

4/1/20

STAFF REVIEW COMMITTEE NOTES

Staff present: Taylor Burns, Town Assessor; Jay Astle, Public Works Director; Jeff Emerson, Deputy Fire Chief; Ryan Barnes, Town Engineer; Matt Panfil, Director of Planning and Development; TC Schofield, Brunswick-Topsham Water District; Rob Pontau, Brunswick Sewer District; Tom Farrell, Director of Parks and Recreation; Dennis Wilson, Town Arborist; Ryan Leighton, Assistant Town Manager. Non-voting Staff: Jared Woolston, Planner.

Applicants Present: Tom Wright, BLCCDG; Curt Neufeld and Melissa Archbell, Sitelines PA; Dan Catlin, Tontine Maine LLC; Mandy Reynolds, Commercial Properties.

Public Present: Cliff Fisher.

1. **Case #20-013 Environmental Resource Center:** The Staff Review Committee will review and make a recommendation to the Planning Board on a **Conditional Use Permit** application submitted by Brunswick Landing Community Collective Development Group to utilize the existing building at 179 Neptune Drive as an Environmental Resource Center. The subject lot (Map 40, Lot 516) is within the **GO (Growth Outdoor) Zoning District and contains the SPO-SP (Shoreland Protection Overlay – Stream Protection) Subdistrict.**

Tom Wright: The proposal is to make an Environmental Resource Center out of 179 Neptune Drive; which is an 18,000 square foot, single story brick building that's in the GO zone. The idea was to have the building and the parking area around it be a part of the whole conservation project that's at Brunswick landing - the 1,500 acres. It will eventually become the pathway around the landing and all the trails that are associated with that. Right now we're hoping to put Brunswick-Topsham Land Trust in part of the building and the Cathance River Ecology Trust in another part of it. That would make three office spaces at this point. The larger section, which is about a 9,000 square foot piece will be more environmental related type activities. Right now I'm just trying to get the offices up and running.

Jared Woolston: We also received an addendum to the packet for this project which is the responses to the Conditional Use Permit criteria.

Matt Panfil: I just got the Sewer District's letter to serve this morning so we do have that now as well. For this project, the bigger issue was getting the zoning ordinance to allow for such a use. We didn't really have anything that covered what was being proposed. Now Environmental Resource Centers are permitted as a Conditional Use within the GO district. The adjacent parking lot will serve the uses that are proposed. I don't really have any concerns.

Jeff Emerson: I don't have anything at this point.

Ryan Barnes: I don't have anything on this one.

Jay Astle: I'm good.

TC Schofield: I'm all set.

Rob Pontau: We're good. I worked with Tom yesterday and got everything I needed. The permit has already been applied for.

Taylor Burns: I'm good.

Tom Farrell: In looking at what came as an addendum to the packet, item number five says the application furthers the intention of the comprehensive plan by providing space for the oversight and management of what will become 1,500 acres of publicly accessible land. The Town is the owner of a majority of that property and the Parks and Recreation Department has been the entity that has overseen all the conveyances and is familiar with all the restrictions in the covenants and the deeds. There's been no discussion with the Town, to my knowledge, with respect to any other entity that might occupy the building overseeing management of the Town's properties. I would like the applicant to explain what he has in mind there.

Tom Wright: I meant that the Brunswick-Topsham Land Trust would have the opportunity to oversee their lands from their office. I didn't mean to imply that they were taking anything away from the Town. I meant to imply that they were helping to oversee it and I should've put helping in there because I hadn't realized that I was overstepping in that paragraph.

Tom Farrell: I appreciate that response. We had a joint zoom meeting two days ago with the Redevelopment Authority, the Land Trust and the Town as it relates to the overall perimeter trail for the property and some of the obstacles that we have to overcome to make that a reality. We've signed a joint use agreement with MRRA and Bowdoin College – they are another major landowner as it relates to this perimeter trail. I think that it would be to everybody's best advantage if there were coordination. A conversation should be encouraged right away between the entities.

Tom Wright: I certainly agree. I'm really the vehicle for putting the space together I'm not endorsing anything other than these entities working collaboratively.

- 2. Case #20-014, Brunswick Landing Village Subdivision Amendment, Lots 8 & 9:** The Staff Review Committee will review and make a recommendation to the Planning Board on a **Final Plan** application submitted by Sitelines PA on behalf of Brunswick Landing Condominiums LLC for the development of eight (8) condominium units on lots 8 and 9 of the previously approved subdivision. The subject lots (Map 40, Lots 138 and 139) are within the **GRI (Growth Residential 1) Zoning District and the SPO-SP (Shoreland Protection Overlay - Stream Protection) Subdistrict.**

Curt Neufeld: There are four single family house lots proposed just west of the intersection of Intrepid and Forestal and four more along Admiral Harry Rich Road (formerly Anchor Drive). You may recall from a few years ago there were a number of condominium units proposed but market forces and costs have decided that's not the best way to move forward. This supersedes those previous approvals. We've submitted to this to DEP and we understand the approval is underway. Each of these will probably be three bedroom houses, but they're designed to be a relatively small footprint. There's going to be a little bit of a sewer extension on Forestal to service those four lots. The sewer for those off of Admiral Harry Rich will come from the existing units behind.

Jared Woolston: It looks like the public notice for this project says it is going to be eight condos. Forty condominium units were approved maybe a year or two ago and now it's just eight single family dwellings.

Jeff Emerson: I think we're all set on this one. Since it is single family dwellings we don't have any issues.

Ryan Barnes: I'm all set. Melissa and I have already had some conversations that the Town doesn't own Forestal so there is no moratorium and connections within that street are allowed. Obviously with any work on the force main relocation, at Rob's approval, we would want to try to avoid damaging the new sidewalks.

Jay Astle: I don't have any questions.

TC Schofield: It will be served by MRRA's private water system, so I don't have anything.

Matt Panfil: I hate seeing us not take advantage of density in that area.

Curt Neufeld: We're getting about the max density on there, eight per acre.

Rob Pontau: I've talked with Melissa and Curt. The only thing that I just picked up on is that it is not on a Town owned street. I'd like Melissa to show all of the easements on the drawings of where the district will have access. I know we're keeping Forestal in the roadway. We do have like a blanket easement with MRRA that should cover us, but it'd be best to show it on the drawings.

Melissa Archbell: I'll show it.

Taylor Burns: I don't have anything. Once the driveways are in we'll be able to address.

Tom Farrell: I see the impact fees are going to be paid consistent with the formula in the ordinance so I'm all set.

Jared Woolston: I would note that we don't have a Code Enforcement Officer right now. We'll do the best we can to double check the dimensional and density standards and give some advice to the Planning Board when it comes to that.

Ryan Leighton: No comments.

Dennis Wilson: The overall landscape plan looks good. The only thing I ask is you use the list of trees that are in the tree ordinance. In your landscape notes, you have two trees that could be used; one is the Ash tree, which is no longer recommended. The second one, a flowering pear, has many varieties that are invasive to Maine.

- 3. Workshop**– The Staff Review Committee will hold a workshop to discuss the proposed redevelopment of the Tontine Mall and adjoining parcel for a mixed use development to include 16 dwelling units. The subject lots (Map U13, Lots 164 & 165) are within the **GM6 (Growth Mixed Use 6) Zoning District**.

Matt Panfil: As Jared mentioned, it's within the Village Review Overlay District. Part of this project is to obtain more parking by demolishing the abutting property at 11 School Street (the property to the east behind the theater) which is in the Nationally Registered Federal Street Historic District, and there is a 90 day delay on demolitions. The Village Review Board started the clock back in January on that 90 day delay. The Village Review Board can't vote on this until April 29th, I believe. In the meantime the applicant really wants to start getting some feedback. It's going to be a somewhat complicated construction project. They're building right on top of the existing mall. I still haven't heard back from our attorney as to whether or not we can officially call it a sketch plan. The zoning ordinance says the Planning Board shouldn't take any action until there's a Certificate of Appropriateness. To me that doesn't mean we can't introduce the project and start getting feedback from everyone to make the whole process smoother.

Dan Catlin: We feel there's a real need for dwelling units downtown. We have four units downtown currently and they always stay full. We feel that 11 School Street has reached the end of its economic life. Mooney Engineers reinforced our thoughts with a report that they've done that we can certainly make available. If we raze that duplex it will give us the parking we need to adequately serve the 16 units. We're talking about a shared parking concept. Employees of the downstairs tenants will use it during the day and the apartment units will use it in the evening. We feel that there are going to be less employees with our two new tenants than what is presently there. The only comment that I had from my existing tenants is how's the construction going to work? A lot of people don't realize that we've got an approximately 18 car parking lot in the rear of the building. I have spoken with two different construction companies we've used in the past. They have thrown out 8 weeks as a time frame to get this framed up. They're talking about panelizing the walls which will make a relatively quick process. We will bolt a pressure treated 2x8 on top of the parapet and basically start up a truss component that would go across for the first floor of the first eight units. There will be a space underneath that for all the plumbing and access for utilities. It is going to be a tight site, but we're going to reserve the front of the yard for our existing tenants and try to do most of the placement of materials from the rear of the building. Not to say that first thing in the morning we might have a boom truck unloading a few materials in the front but we're going to do that in non-peak times.

Curt Neufeld: Our feedback from the VRB was pretty direct. It's a historic structure, but it's no longer particularly contributing based on the alterations that have been done. Dan has been doing the things required by the ordinance in terms of offering the building for sale and doing studies. The biggest disruption will be bringing new water and improving the sewer for that site. By adding an external grease trap and a new sewer connection, I would come back in and tie into this existing structure out at School Street. Once it's done, the parking will remain largely the same. This new building will have a stairwell and entrance, and I think we're going to lose a parallel parking space but we're also going to be able to improve the entrance into the building and update the look. The food prep will be moving to the other side of the building and some of the existing retail spaces will be preserved. Included is an idea of what the upper units are going to look like with central hallways, bedrooms or living spaces. There will be a second egress for these on this side of the building that would go over towards the parking lot. The patio area that exists now will actually be expanded and covered with translucent materials so the sun can get through but it will be protected from the elements. We are using architectural components and elements found up and down Maine Street with the heavy cornices and the clapboards. Many of the comments at the Village Review Board meeting were that it's a nice fit in there and fills up an underutilized space in the downtown streetscape. One thing that we've talked about, because of the nature of the site, it's very difficult to have landscaped areas and accommodate the traffic flow, but probably what we're looking to do is have some raised planting beds available in the patio space that could have perennial flowers and annuals.

Jared Woolston: It is proposed as a sketch plan. I guess it is semantics whether or not we review this as a sketch plan or workshop with the Staff Review Committee. I think it's probably more important to know how Planning Board reviews this. If we do consider it a workshop, the scope of review can be just about as broad as you'd want it to be. I don't know if there are any specific comments you wanted back from the group to get you ready for final plan review or if we should just focus on dimensional and density standards.

Curt Neufeld: I always like to get feedback early in the process. There are no setbacks in GM6 and we're not really proposing a lot of changes outside of the building footprint itself. That said, everyone's got their own perceptions and perspectives and I'd like to hear anything that someone wants to offer at this point. Hopefully we'll get a good read from the attorney and we'll call it a sketch plan and improve that.

Jared Woolston: Are you looking for the 10% administrative adjustment to get that building height increased?

Curt Neufeld: No, the building height is about 39 feet, 11.5 inches and there is a 40 foot max.

Jared Woolston: Ok, I read that incorrectly. As far as parking goes, how does the new use change your parking demand?

Curt Neufeld: Dan can probably speak to how many employees they have over there...

Dan Catlin: Right now, about 50 employees.

Curt Neufeld: Like any downtown living scenario we would probably have to look at assigning some parking spaces out back. They would probably have one parking space assigned per unit like the Noble Street Apartments.

Matt Panfil: If I remember correctly, before Jeff Hutchinson retired, he had calculated the parking demand as 20 spaces. I don't know where he came up with that number, but I believe the thought was that there were 16 units being proposed and they might need to come up with four either offsite or somehow through a shared parking agreement. I'll go back through my records and find out how Jeff came to that conclusion.

Mandy Reynolds: There are currently about 65 parking spaces on the total lot. That's something to take into consideration. There are spaces behind the building that people don't really know about and then there's obviously the retail is parking in front.

Matt Panfil: We will have to review that. I'm not quite sure about the 65 spaces you're referring to.

Jared Woolston: If the parking doesn't meet the standard right now, that would be good to know. We should know who is using the parking lot now and for what uses and that would be sort of a baseline. You're adding some dwelling units, you're changing things around a little bit - what's the new requirement? If there's some gray area in there between grandfathering and new uses then I think we have a more defined conversation with the Planning Board about the expectation.

Jeff Emerson: Curt, you said that you might lose some of those parallel parking spots. I think you if you went back far enough in the records, you might find that those actually weren't parking spots to begin with. I think the Town tried to eliminate those at one point. I could be wrong, but it's worth looking at.

Curt Neufeld: Okay. Yeah, I'll strip the history on that end. Dan, do you have any recollections on that?

Dan Catlin: Jeff Hutchinson and Jeff Emerson and I had a meeting down there and how that worked out is we have the two spaces closest to our front door that we have striped - they were quick turnover spaces when Bart and Greg's were in business. The other parallel spaces are striped now.

Jeff Emerson: I still think it needs to be reviewed. I think there was some confusion back then and I think it gets back to what's approved there and what's not. It's the access to this parking lot. It's very tight. If you're going to look at redoing the parking lot, I think the access should probably be reviewed as part of the plan.

Curt Neufeld: Typically what we might do is use the auto turn software and drive a truck through it and make sure it all works. If we can do that with your vehicle would you be okay with those parking spaces remaining?

Jeff Emerson: I'd like to go back and look. If my memory serves me correctly we weren't satisfied with the parking as it is now and I think there were efforts to try and get it corrected.

Ryan Barnes: The parking dimensions shown in the proposed lot don't meet our standards. They're showing up as eight and a half feet wide, which is pretty narrow. Also, as for the discussion of the number of parking spaces; I know the JHR property (Noble Street Apartments) doesn't have more than one spot per unit, but they do have agreements for the use of the Town lot. I think that if we end up not having enough parking around it, we should be looking at where they're going to go for parking.

Melissa Archbell: We were looking for an administrative adjustment on those spots when the time comes.

Jared Woolston: I noticed we lost Cliff Fisher and he was interested in this project. Maybe he'll come back. It looks like some of the access issues that already exist are still going to exist. I don't think storm water is really going to change significantly based on what they're proposing. If anything it might clean some of that up. I'll defer to Jeff Emerson on access because it's really their vehicles that need to get in and out of there. It definitely looks like a tight lot for fire truck access.

Jay Astle: Not to beat the poor dead horse of parking, but School Street is already a problem with the other multi-units that are there. I've heard complaints from Maine State Music Theater about parking on the even side of the road causing issues. It looks like with your entrance onto School Street you're going to lose a parallel parking spot out there. I think parking is probably one of the most critical aspects of this.

Curt Neufeld: There's no change to the entrance proposed on School Street. We don't lose a spot.

Jay Astle: It looks like it on the drawing. If it's not the case, then that's fine. What happens overnight – where are tenants going to be parking if they don't have enough room in the lot, even as it's expanded?

Melissa Archbell: I did a lot of research on the downtown plan and the comprehensive plan when we were looking at this, trying to figure it out. Not having done that many projects in downtown per se, I was wondering how do you work with those lots that don't have the parking; it's all shared parking agreements?

Jared Woolston: My understanding is some of them do. The zoning ordinance also has an exemption for lots that are less than 10,000 square feet where you don't have a parking standard basically if it's a small building or a small lot. That sort of goes out the window with big lots and major redevelopments.

Curt Neufeld: I know that there are some provisions for identifying nearby public lots and how they might be utilized. We did that with the Unitarian Church, it basically has no parking, but there were other parking areas available. Granted its peak usage is more off peak than this one but there was language in there for uses in the downtown area. We definitely want to look at it and do some tabulation of how it has been utilized by customers and residents. It is a conundrum that there are no restrictions on density downtown, but then anybody will run up against this issue if they try to increase living space. There may be a bigger discussion here, but we'll certainly look at tabulating it and making the best case on this scenario.

Jared Woolston: To that end, the zoning ordinance still has some latitude for making a case for a different parking standard. It's also got some language in there for variable parking demand but again, I still think it's critical to say what's there for existing uses and then what's proposed so that at least there can be an informed discussion about what's equitable. It is a good place to start for a sketch plan or a workshop. When we get to final

plan, that's where you make your case for these things, but hopefully we'll keep the discussion going. Obviously there is a lot of staff that have an interest in access and parking for this one.

TC Schofield: I'm curious what the plan is for getting water service to the new apartments. Were you planning on trying to pull from the existing domestic service that serves the entire building? There's also a six inch fire service to the entire building off of School Street. Just kind of curious what the thoughts were there.

Curt Neufeld: No, we're going to bring in new domestic water, an inch and a half line off of School St and then I think Dan's been looking at the existing firefighting system to see if it could scale up and take the new units.

Dan Catlin: When we did our sprinkler system I think four or five years ago and they indicated to me that they could use the elevator shafts and put a valve on each floor and there was plenty of capacity to sprinkle both the second and the third floor.

TC Schofield: Okay. The part of the domestic in the Town right of way - the part that we'd own - would need to be two inch. Then it could reduce down to one and a half from there. We want to see a fixture count or a peak demand with the application for service just to make sure that two inch polyethylene will work and it wouldn't need to be two inch copper. It's pretty straightforward stuff. We do only allow one meter per district owned shut off valve so with bringing in one service all the units would be metered together, but that's fairly common for apartments. That's just something to be aware of.

Dan Catlin: We spoke with a contractor just a few days ago and they were thinking that it would be cheaper going to a four inch line than the two inch copper so, with your permission, we would use a four inch plastic line and bring that in to a location where we could go to a manifold and supply the 16 units and also have the water feed for the kitchen area.

TC Schofield: Okay. Once I get a plan, we can take a look at that and see how that would work out. Anything in the street – one inch needs to be copper, two inch would need to be copper or polyethylene and anything above two inch would need to be ductile. It wouldn't be much pipe really. We'll take a look at it once it's on the plans and go from there.

Matt Panfil: Knowing more about the parking situation and providing Planning Board with all the information to make a decision will be helpful. That's really it from me at this time.

Rob Pontau: I want to talk sewer upgrades. Dan, a couple of your contractors have called me to get some ideas, so I don't really anticipate much for sewer work. Where this is a change of use, I will need to see what the anticipated flow is. We can either do it by building or per plumbing code, and then I can compare that with the existing flows. It may be a negative and be nothing, but I do need to check that.

Dan Catlin: Okay. We're expecting that maybe the kitchen use might drop a little bit; obviously we can get you the numbers for the 16 units. In my discussions with the contractors I specked out a six inch pipe. We are working on the grades and taking that pipe beneath the slab and then going East and West with a trunk line once it's in the building. I'd love to get rid of the two pump stations that service that building which are problematic at certain times of the year to maintain.

Rob Pontau: Yes and that's fine. There's plenty of depth in School Street so I don't see why you won't be able to go with gravity and get rid of those pump stations. When you have the plans drawn up, send them over to me and

I'll take a look. I'll just double check the capacity numbers, but we'll be able to handle it. It's just a matter of figuring out if there's an impact fee.

Taylor Burns: I think I'm good. I don't think we have any address issues other than just assigning unit numbers for everything.

Jared Woolston: There's no reason that the lane, the parking aisle or whatever, needs to be a private street - is that a possibility? Jeff Emerson? It's a parking lot, but we're talking about access, so I'm just curious...

Jeff Emerson: No, I don't believe so. I think it goes off the number of buildings. I can double check for you, but I don't see that being an issue at all. I know if it's two or more buildings off of a street, then it needs a name. We'll just treat it like a parking lot aisle. Unless we find out something different that that would be my assumption.

Jay Astle: No comments.

Jared Woolston: How do you guys deal with snow now? You don't push it out into the street obviously.

Dan Catlin: No, we put it in the corner by Edward Jones. Alan Houston has plowed that lot going on 30 years and we truck it off as needed. It's expensive, but when we lose two or three or four spaces, we do truck it off.

Jared Woolston: And then the new parking lot, will he just push it up the North side up by the dumpster and treat it the same or is there another idea for that?

Dan Catlin: It would be the same deal. Every space is very valuable downtown. We push it up back by the dumpster adjacent to the building and then he comes during off peak time and trucks the snow as needed.

Dennis Wilson: I definitely would like to see a landscape plan. I know you'd probably have to be pretty creative. Along the front on Maine Street where you are showing grass, I think you need at least some ornamental trees. Maybe some perennials that won't obviously impede security, but with apartments up there - you know where the dogs are going to go. Try to prevent turf burn and stuff from where dogs are going to go. I definitely would like to see a landscape plan and if you take trees down, probably a one for one replacement for them. Also when you're taking down 11 School Street - there is a little bit of existing landscape there - I don't know if you're going to put something back in front right by the entrance from school street or not...

Dan Catlin: Curt and I were talking the other day and I said that we would install some granite curbing there and make a landscaped island. We'll have nice tall green shrubs like arborvitae to screen the parking lot. That one green area you bring up is small but it is actually the place that our Christmas tree goes. It's really just big enough for our annual Christmas tree. If you guys want landscaping in there that would void putting that tree up every year.

Dennis Wilson: Well, I think there are ways you can do both. You need something probably to soften up the landscape as you're building up and you're in from the look from Maine Street. Like I said, you are probably going to have to be creative with it, but you need something - at least one small ornamental tree or something to soften that area up.

Tom Farrell: The only thing I would add is obviously the residential units will be subject to the impact fee. I'm looking at the plan as proposed and there's going to be a loss of existing bedrooms in 11 School Street, assuming the building comes down as part of the project. I think it would be fair to credit those bedroom units as a

deduction from the 16. You'd have to do a calculation, but I think if that building is coming down you should have a credit toward the 16 development unit fee for the project.

- 4. Workshop** – Upon the recommendation of the Town Council at its meeting on March 16, 2020, the Staff Review Committee will hold a workshop to discuss proposed options for zoning ordinance amendments that would accommodate construction of a fire station exceeding the maximum building footprint.

Matt Panfil: I don't know how much everyone knows, but the proposed fire station on Pleasant and Webster - the footprint is a little bit bigger than what we allow. There are a couple of ways we can go about making this work. We were asked to propose something for the Town Council to take a look at and they sent it straight to the Planning Board. They didn't even have a discussion as to whether they preferred anything or not. It's up to you all if you want to chime in with what your preferences are, but we came up with five different options. The first one would be exempting municipal facilities in general from development review standards. That's the broad swipe at things that would allow for future uses. I think there's a definition of municipal facilities in the ordinance that's basically everything but schools. Anything we did in the future - sewer and water - are included in this and would be exempt from review. It would really prevent anything like this from happening again. Option two is basically a takeoff of option one, which is a detailed exemption of essential services. We're not saying any municipal facility, but just essential services intended and used to promote the public health, safety and welfare. This would include FCC equipment, sewer and water, fire stations, government buildings but some of the other municipal but not essential services would still go through review. Municipal essential would be exempt. Option three would just be exempting municipal facilities from the GM5 zoning district. That's basically the outer Pleasant Street area. This would basically say if you're a municipal facility on outer pleasant street you don't need to meet the building footprint requirement. That one's pretty specific to our proposal at hand. Option four changes the allowable building footprint within the GM5 from 20,000 square feet to 30,000 square feet. This would be actually consistent with GM3 and some other areas. There are already a couple of buildings on Outer Pleasant Street that are around 24,000 and 30,000 square feet respectively. This option has the added benefit of bringing those into compliance. Oh, I'm sorry - option four is just for corner lots which is very specific again. Option five is that we would just change it to 30,000 square feet maximum for the entire district, which I think if staff had a preference, that's the one we are leaning towards. It's the easiest and it isn't specific to the fire station. It would be hard to argue that it is spot zoning.

Jared Woolston: We have had some internal discussions about what the architect came up with for a building, why it was needed to be this dimension, why it needs to be one story; to see if maybe there was a chance to do something within the zoning ordinance from a dimensional standpoint. There's really nothing that can be done with the preferred design. And I wonder if Jeff could speak to that design at all and kind of why it works the way it does. Why this is the preferred layout?

Jeff Emerson: It's cheaper. One story vs. two story. That's what it boils down to. The committee looked at two story potential when doing the site selection. Over time it was decided that with a one story you lose a lot of other significant costs that bring the price down. Unfortunately when that happened, it went a little bit wider and the square footage was exceeded. If I were to make a recommendation I would suggest we keep the building plans the way they are and adjust the ordinance as everyone sees fit to accommodate the building.

Jared Woolston: We also looked at splitting up the living quarters from the office and the other pieces. Functionally that means that people would have to go outdoors to get into the other parts of the fire station. That would meet the zoning ordinance but the fire department staff probably wouldn't be too happy about that.

Ryan Leighton: I assume there is some history as to why municipal facilities are exempted to begin with...

Jared Woolston: In some other places; you can even look at state statute for certain things that give public entities a little bit more latitude than private entities to advance the common good - the benefit of the public. Why doesn't Brunswick have that kind of latitude, Matt – do you have any history on that?

Matt Panfil: I had a conversation with Jeff Hutchinson about this a while back and he remembered from the zoning ordinance rewrite process that people weren't too keen on treating the Town differently from any private entity. It's not unusual for towns to exempt themselves to some extent but from my conversation with Jeff Hutchinson, I understand the preference was to treat ourselves like anyone else which, while a noble idea, sometimes it runs into issues like this.

TC Schofield: I don't have a preference either way.

Taylor Burns: I don't have anything to add.

Jay Astle: It seems to me that five is the most straightforward and back to the question of why a municipality wouldn't exempt themselves – the intent of planning is to create an a smart way and allowing exceptions regardless of whether it's for a municipal use or not, goes in the face of that intent. If you already have a couple of buildings that are larger than what that zone allows for then creating an amendment that brings those into conformity seems to make the most sense and it doesn't necessarily reek of spot zoning as Matt pointed out.

Jared Woolston: Right. Those couple of buildings we're looking at are the car dealership. Big car dealership buildings that are nonconforming but grandfathered.

Ryan Barnes: Matt and I have talked about this from quite a bit and I concur. Option five is probably the cleanest option on this one, since it will bring nonconforming buildings into conformance or at least to a point where with waivers they could be conforming.

Jared Woolston: Rob, I know you had to deal with the town's dimensional standards for some district upgrades.

Rob Pontau: Yeah, we did but it worked out fine for us because a large portion of our second building was just heated storage anyway. It's quite a bit different than a fire station so no preference from my point actually. I want whatever Jeff wants.

Dennis Wilson: I don't have anything on this.

Tom Farrell: Here's what I would say. To Ryan's point, I am aware that there are other municipalities that have exceptions for municipal facilities of all types. From my perspective, I've got a long tenure in the Town and I've been involved in instances when the ordinance has been up for discussion. I think you're right on with Jeff Hutchinson's assessment that anytime we've gotten into that public forum, it's been about people wanting the Town to hold itself to the same standards. From my personal perspective, when it comes to public safety, there should be flexibility to go beyond what the standards require. Maybe not all municipal functions, but public safety. I think it seems reasonable and prudent to build the facility that will best serve the community in the configuration that the professionals who work in public safety feel it should be built.

Ryan Leighton: I'm all set.

Meeting Adjourned

JAE