

**BRUNSWICK PLANNING BOARD
NOVEMBER 27, 2012**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Charlie Frizzle, Vice Chair Margaret Wilson, Dann Lewis, Dana Totman, Richard Visser and Steve Walker

STAFF PRESENT: Anna Breinich, Patrick Scully-Town Attorney

A meeting of the Brunswick Planning Board was held on Tuesday November 27, 2012 at the Municipal Meeting Facility at Brunswick Station, 16 Station Ave. Chair Charlie Frizzle called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

Public Hearing: The Planning Board will hold a public hearing to consider an amendment to the Town Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 2, Section 216, relating to the review of demolitions in the Village Review Overlay Zone.

Anna Breinich began by reviewing the history behind the request by the Town Council for the Planning Board to review the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance Chapter 216, relating to the review and approval of demolitions within the Village Review Overlay Zone. Anna stated that the Planning Board has held one joint workshop with the Village Review Board and held a Planning Board workshop on November 6, 2012. Anna stated that after the Planning Board packet had been sent out, Emily Swann, Chair of the Village Review Board, questioned whether the proposed time requirements for submittal of review were adequate to include a meeting of the Village Review Board and potential site visits. Anna noted that she made changes to the drafted language and asked that members please refer to proposed November 27, 2012 amendments. Anna stated that the amendments highlighted in yellow in the 11/27/12 copy are revisions to address the time constraints. Anna reviewed the newest revisions to Section 216.8.A and Section 216.10. Margaret Wilson and Charlie Frizzle suggested adding “and then forward the application to” to Section 216.10. B, for clarification. Richard Visser suggested clarifying in Section 216.2.C to refer to the Village Review Zone. Charlie replied that this is language that has been in the ordinance for a while; demolition is all that has been added. Anna suggested stating “within the Village Review Zone”. Charlie suggested limiting changes to demolitions and reviewing the rest of the language during the ordinance rewrite. Margaret Wilson suggested adding “within the Town” to the remaining sentence for clarification as the meaning has changed. The resulting Ordinance section would read as follows:

Section 216.2.C

Act in an advisory role to the Town Council, Planning Board and other Town bodies regarding proposed demolitions or relocations of structures *within the Village Review Zone* and the protection of historic sites, structures, and artifacts *within the Town*.

Dana Totman noted that Section 216.10.B, states that for simple or routine request, the application goes to staff for approval but noted that the way it reads, if disapproved, the appeal would go to the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Planning Board would never be involved. Dana stated that it sounds like the Planning Board is hearing the appeal because they may be unhappy with the staff’s decision. Charlie Frizzle replied that this language refers to whether or not a project should be deemed minor; if the Chair of Village Review Board or the Chair of the Planning Board feels that the project is not minor, they have the right to take it over. Dana

replied that the way this reads, the applicant can make this determination as well. Dana asked whether the applicant can make their determination before or after staff makes their decision. Patrick Scully, the Town Attorney, replied that he believed that the intent of the language is that the applicant or the Planning Board Chair can request or require the initial review of the plan be reviewed at the planning level and not at the staff level.

Chairman Charlie Frizzle opened the meeting to public hearing.

Emily Swann, Chair of the Village Review Board, stated that she has discussed these revisions with Charlie Frizzle and Emily stated that she is happy to see things moving forward with improving the demolition process and this is a good step as they move towards working on some of the current problems both for the applicant and for the Board. Emily stated that at the initial meeting timing had not occurred to her until she reviewed the ordinance more closely and she realized that this could be an issue as the Village Review Board makes a site visit and she was concerned that a shorter time frame would make this impossible. She suggested that a joint site visit between the two boards might be helpful in making the final decision. Emily stated that she likes the way Anna and Pat have lengthened the overall review process.

Chairman Charlie Frizzle stated that some of the hope of the interim process was to take some pressure off those who volunteered to review the ordinance and allow them the time necessary to do a good job.

Chairman Charlie Frizzle closed the public hearing.

Dana Totman suggested adding a fourth criteria to Section 216.10.E. He suggested that the fourth criteria be *the recommendation of the Village Review Board*. Pat Scully replied that if they add the Village Review Board in as criteria for approval, does that mean that if the Village Review Board recommends denial or approval then the Planning Board is required to follow suit. Pat stated that by adding it in as criteria it suggests that the Planning Board is compelled to act. Dana replied that he was not suggesting that it be binding; they have set the process up so that the Village Review make recommendation to the Planning Board. Margaret Wilson replied that they need to consider the Village Review Board recommendations. Pat suggested adding a sentence to the end of section E that reads “in acting on the application the Planning Board shall consider the recommendation of the Village Review Board”. Margaret Wilson replied that she is generally comfortable with the language because of the work that has been done but noted that the problem, when reading this, is that there continue to be no standards in the ordinance or at least the same difficult standards that the Village Review Board shared that they were unable to apply; this places the Planning Board in the same position of applying the same inapplicable standards. Margaret stated that she is concerned about this issue. Charlie Frizzle replied that they are aware of this but noted that the review by the Planning Board does bring in another set of eyes and perspectives.

MOTION BY STEVE WALKER TO RECOMMEND TO THE TOWN COUNCIL THE REVISED ORDINANCE LANGUAGE AS AMENDED ON 11/27/12. SECONDED BY DANN LEWIS, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Case Number: 12-039 10-Unit T-Hangar: The Board will review and take action on a joint **Sketch and Final Plan** application submitted by MRRA to construct a 10-unit nested T-hangar at Brunswick Executive Airport (**Assessor's Map 40, 0**) in the **Reuse - Aviation Related (R-AR) Zoning District**.

Steve Levesque, Executive Director of MRRA, stated that the project is for a 10 unit T-Hanger on the site of former Hanger 1 that was torn down in 2006. Steve stated that this is part of the overall Airport Master Plan and is the first new construction on the airport. Steve stated that a T-Hanger is essentially a garage for individual private airplanes. Steve stated that for construction they have their site law permit for this and other related activities for this project.

MOTION BY MARGARET WILSON THAT THE SKETCH AND FINAL PLAN BE DEEMED COMPLETE. SECONDED BY DANN LEWIS, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Steve Walker asked why they call it a T-Hanger; Steve Levesque replied that airplanes back in and park in a "T". Charlie Frizzle noted that in the Staff Review Committee meeting minutes, the Deputy Fire Chief requested that no portable heating units be permitted on site. Charlie asked Steve if this was going to be followed through or if there was a reason that they might entertain portable heaters in the unit. Steve replied that they have no desire to put portable heaters in. Steve stated that the hangers themselves will not have any water either, but they will have a bathroom. Margaret Wilson asked for clarification on the impervious surface; the Nils Gonzalez, Engineer, replied that the limits of construction are 100% impervious. He stated that the total parcel itself is 70% and noted that the entire parcel is over 700 acres.

MOTION BY STEVE WALKER THAT THE BOARD WAIVES THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS:

1. Section 412.2.B.8 – Name, location and width of paving for proposed roads
2. Section 412.2.B.14 – Location of proposed cross section of sanitary sewers
3. Section 412.2.B.16 – Class A Soil Survey
4. Section 412.2.B.23 – Landscaping Plan

SECONDED BY RICHARD VISSER, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY MARGARET WILSON THAT THE SKETCH AND FINAL PLAN IS APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

1. That the Board's review and approval does hereby refer to these findings of fact, the plans and materials submitted by the applicant and the written and oral comments of the applicant, his representatives, reviewing officials, and members of the public as reflected in the public record. Any changes to the approved plan not called for in these conditions of approval or otherwise approved by the Director of Planning and Development as a minor modification shall require a review and approval in accordance with the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance.

SECONDED BY DANN LEWIS, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Other

No other business.

Minutes

No minutes reviewed at this meeting.

Adjourned

This meeting was adjourned at 7:45 P.M.

Attest



Tonya D. Jenusaitis
Recording Secretary