

**BRUNSWICK PLANNING BOARD
JANUARY 13, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Charlie Frizzle, Vice Chair Margaret Wilson, Bill Dana, Soxna Dice, Dale King, and Richard Visser

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dann Lewis

STAFF PRESENT: Director of Planning and Development, Anna Breinich; Town Planner, Jeremy Doxsee

A meeting of the Brunswick Planning Board was held on Tuesday, January 13, 2015 in Council Chambers, 1ST Floor, 85 Union Street. Chair Charlie Frizzle, called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

Case # 14-038 Sketch Plan for Professional Office Buildings and Lot Line Adjustments to Brunswick Landing Subdivision (Case # 14-017): The Board will review and take action on a Sketch Plan Major Development Review application submitted by Priority Real Estate Group to adjust lot lines delineating Lots 6A, B, & C of the previously approved Amended Brunswick Landing Subdivision and to develop a 10,000 sf footprint office building, a 15,000 sf footprint office building, a 4,000 sf footprint financial institution with a drive through, a 195 space parking lot, along with associated site improvements, on 3 contiguous lots (6A, 6B, 6C) totaling 5.61 acres, located at 4-16 Admiral Fitch Drive, in the BNAS Reuse District (R-CMU Land Use District), and also within the previously Planning Board-approved Brunswick Landing Common Development Plan area. Assessor's Map 40, Lot 37.

Jeremy Doxsee introduced the application for Lot 6 as proposed in the Common Development Plan (CDP) approved in June 2014 and noted that this application is for Sketch Plan Major Development review with a Final Plan to follow. Jeremy said that this application is for 3 lots, Lot 6A is 1.34 acres, Lot 6B is 1.49 acres and Lot 6C is 2.78 acres with primary access on Admiral Fitch Ave. with secondary access off Allagash Drive. In total, this project includes 5.61 acres with a proposed a 10,000 sf footprint office building, a 15,000 sf footprint office building, a 4,000 sf footprint financial institution with a drive through, a 195 space parking lot, and associated site improvements. Jeremy pointed out that the basic layout of the site and service have been included in packet and that the development has been designed in compliance with the CDP.

Charlie Frizzle noted that they should be looking at plan C101 included in the packet.

Tom Saucier, Site Design Associates, reviewed a PowerPoint presentation and the proposed lot layout. Margaret Wilson asked what the setbacks were for each building. Tom replied that they will be labeled on the final plan. Margaret said that the applicant should be clear about what is/are the front and the sides of the buildings and asked what the address will be as she is concerned with the setbacks. Tom replied that the front for 6A would be Bath Road. Lot 6B is a corner lot with frontage on Admiral Fitch and Bath Road and Lot 6C with frontage on Admiral Fitch Drive and Allagash Drive.

With respects to the Staff Review comments, Charlie Frizzle asked about adding a cross walk on Admiral Fitch and Tom Saucier replied that there will be a sidewalk. Charlie said that John Foster noted that the drive thru lane is very wide and Tom replied that they can narrow it up a little. With respect to building frontages, Charlie said that they all appear to face the internal parking lot, but said that it is the view of these buildings from the front / Bath Road that they need to be concerned about and will need to pay attention to. With respects to Stormwater, Charlie said that the Town would prefer that stormwater be addressed collectively and Tom replied that stormwater will be addressed collectively in the beginning, but it may not be permanent depending on how the lots are sold. Bill Dana asked where the sewer drains go and Tom replied that there is a pump system; the Sewer District has been informed. Dale King asked why the drive thru lane is so wide and Tom replied that this was a concept that is still in design. Jeremy Doxsee pointed out that lot 6C has a potential stormwater area and lot 6A could be permitted to use lot 6C for stormwater. Soxna Dice asked if they could reduce the impervious coverage through reducing the drive thru or by removing the island in the separate drive way entrance for the financial institution. Tom replied that they discussed this in Staff Review and with the way the lots are going to be sold they need to keep the second access. Tom said that they can reduce the endcaps and make the lanes narrower. Soxna suggested waiving some of the parking spaces and Tom replied that if the buildings are sold as single story buildings, they can reduce parking. Tom said that if the developer felt that the tenant required less parking per the Town requirement then they would ask for a waiver as it is \$3,000 per parking space and it would make sense, but at this point, they are at a concept plan. Margaret Wilson replied that she shares Soxna's concern about reducing the impervious surface and said that anything that can be done to reduce the impervious surface, the better. Charlie replied that if parking meets requirement, he is less inclined to place a lot of restrictions on the developer.

With regards to the stream, Charlie Frizzle said that he is persuaded by the arguments that the applicant has put forth but asked for clarification on the 75 foot and the 25 buffers and asked that the applicant to describe these measurements. Tom Saucier clarified the measurements and jurisdiction of the DEP over a stream and adjacent land area. Soxna Dice asked who reviews these types of determinations when they are part of an application and Jeremy Doxsee replied that they do not have an expert on staff, but they do have experience on staff and that staff can refer to the consultant engineer. Jeremy said that he has spoken to Steve Walker who questioned the methodology that Mr. Forester used in deciding whether or not the stream met the Town criteria. Tom reviewed the process which they went through in determining natural resources and why they felt that the stream doesn't meet the Town definition but meets the DEP stream determination. Margaret Wilson clarified that the reason why this is relevant is because the town has a 75 foot no disturb rule and the state has a 25 foot no disturb rule requirement. Jeremy Doxsee asked if staff could obtain a written copy of the common methodology practices that were used along with the dates that site visits were made.

With regards to the forested wetlands, Tom Saucier stated that they have submitted a detailed response to Steve Walkers concerns. Tom said that municipalities usually regulate wetlands and noted that in reviewing the definition of a fresh water wetland, it specifically excludes forested wetlands. Soxna Dice asked for clarification on NRPZ protections and Jeremy Doxsee replied that there is no specific standard, but one could conclude that in preserving natural resources, you are preserving wetlands to the extent that they work with applicants.

Charlie Frizzle opened the meeting to public comment. No comments were made and the public comment period was closed.

MOTION BY BILL DANA THAT THE BOARD DEEMS THE SKETCH PLAN TO BE COMPLETE. SECONDED BY SOXNA DICE, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY DALE KING THAT THE BOARD APPROVES THE SKETCH PLAN. SECONDED BY BILL DANA, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Committee (ZORC) Update

Anna Breinich said that they are in the process of completing the review of the general public comments. It is the intention to wrap up items such as signs and be able to wrap up the text by beginning of February for Clarion Associates to rewrite and then staff will be looking at the zoning maps. Anna Breinich reviewed the upcoming meeting schedule.

Approval of Minutes

No minutes were approved at this meeting.

Other Business

No other business.

Adjourned

This meeting was adjourned at 8:05 P.M.

Attest



Tonya D. Jenusaitis
Recording Secretary