

**CITY OF LEWISTON
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES for March 8, 2004 - Page 1 of 2**

I. ROLL CALL: This meeting was held in the City Council Chambers on the First Floor of City Hall, was called to order at 7:00 p.m. and was chaired by Jeffrey Gosselin.

- **Members in Attendance:** Jeffrey Gosselin, Roger Lachapelle, Lucy Bisson, John Racine, Tom Truchon, Jim Horn, John Butler, Stephen Morgan and new Associate Member Tom Peters.

- **Staff Present:** David Hediger, City Planner and Eric Cousens, Land Use Inspection Officer.

- **Student Member Present:** Wade Morgan.

II. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA: None.

III. CORRESPONDENCE: Distributed at this meeting were the draft minutes from the February 23, 2004 Meeting and a draft of proposed changes to the definitions of adult business establishments.

IV. HEARING: *FY2005 Lewiston Capital Improvement Program (LCIP).*

MOTION: by *Lucy Bisson*, seconded by *Tom Truchon* that the Planning Board continue the *FY2005 Lewiston Capital Improvement Program (LCIP)* to its March 22, 2004 meeting.

VOTED: 7-0.

V. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Discuss a proposed amendment to Appendix A, Article VII, Section 4 (f), (g), and (h) of the Zoning and Land Use Code. David Hediger read the staff comments and explained how the proposed amendment would be consistent with Policy No. 38. Tom Peters explained that because the LCIP is reviewed by the Board, past Boards have been reluctant to give up their reviewing responsibility pertaining to real estate sales and expenditures. Chairman Gosselin used the Southern Gateway projects as an example of this policy's execution, where the Planning Board was not asked to make a recommendation.

John Butler asked Tom Peters how this has worked previously and what changes will result from the proposed amendment. Tom Peters explained that the Board played an important role in this review process in the past making reference to the Pilsbury Block. Steve Morgan stated that the \$100,000 limit on expenditures is too high. Smaller expenditures are still significant.

Tom Peters stated that Planning Board members are appointed and not elected, so they can speak their mind without "counting heads" or appeasing others as City Councilors must sometimes do.

Roger Lachapelle agreed that the Planning Board should keep their review power.

MOTION: by *Lucy Bisson*, seconded by *John Butler* that the Planning Board not initiate the proposed amendment to Appendix A, Article VII, Section 4 (f) and (h) of the Zoning and Land Use Code and that the City Council review the policy on this.

VOTED: 7-0.

The Planning Board was concerned with projects not getting a thorough and proper review. Roger Lachapelle stated that he sometimes finds out about development deals or projects through the newspaper and he thinks the Planning Board should know about these before the paper for planning purposes. Lucy Bisson agreed.

Chairman Gosselin and Roger Lachapelle stated that the Board would not necessarily oppose issues but could add valuable insight.

The Board agreed to have executive or emergency sessions, if necessary, to provide recommendations when needed.

B. Discuss definitions of adult business establishment, adult amusement establishment, and eating and drinking establishments. John Butler read the Random House Dictionary definitions for bar, adult and restaurant.

Tom Peters asked why tattoo artist is in the bar and tavern category on the proposed changes. David Hediger acknowledged that this was something else to be addressed and that the proposed changes were just rough draft for discussion purposes.

Tom Peters stated that a legal enterprise for those 18 and over should be an adult business.

MOTION: by **Lucy Bisson**, seconded by **John Butler** that the Planning Board initiate a proposed amendment to Appendix A, Article II, Section 2 of the Zoning and Land Use Code regarding the definitions of adult business establishment, adult amusement establishment, and eating and drinking establishments, that tattoo artists be included as part of the adult business section, that Staff use the draft proposal as a basis for the amendment, and that a hearing date of April 26, 2004 be set for this item.

VOTED: 7-0.

C. Any other business Planning Board Members may have relating to the duties of the City of Lewiston Planning Board. None.

VI. READING OF THE MINUTES: Reading of the minutes from the February 9, 2004 and February 23, 2004 Planning Board Meetings.

February 9, 2004:

MOTION: by **Lucy Bisson**, seconded by **Roger Lachapelle** to accept the Planning Board Minutes for February 9, 2004, with the following changes: On Page No. 2, Leo Baillargeon asked ~~if~~... and also on Page No. 2, ~~Karen Kay~~ Leo Baillargeon asked how many years did it take...

VOTED: 7-0.

February 23, 2004: These minutes were distributed at this meeting for review, therefore, no action was taken.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: The following motion was made to adjourn.

MOTION: by **Lucy Bisson**, seconded by **John Butler** that the Planning Board adjourn this meeting at 7:40 p.m.

VOTED: 7-0.

The next regularly scheduled Planning Board Meeting is for Monday, March 22, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Lachapelle
City of Lewiston Planning Board Member and Secretary

