement. A copy of the executed Memorandum of Understanding was included in the packet, as well.

Mr. Tom Greer, representing the applicant, noted the presence of Mr. George Paton, the Director of Facilities for Hyde School. He summarized the application and the increase in storm water off of the site, flowing south from the project site. A description of the movement of water through a new separated line was presented.

Mr. Greer noted it was a simple solution, but that it took them a while to get to it.

Mr. Greer spoke of a required approval from the DEP that has been requested with a letter of confidence from Mr. Peter Owen, Director of Public works. The DEP approval of the project is expected shortly.

Mr. Hopkinson asked if any other approvals were necessary for the project.

Mr. Greer replied that the DEP approval was the only other permit necessary, besides Fire Marshal and Code Enforcement Officer approval of building plans.

Ms. Lockwood asked about the Planning Director's memo's reference to the MOU terms not being within the purview of the Planning Board.

Mr. Hopkinson summarized the concern and indicated that the agreement was between the City Council, acting through the City Manager and Hyde School. If the Planning Board believed that the underlying basis or engineering analysis is incorrect, or if the Planning Board felt that the applicant needed to do something related to storm water management, the Planning Board could recommend additional changes to the plan, but not the agreement.

Ms. Lockwood questioned the wording in the MOU that described that the "Hyde School as working on a site plan" when a MOU usually describes the conclusion of a negotiated process.

Mr. Hopkinson indicated that based on the lack of approval of the site plan when the MOU was drafted and executed, the language was correct.

Mr. Deci indicated that the City Solicitor had drafted the MOU and that the statement established the reason that the parties were entering into the agreement.

Mr. Omo asked if anyone from the Public Works Department was present.

Mr. Deci indicated that Mr. Peter Owen was not present, but that he could speak on his behalf. Mr. Deci described how Mr. Owen, Mr. Paton, and he had met to discuss the outstanding issue. He further described the process of developing the MOU and the responsibilities of each party.

Mr. Deci outlined the communication with the property owners affected by the required easement and suggested conditioning the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the new dormitory on the recordation of the necessary easement.

Mr. Hopkinson asked how many property owners are affected by the easement.

Mr. Deci indicated that the exact path of the line would not be certain until design had been completed, but that 4 or 5 property owners were expected to be effected.

Mr. Greer confirmed that it would likely be 4 property owners, plus the Hyde School property.

Mr. Oxtan opened the floor to members of the public who wished to comment.

Mr. Ed Benedikt, 10 Garden Street, questioned how combined sewage and storm water could be could be separated.

Mr. Greer described that the system is currently separated at the top of the site and flows into two separate lines; it combines further down the system near where another separate storm water line exists. The project would connect the two separate storm water lines.

Mr. Benedikt asked where the storm water went to.

Mr. Greer indicated that it flowed to a line that ran through town.

Mr. Deci indicated that he believed it flowed to a discharge point at the Rose Street pump station. He noted that there is sufficient capacity in the system from Hyde School to the discharge to handle this increased amount of storm water.

Seeing no further public comment, Mr. Oxton closed the public hearing.

MR. HOPKINSON MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. SWENSON TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL AT 616 HIGH STREET (MAP 31, LOT 22) FOR HYDE SCHOOL, APPLICANT, WITH APPROVAL SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE SUBMISSION OF A COPY OF THE REQUIRED DEP APPROVALS TO THE PLANNING DIRECTOR.**
- 2. ANY REQUIRED CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY SHALL NOT BE AWARDED BY THE CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER UNTIL PROOF OF THE RECORDATION OF ALL NECESSARY EASEMENTS REQUIRED TO COMPLETE IMPROVEMENTS DESCRIBED IN THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ARE PROVIDED TO THE PLANNING DIRECTOR.**

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

New Business

Item 1

Request for Pre-Application Workshop – 1 Washington Street (Map 43, Lot 21); PMH Real Estate, applicant

Mr. Deci described a memo that was written to the file and distributed to the Planning Board. He pointed out that he had been interchangeably using 'pre-application workshop' and 'sketch plan review'; these are not the same processes, as pre-application workshop is voluntary for both the subdivision and site plan processes and the sketch plan review is mandatory for the subdivision process. As such, it will be required that the applicant submit a sketch plan review application (with fees and the necessary information) before submission of a subdivision application.

Mr. Deci also noted that the comments refer to an 'illegal subdivision'. His previous understanding of the history of the two lots was that they were created illegally. Since at this time no development has taken on the sea-ward lot, there is no illegality in the creation of the parcel; previous concerns related to setbacks were negated when the applicant withdrew their

previous site plan application. However, when development (addition of assisted dwelling units) does take place on the sea-ward lot, a subdivision application must be submitted.

Mr. Deci advised the Planning Board that staff was very aggressive in their review of the application, generating many comments, but that many of the comments were stating that the additional information was necessary. Many of the comments were generated explicitly because the application was accompanied by a conceptual plan and not a formal application or complete site plan, contract rezoning, or subdivision plan.

Mr. Oxton invited the applicant to present the application.

Mr. Tom Saucier of Site Design Associates, representing the applicant, said that since the City Council passed a text amendment allowing contract rezoning within the Plant Home Zone, the applicant has another tool to remedy any setback infringements. Mr. Saucier described the submission materials, indicating a conceptual site plan and elevation were provided. The conceptual plan presented a three-story building, that allowed the footprint of the building to be reduced. He thanked staff for providing a comprehensive review, indicating that it would serve as a good checklist for future submissions.

Mr. Saucier asked the Planning Board to focus on whether a three-story or four-story building was appropriate at this location. Raising the height of the building would reduce the impacts on the land. For every story built, the area of disturbance, vegetation clearing, and visual impacts are reduced. Mr. Saucier then described the differences between a two-story proposal, a three-story proposal, and a four-story proposal, as related to footprint size, distance from the point, and height of the building.

Mr. Saucier identified the need for contract rezoning to allow additional height within the zoning district and to allow encroachment into the side setback by one of the duplexes. Additional waivers for site features, including parking in front of the building and separation of intersections, were acknowledged by Mr. Saucier.

Mr. Saucier concluded his remarks and invited comments and questions from the Planning Board.

Mr. Omo asked what the difference was in distance between the south face of the existing Plant Home complex and the proposed three-story option.

Mr. Saucier and Mr. Steve Normand, architect for the applicant, responded 60 feet.

Mr. Fraser asked if economies of scale provided a cost-reduction with an increase in height.

Mr. Normand indicated that costs had not be calculated, but height would reduce the amount of foundation and roof necessary to be constructed.

Mr. Swenson asked if the proposed duplexes could be rotated to get them out of the side setback or moved to east of the existing Plant Home Complex.

Mr. Saucier indicated that their intent in proposing the duplexes as shown on the conceptual plan was to keep them in the same locations as existing buildings. Besides the additional impacts of extending a road into the Shoreland zone to serve duplexes located on the east side of the existing Plant Home complex, he did not see any design issues to locating them as Mr. Swenson suggested.

Mr. Oxton asked if there were any additional questions.

Mr. Omo asked if the number of units would change with any of the higher building options.

Mr. Saucier indicated that all options would be based on 44 or 45 units.

Mr. Normand added that with additional stories, the footprint and unit layouts would be compacted.

Mr. Oxton asked if the original plan was still an option.

Mr. Saucier indicated that two to four stories were contemplated, though a two-story option would likely not be located at this location.

Mr. Oxton asked why the two-story option at the current location was not being contemplated.

Mr. Saucier said that they had withdrawn that proposal to keep the application process clear and because of concerns of the neighborhood.

Mr. Hopkinson asked why they needed another entrance on to Washington Street and if the entrances into the parking lots could be combined.

Mr. Saucier responded that they were trying to keep the lots separate and distinct, but they would consider combining the entrances.

Mr. Deci said that it was possible to combine the entrances and serve the lot with a shared parking agreement and access easements.

Ms. Lockwood asked if the proposed parking was located where the existing duplexes are located.

Mr. Saucier said that they were.

The Planning Board and the applicant's representatives discussed the need for more information, especially architectural information, before any decisions could be made. Discussion was made about the impacts of the different stories on the impacts on the Shoreland zone, parking requirements, and the reduction of impervious surfaces on the site.

Mr. Oxton commented that he had asked previously about the two-story option, because to him anything higher would have more impacts on the viewshed.

Mr. Saucier indicated that there were Shoreland zoning issues that may have prevented a two-story option as previously proposed; any future two-story option would be shifted to the north or proposed on the north side of the property.

Ms. Lockwood said that it would be nice to have elevations from Washington Street.

Mr. Saucier and Mr. Normand indicated they would submit those with future submissions.

Mr. Omo commented that he would prefer to see taller proposals. He prefers a smaller footprint with a design that complements the existing building. He said that viewsheds of neighbors would be improved, since even homes located on Lamont Street could see over a taller facility.

Mr. Oxton disagreed with Mr. Omo's comments. He prefers to see a lower building.

Mr. Normand described the design approach of using the context of the site—mirroring the massing of the existing building to the expansion proposal.

Mr. Normand stated that what they hoped they would get from the Planning Board at the meeting was whether a taller building was on-the-table or if it was necessary to stay with a two-story option.

The Planning Board inquired about the ability to establish a parking deck on the property.

Mr. Saucier explained the difference in cost between establishing parking where impervious surfaces already are and building a new parking garage.

Mr. Omo asked what the difference in height is between a three-story or four-story option.

Mr. Saucier and Mr. Normand indicated about 9 feet.

Mr. Omo asked if there was a possibility of locating parking between the existing building and the river.

Mr. Saucier said no, as the goal was to reduce the impacts within the Shoreland and protect the river.

Mr. Swenson asked if it was possible to move the building farther north, so as to reduce the visual impact by putting some or all of the building behind the existing complex.

Mr. Saucier indicated yes, it was possible.

Mr. Hopkinson asked what other footprint configurations had been contemplated to reduce the building's size from end-to-end.

Mr. Saucier said that the principal consideration for building width was the 75 foot-setback and how much building could fit in there.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that if they could move the building farther north, it would be possible to widen the building and reduce the north-to-south length of the building.

Mr. Omo agreed with Mr. Hopkinson's sentiments.

Mr. Hopkinson indicated that one of the principal considerations for the application would be the massing of the building. He stated that the current proposal was a very long building. He added that it is hard for him to provide a reaction to the proposal without additional information. He would be willing to look at higher buildings, if the footprint of the building is reduced. He would like to look at all possible options, especially options that address the issues of view from Washington Street and homes higher on the ridge and elsewhere in the neighborhood.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that he had not heard comments in the past from the neighbors that no buildings should be placed on the site. However, when he sees the building proposed with this plan, he sees a 'big' building—and that is not positive. Mr. Hopkinson did not think that the goals that the applicant is trying to accomplish are inappropriate.

Mr. Oxton asked if there were any additional questions from the Planning Board.

Mr. Omo asked if there was a possibility of a five-story option.

Mr. Saucier stated that in general, no, considering the context of the existing Plant Home and the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Oxton indicated that the Fire Department's reach with a ladder truck may prevent higher buildings.

Mr. Saucier described the height issue as it relates to Fire Department reach.

Mr. Oxton opened the floor to the public, requesting speakers to state their name and address. Speakers should address their comments and questions to the Board; the applicant may or may not be asked to respond to the public's comments.

Ms. Victoria Jackson, 24 Washington Street, stated that it may be less of an impact on the neighborhood to site the building where the current parking lot and duplexes are.

Mr. Oxton stated that previously that the applicant and Planning Board had reviewed an option similar to that.

Mr. Hopkinson indicated that he did not believe that the Planning Board had actually reviewed a proposal showing that configuration.

Mr. Oxton thanked Ms. Jackson for her comment.

Ms. Phyllis Bailey, 16 Riverview Road, said that she was heartened to see the proposal by the applicant, as it showed that the applicant was willing to consider the neighbor's concerns. She suggested that the applicant should remove as much development from the point as possible. Moving the building farther north and investigating an 'L'-shaped option that extended towards Washington Street would reduce the visual impact of the building. She requested that tree loss be prevented, especially near Mr. Bishop's home, since the plantings currently shield the existing duplexes from Riverview Road. She stated that this was the first time a height change was contemplated and she needed more time to assess what that meant in terms of massing of the building.

Mr. Ed Dawson, 8 East Lane, expressed his concern about noise from any proposed generators, stating that the existing generator disaffects him on East Lane.

Mr. Ed Benedikt, 10 Garden Street, stated that he had worked on the Comprehensive Plan and that this discussion is more difficult since the expansion is treated as a separate building and not an addition to the existing building. He described his concerns about the building's impact on the Shoreland zone and the need to address the impacts within 250 feet of the river and wetlands, as opposed to just the 75 feet that was discussed tonight.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that the zone is 250 feet, but that the requirements and allowable uses within the 250 feet change at different points.

Ms. Julie Rice, 27 Washington Street, expressed her concerns about impacts on groundwater. She stated that she attended the lecture series in the fall hosted by the Kennebec Estuary Land Trust and that she was concerned about the impacts of climate change and a rise in the height of the river may affect this land and the siting of the building.

Mr. Oxton thanked Ms. Rice for her comments.

Mr. Greg Howar, 464 River Road in Woolwich, said that his mother was a resident of the Plant Home and has Alzheimer's Disease. The Plant Home provides her with appropriate care and insures that she takes her medicine regularly. He expressed that the Plant Home is a national treasure. If the Plant Home wasn't there, he stated he wouldn't know where his mother would be. He added that the people of the Plant Home are good people and are trying to do a good thing. He asked the Planning Board to consider the work that the Plant Home does as it makes its' decision.

Mr. Don Capoldo, 156 Oak Street, stated that he is the executive director of the Plant Home. He stated that the Plant Home had started the process of expansion three years ago. He told the Planning Board that they were three hours away from having a review for site plan approval before the Planning Board a year ago, until the decision was made that the application constituted a subdivision and they had to change their proposal. Mr. Capoldo said that he felt that they were doing as much as possible to try to meet everyone's needs. He is not sure that they can meet everyone's needs. He stated that they previously could not go three stories, without a contract rezoning. Mr. Capoldo noted that he wants to do what is good

for everyone, but at some point they would need to do what is best for the Plant Home. The Plant Home Board does not want to put it behind the existing home, but also does not want to block any neighbors' views. At some point, if a consensus is not reached, they may have to put a building wherever they can through the site plan process.

Mr. Oxton stated that no one can please everyone. He advised that the applicant consider the reaction of the neighbors and the Planning Board and to submit an application. He stated that he believed that the Planning Board has provided a positive reaction to a taller building.

Mr. Capoldo said that he is unsure that there is a consensus of the Planning Board and what direction to go. He believes that the Board is divided.

Ms. Lockwood questioned how he felt that the board was providing guidance.

Mr. Capoldo stated that some members had indicated that they did not like a taller option and that the Plant Home was at a point where they needed more guidance. They cannot put much more time or money into what others think is best.

Mr. Oxton noted that the next step is a submission, after they consider the neighbors' and Planning Board's concerns and comments. Mr. Oxton noted that he did not think the meeting was negative.

Mr. Capoldo stated that he did not think there was a consensus and that they would move forward with whatever plan best suited the Plant Home, and will not please everyone.

Mr. Deci said that the only thing they needed to please was the codes and ordinances of the City. He stated that his job was to make sure the process was fair and objective, despite the current public sentiment. It is the applicant's prerogative as to who's concerns to account for.

Mr. Dan Daggett, of Woolwich, stated that he is the president of the board of the Plant Home. He summarized that he did not feel that he had gotten a since from everyone on the Planning Board of their thoughts on the conceptual plan. He asked to take a poll of the Planning Board.

Mr. Stilphen said that he felt that the Board conclusively said they would like to see more information.

Mr. Omo said he would like to see a taller building there, especially if it is moved behind the building. He suggested that less parking areas would be better, unless they could justify more parking.

Mr. Fraser said he would like four stories.

Mr. Oxton stated that as chair, he could not allow a poll-vote of the Planning Board.

Mr. Omo disagreed that it was a poll-vote, but rather an individual response from each member.

Mr. Hopkinson noted his opposition to continuing a poll-vote of the membership, stating that if the Plant Home came forward with a four story proposal in response to Mr. Omo, but it wasn't what Mr. Omo had in mind for a four story building, they would not be making forward progress on developing a consensus on the design. He commented that if he hired four architects to design a building, all four architects would come up with a different building—even when given the same parameters. Mr. Hopkinson noted that a poll would not provide the designers with additional information to mandate approval. He stated that there is a process in which as much information is gathered from staff and the community and then decide if they meet the provisions of the ordinance. If a contract rezoning is proposed, the review is much more conversational.

Mr. Daggett said that they had been in the process for three years and their time and money is running out. They have to make a decision, and they have done everything possible to minimize the impacts on everyone. The alternative is that the Plant Home submits a proposal with disregard to concerns but that meets the site plan process. He asked for common sense from the Planning Board and to give him confidence in an option. He said that, except for the few that provided direct guidance, he didn't have enough to give direction to the Plant Home board. Without direction, they would choose an option that does not consider the neighbors. He noted that the best view, in his opinion, was from inside the building, by the people who live there.

Mr. Kevin Connors, 16 Riverview Road, said that there is common commitment by all of the neighbors to the mission of the Plant Home. No one is saying it is a bad idea to add to their property. He stated that he was encouraged earlier by comments that the building could be moved farther to the north and raised in height. He noted that the last comments did not provide him with the same feeling of openness.

Mr. Hopkinson asked if Mr. Connors was speaking of the last few design comments or the last comments, generally.

Mr. Connors stated he was speaking of the last few general comments, which he felt were defeatist, considering the positive reaction he had earlier in the meeting. He did not feel that it was positive to ignore everyone.

Mr. Oxton closed the public session.

Mr. Saucier stated that the Plant Home and the consultants have decisions to make. He asked if they want to come back for another workshop, would it need to be tabled.

Mr. Deci said that the three-week submission deadline is to allow staff to complete a thorough review. With a secondary submission, if the application is similar he could work with the applicant to reduce the submission time before the next meeting. He noted that at the time a formal application is submitted, issues may be raised by staff, that were not apparent with conceptual drawings.

Mr. Saucier said that if future pre-application meetings were requested, they would likely be small changes to the footprint and additional elevations.

Mr. Deci said that if future workshops were architectural in nature, a reduced submission timeline could be appropriate.

Mr. Hopkinson said he had questions for Mr. Saucier and Mr. Normand. He asked if an L-shaped building would be possible.

Mr. Saucier noted that they had discussed it but that it had not been previously presented to the Planning Board.

Mr. Normand said that an L-shaped building would be possible, especially with a higher building.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that if the consultants provide a higher building, moved farther north, and shaped in an L wrapped around the existing building, it would be very positive.

Mr. Saucier said that it could be explored, but that parking and access were concerns.

Mr. Hopkinson agreed that there were many factors to consider, especially as related to parking and access. He asked Mr. Normand how his suggestions would effect the scale of the building and visual impact to the neighborhood.

Mr. Normand agreed with the concept, and suggested that it would definitely reduce impacts on the site and the view.

Mr. Hopkinson stated that an L-shaped building does generally reduce the mass.

Mr. Normand appreciated the option to come back to the pre-application workshop and talk about this new concept that Mr. Hopkinson had raised.

Mr. Hopkinson asked for additional conceptual renderings for consideration in the future. The concept he outlined he feels best with. He outlined that if the building could be moved closer to the existing building and designed to limit the effect on the point, the proposal would be better than in the past. Mr. Hopkinson requested Mr. Saucier to address the flood map issue raised issue.

Mr. Saucier indicated that the building would be as far from the flood plain as possible. He outlined the requirements related to floodplains.

Mr. Hopkinson urged consideration of the issue as the consultants move forward with the design. He asked Mr. Saucier if any of the ideas he outlined presented major site issues or impacts.

Mr. Saucier said no.

Mr. Oxton asked if there were any additional comments.

Mr. Deci asked the applicant to work with him as they move forward with designs.

Mr. Saucier indicated they would and asked if there was a second Planning Board meeting in February.

Mr. Oxton thanked the applicant and indicated he felt it was a positive experience.

Other Business

Mr. Oxton indicated that there was a need to form a committee to review the comprehensive plan against the land use code.

Mr. Omo stated it was a good idea.

Mr. Oxton raised the implementation list which was developed after adoption of the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Deci noted that he has updated the list as he has identified inconsistencies between the documents. He asked if there were members particularly interested in the issue that would like to be part of a committee.

Mr. Stilphen and Mr. Omo indicated they were.

Mr. Deci stated that the Planning Board has a scheduled meeting on July 3, 2012. He asked if the Planning Board would like to cancel the meeting or postpone it to later in the meeting.

Mr. Oxton said that in the past, the Planning Board generally does not meet in July or August, unless there is a critical issue that needs to be addressed.

The Planning Board agreed.

Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, **MR. HOPKINSON MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. STILPHEN, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:11 P.M.**

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL

Minutes prepared by Andrew H. Deci, Planning Director