

**CITY OF LEWISTON
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES for November 13, 2001 - Page 1 of 10**

I. ROLL CALL: This meeting was held in the Third Floor Conference Room of Lewiston City Hall, was called to order at 7:06 p.m., and chaired by Dennis Mason.

- **Members in Attendance:** Dennis Mason, John Cole, Roger Lachapelle, Lewis Zidle, Kristine Kimball, and Student Member to the Planning Board, Ethan Chittim.
- **Staff Present:** Gil Arsenault, Deputy Development Director; James Lysen, Planning Director; David Hediger, Land Use Inspector Officer; David Sanborn, Planning Coordinator; and Doreen (Asselin) Christ, Administrative Secretary - Planning Division.
- **Member Absent:** Rob Robbins.

II. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA: None.

III. CORRESPONDENCE:

- A. Correspondence dated November 13, 2001 from *Paul G. Marcolini*, CCEMT-P, Program Director of LifeFlight of Maine in regards to the CMMC Parking Garage (facsimile transmission); and
- B. Planning Board Project Development Review Forms from both the Police Department and Public Works Department in regards to the proposed retail development on East Avenue, across from the Lewiston Mall.

The following motion was made.

MOTION: by *John Cole*, seconded by *Lewis Zidle* to accept the above correspondence and place it on file to be read at the appropriate time.

VOTED: 5-0.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING: *A Public Hearing on a proposal by City Staff to amend the City of Lewiston's Zoning and Land Use Code [Appendix A, Article XIII, Section 4(c)] regarding access into a development site, including minimum site distance and grade of driveways on proposed streets.* David Sanborn read the memorandum prepared by David Hediger, Land Use Inspection Officer from Code Enforcement dated November 8, 2001 in reference to the proposed amendments to the Zoning and Land Use Code regarding Access Management Standards.

Enclosed in the Planning Board packets, in addition to the above memorandum, were: A. A proposed amendment to the Zoning and Land Use Code regarding site distance standards and driveway/entrance grade requirements for projects subject to development review; B. A mapping of Drives on Non-Sidewalk Sections; C. Driveway Rules (revised 11/01/01); and D. Entrance Rules. Both the Driveway and Entrance Rules the state anticipates will be adopted in January 2002.

In accordance to David Hediger's memorandum, specific changes are proposed for: A. Appendix A, Article II, Section 2 for the definition of *frontage*; B. Article X, Section 3(2) for standards for conditional use permits; and C. Article XIII, Section 4(c) regarding approval criteria.

David Hediger briefly described the three (3) amendments.

The current standards refer to site distance standards as that recommended by the MDOT, which were in effect at the adoption date of the City's code in 1988. Several amendments have been made to the standards by the State since that date. The City's proposed site distance changes are more stringent than the State's standards for non-urban compact areas; there are no such standards for urban compact areas, i.e. the proposed State stopping site distance for non-urban compact areas for 25 MPH is 200 feet; the current City standards is increased to 250 feet.

Changes are proposed as to the grade requirements of driveways and entrances subject to development review. Currently, the grade must not exceed a maximum of three (3) percent for the first 100 feet from its intersection with any existing street. This applies to single-family residences as well as large commercial developments. David Hediger referenced the mapping produced for the Planning Board by Planning Staff, which was entitled, "Driveway Profile (Maximum Slope)". This mapping made reference to the First 6' at 4%; Next 6' at 13%; and the Next 6' at 18%. The proposed amendments will allow greater flexibility for property owners and developers in meeting the grade requirements. Single-family residences will have less onerous grade requirements to meet. There are no such standards for single and two-family dwellings. All other development review projects must meet existing grade requirements. The proposed amendment will allow for possible modifications to all driveway/entrance grade requirements from the appropriate reviewing authority. This will add more consistency to the code.

The amendment to the definition of *frontage* will allow property owners currently interested in creating a second lot through the Right-Of-Way (ROW) provisions contained in the frontage definition to choose the width of the proposed ROW in accordance with the construction criteria standards for private roads, i.e. the change would allow ROW's as narrow as 30 feet versus the existing 50 feet with a 12 foot driveway. Currently the code requires a minimum ROW width of 50 feet for the second lot being created and a private court for residential uses producing 100 or less average daily traffic (ADT) requires 30 feet.

At this point in the discussion, there were no comments or questions from the Planning Board, therefore, this item was opened to the public for comments.

Judy Chamberland (resides with her parents on Old Lisbon Road) said that she does not understand site distance. She is hoping for code changes so that she can build on this property.

Ray Frechette (137 Old Lisbon Road) distributed to both Planning Board Members and Staff a lengthy article (five pages) on his feelings of the changes. This is good for the area and he feels that consideration should be made on the impact to the City street system. He feels that the roads, with continued movement in demographic needs, will not likely be able to contain and handle the City's needs. There is no difference between State aid for highways and major collectors. These changes will alter the percentage of safety issues. He feels that three percent (3%) is steep. This is a reasonable change that will allow people to build one (1) house on a piece of land that is currently accessible by a 30 foot frontage on an existing road and that this will prevent the expense of building a City street to access the road. Ray Frechette sees no problem with this change, feels this is a minor right of width change, and wants to see the code modified to this change. He said he feels that this is a good idea and that it will ease grade restrictions.

He questioned, "Who determines standards?" In his article, Ray Frechette referenced three (3) major changes. Those changes were: A. Site Distance Language; B. Grade Requirement Changes; and C. Modifications of Grade Requirements.

In regards to Site Distance Language, Ray Frechette feels that Planning Staff is to be commended for utilizing the older AASHTO standards in acknowledgment that speed traveled on the City's roads is already in excess of posted speeds. He feels that the Planning Board should consider enacting more stringent Mobility Site Distances onto the City's arterials and State Aid Major Collectors. This would take into account and preserve the ability to plan for future traffic flows on these City streets. He feels the Planning Board should require language that takes into account actual speed traveled on the road being accessed by a certain percentage of drivers in determining safe sight distances.

As to Grade Requirement Changes, Ray Frechette feels that this intent was to ease the expense of creating a second house lot without adversely affecting public safety. He feels that this

fails to take into account the different roads that the development may be entering onto. The traffic safety impact is greater if the proposed ROW enters onto a State Aid Major Collector than a larger subdivision entering onto a side street, cul de sac, and loop roads. Ray Frechette's suggestion to the Planning Board was that any substantial easing to this requirement be in the form of a waiver that would be granted only if the cost to meet exceeds certain financial thresholds, it should address the type of street being entered, and it should allow for both an incoming and outgoing vehicle to get on or off the road. He feels that the proposed grade requirement makes little sense.

Lastly, in reference to Modifications of Grade Requirements Ray Frechette feels that the language is very weak. He feels it gives the reviewing authority the ability to require professional engineering, but it does not require them to actually do so. He feels the language should lay out specific criteria to be met, as opposed to creating criteria on a case-by-case basis.

After hearing Ray Frechette's concerns and suggestions, John Cole said that more study is needed. He suggested that Staff meet with Ray Frechette. It was suggested to eliminate the piece pertaining to grade requirements and go forward with the remainder of the items. LACTS or a traffic engineer should take a look at this. Staff does not have a problem with slowing this down. Gil Arsenault mentioned that there is no standard for a single-family home.

The proposed definition of frontage means, "*The linear distance between the sidelines of a lot, measured along a continuous lot line that borders upon an accepted public street or public easement, or upon a private road within a commercial, industrial, or residential development that has been reviewed and approved.*"

It was mentioned that it is not a good idea to get a traffic study for each project. There is a need to present evidence of why they want the slope changed. It is not reasonable to enforce or allow the same standard.

Dale Boucher Sr. (Old Lisbon Road) commented that he has held on to his 11 acres of land so that his son could build. He has now turned over the parcel to his son. He then invited the Planning Board to view their entrance, which is at a five percent (5%) grade. He feels that a serious look needs to be done, as to site distance and speeds.

Nathalye Boucher (125 Old Lisbon Road) commented that she has a very hard time getting out of her driveway.

Dale Boucher (125 Old Lisbon Road) commented that if their grade requirement was at three percent (3%), it would be a lot worse visibility. In their situation, five percent (5%) is not bad.

Dennis Mason commented that these zoning changes affect the whole City.

Ray Frechette commented that the slope is way too steep in his estimation.

Dennis Mason was in agreement with John Cole's suggestion of adopting what is presented, but dropping the grade standards.

James Lysen said that there is no rush for a judgment. He said, "Lets do it and do it right". This is a balance between safety and housing. The first portion of the property is what is affected.

The maximum grade is either upslope or downslope. Reference was then made to Item No. (7) on Page No. 6 of the Ordinance Pertaining to Frontage and Right-Of-Way Provisions. Again, it was suggested to strike Item No. (4) on Page No. 6. The reviewing authority can still make modifications. Dennis Mason said that this will loosen any requirement in the City. James Lysen suggested adding more language. The definition of access ways is not defined. John Cole then asked, "Should access way be present in Item No. (3). In Item No. (4), access way would not be necessary. It was suggested that after the wording, "*reviewing authority*" and before the words, "*should it be determined that safety and site distances have not been compromised*" in Item No. (7) on Page No. 6 to add new wording. It was also noticed in this same item that the word, "*maybe*" should be separated into two (2) words.

It was asked if this had been reviewed by the City Attorney. The response was, "No".

In closing this discussion, it was decided to delete Item No. (4) on Page No. 6, since this is the problematic section. Also, Ray Frechette, in his final comments, said that 18 percent is too steep. Six percent (6%) is where you start having trouble gaining momentum.

The following motion was then made.

MOTION: by **Lewis Zidle**, seconded by **Kristine Kimball** that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council to approve the amendments to the City of Lewiston's Zoning and Land Use Code [(Appendix A, Article XIII, Section 4(c)] regarding access into a development site, as submitted and presented with the removal of Article XIII, Section 4. Approval criteria, Sub-section (c), Item No. (4); renumbering the remaining items accordingly; and rewording Item No. (7) to read, "based upon the intended use, the amount of traffic expected, and the specific location of the project" after reviewing authority.

VOTED: 5-0.

After this motion was made, it was agreed that Item No. (4) should be revisited and placed on the agenda at another time.

John Cole recused himself from the Planning Board on this item.

V. **FINAL HEARING:** *A Final Hearing on a proposed by Central Maine Healthcare to amend the CMMC Campus Plan including: A. An expansion of their existing parking lots to add an additional 29 parking spaces on three (3) adjacent lots (130, 132, and 136 Oak Street) adding 0.35 acres of total development area; and B. The addition of two (2) parking levels to the existing parking garage located at 89 Holland Street, resulting in 360 additional parking spaces.* Reading of the memorandum prepared by David Sanborn dated November 9, 2001 was waived by the Planning Board.

This project is also being reviewed under the City's expanded review authority pursuant to the DEP's Site Location of Development Law.

The application submitted by Jan Wiegman of Taylor Engineering Associates on behalf of the Central Maine Healthcare amends the CMMC Campus Plan by expanding their existing parking lots to add an additional 29 parking spaces on 130, 132, and 136 Oak Street and it will add two (2) parking levels to the existing parking garage located at 89 Holland Street. This will result in 360 additional parking spaces, as mentioned above.

This project will not result in the addition of any footprint or new impervious area to the site, therefore, a drainage study was not performed. There are no utilities for this project.

Comments from the Police Department include questioning of the impact to traffic during the construction of the garage expansion at 89 Holland Street. Jan Wiegman's response was that the majority of the displaced vehicles will be from both patients and staff and from the 10-12 High Street buildings. The impact would be that the Holland and Main Street intersection would experience a slight increase in traffic at the change of shift times. The High and Main Streets intersection may experience a slight reduction in traffic at the change of shift times.

Comments from the Fire Department include that they want assurances that the flight path for the LifeFlight helicopter serving the CMMC campus will not be compromised by the additional height of the garage structure when completed.

Comments from Code Enforcement include: That the Site Plan should indicate the total amount of impervious surface and open space for the entire Oak Street parking area.

Comments from Engineering include: That the Site Plans need to show the current sizes of existing drainage piping, the location of them, and where the detention basins are all located.

Both items: 1. The CMMC - Oak Street Parking Lot Expansion; and 2. The CMMC Parking Garage Expansion are being reviewed as one (1) item.

Present at this meeting were **Jan Wiegman** of Taylor Engineering Associates and **Pat DeFilipp** from Central Maine Healthcare. Jan Wiegman did the presentation to the Planning Board.

The first item covered was the Oak Street Parking Lot Expansion. With this expansion, 29 additional parking spaces will be added. Also added, will be 0.35 acres of total development area. This expansion will include three (3) adjacent lots located at 130, 132, and 136 Oak Street. This property is located behind Dunkin Donuts. Access will be by Union Street. There will be street trees along Oak Street for attractiveness. There will be two (2) light fixtures. The site lighting will be cut off fixtures mounted on 25-foot tall poles. This parking lot is for employee use for CMMC. There will be a chain link fence around the entire lot for security purposes. There is a ten foot difference in elevation. This area will have vegetated grass, ground cover. The primary concern is for security. They want to match what is already there. This lot slopes down from Main Street to Union Street. The slope is at 4 percent. The open chain link fence is for security. This relates to the overall parking plan for the hospital. CMMC is willing to participate in the separation of the sewer along a portion of Oak Street when the City's separation project starts in that area next year. Also, included in the Planning Board packets was the drainage calculations for the Oak Street parking lot expansion. A drainage study of the properties and proposed development has been completed and concludes that the drainage impacts of the project are negligible and that no on-site detention will be necessary. It was mentioned that the Right, Title, & Interest should be noted on the waiver form.

The second item to be covered was the Parking Garage Expansion. Jan Wiegman stated that it is proposed to add two (2) levels to the parking garage. This can accommodate up to three (3) levels in the future. With this expansion, 379 spaces will be added. Access will be from High Street. There will be a ramp along the railroad tracks. Jan Wiegman showed layouts of parking. There will be 209 spaces on the second level and 170 on the third level. An elevator will be located in the corner closest to High Street. Because this project will not result in the addition of any footprint or impervious area to the site, a drainage study was not performed. There is an existing detention facility for the garage, which will continue to collect and detain the stormwater from the facility. Also, a traffic study was not undertaken, since this project is not a generator of traffic.

During this presentation, Dennis Mason made reference to the correspondence, as mentioned under Section III. Correspondence, from LifeFlight of Maine. Dennis Mason said that basically this letter states that there are no issues with this interfering with their flight path.

Pat DeFilipp showed to the Planning board the South Elevation. The outer layer will be brick veneer. This will help to dress up the area by the river. Pat DeFilipp also mentioned that this is part of their Campus Plan. CMMC would like to start this project before winter. Also mentioned was that DEP review authority was received a couple of years ago, since CMMC had exceeded seven (7) acres. James Lysen stated that this basically then brings this back to zero, with respect to their review. The DEP still needs to be notified that this is going through review. Dennis Mason then referred to the temporary helicopter pad and questioned if that lot was included in review at some point in time. That lot is on the right of Holland Street right before the railroad tracks. James Lysen said that he was pretty sure that this lot was included in the review as part of CMMC's Campus Plan. Dennis Mason then requested that James Lysen confirm that.

There was no public audience in attendance at this meeting and no further discussion or comments from the Planning Board, therefore the following motion was made.

MOTION: by **Roger Lachapelle**, seconded by **Lewis Zidle** that the Planning Board grant the Modification/Request Forms that were submitted with the addition of the waiver of Right, Title & Interest of the properties; that the Planning Board deems the application by Central Maine Healthcare to amend the CMMC Campus Plan to be complete; and that the Planning Board approves the projects, as presented with the condition on the project on Oak Street that CMMC participate in the City's extension of the separated storm drain project to the site or provide an on-site detention, subject to the approval of the Public Works Department.

VOTED: 4-0.

John Cole rejoined the Planning Board.

VI. PRE-APPLICATION HEARING: A Pre-Application Hearing concerning a proposal by W/S Development Associates, LLC to develop a 7.56-acre parcel for a proposed 74,500 square foot retail building. The project is also being reviewed under the City's expanded review authority pursuant to MDOT's Traffic Movement Permit process and under the City's expanded review authority pursuant to the DEP's Site Location of Development Law. David Sanborn read his memorandum dated November 9, 2001. This is the first of three (3) meetings. On October 16, 2001 the City Council approved the Conditional Rezoning Agreement for this property, which conditionally rezoned this property to the Community Business (CB) District. Enclosed in the Planning Board packets was correspondence from Lincoln Jeffers, Economic Development Specialist for the City of Lewiston dated November 7, 2001 in regards to the regulatory schedule for development review of this project. The schedule is as follows: 1. Pre-application Hearing (November 13, 2001), a general discussion of the project and a presentation by Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers concerning the Traffic Impact Study; 2. Determination of Completeness (November 27, 2001), to schedule a final hearing; and 3. Final Hearing (December 11, 2001), where final action will be taken concerning this development. This correspondence was mailed to all the abutters and interested parties. Bill Eaton, a traffic engineer, is performing an independent review of the Traffic Impact Study, of which the Planning Board was in receipt of at their October 23, 2001 Planning Board Meeting.

There were no concerns from the Police Department. The Police Department's comment form was distributed at this meeting. Included in the Planning Board packets were the comments made from the Fire Department, which include showing on the plans the following: 1. The location of three (3) fire hydrants; 2. The location of the closest existing street fire hydrants; 3. The approximate location of the four inch (4") Storz fire department connection (in the rear of the building); and 4. The location of the traffic lights and a notation on the plans regarding the emergency vehicle/traffic lights control system. Also distributed at this meeting were the comments from the Public Works Department. Their request was to see information as to why a second curb cut is needed on East Avenue. They are also requesting to see how many trips will be generated on Marston Street and that Marston Street will need to be upgraded, including radii. The Public Works Department is also requesting that storm drain and offsite improvements be shown.

Present at this meeting was **Ron Bissonnette** from Isaacson & Raymond. He said that there have previously been three (3) meetings, one (1) for an overview, then to make a recommendation on the rezoning, and again to the City Council to enact the rezoning. There will be a meeting with the School Department and the School Committee for an easement and buffering for the Martel School. He will be meeting with Planning Staff and next Tuesday, November 20, 2001, there will be a meeting with the Parent-Teacher Organization. The intent is to keep everyone informed as to what is going on. Also enclosed in the Planning Board packets was the application for development

review from Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers, Inc., which included a general location map and Site Layout Plan.

Also present at this meeting, from Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers, Inc. were: 1. **Alton Palmer, Jeremiah Bartlett, and Tom Gorrill.**

Al Palmer briefly described the location of this project. This project is between the Martel School, East Avenue and residential properties off of Pleasant, Marston, and O'Connell Streets. This property has approximately 600 feet of frontage on East Avenue and 710 feet of frontage on O'Connell Street. This site is mostly undeveloped woodlands with the exception of the Marquis Sign Company, which is located on East Avenue.

Al Palmer continued his presentation. The topography of the site slopes from O'Connell Street toward East Avenue. Slopes on this site range from two percent (2%) adjacent to O'Connell Street to localized fifty percent (50%) slopes in some areas near East Avenue. Elevations on the site range from 277 feet along O'Connell Street to 252 feet along East Avenue. This site is approximately 7.5 acres and is identified as Lot Nos. 55, 62, and 63 on Tax Map 176 on the Lewiston Assessor's Map. A portion of Marston Street has been recently discontinued by the City Council.

Al Palmer showed the plan view to the Planning Board. The structure to be located on this property is an approximate area of 72,540 square feet. The proposed retail development is shown on the plan as Retails A and B. There will be 327 parking spaces provided. The primary access will be off of East Avenue and will align with the existing entrance/exit of the Lewiston Mall. There will be two (2) exit lanes on the signalized intersection and a second entrance on East Avenue, which is proposed to be nearer to the East Avenue/Pleasant Street intersection. A third entrance is proposed on the dead-end portion of Marston Street. At the connection of Marston Street, only passenger vehicles will be allowed. This access will be signed to prohibit service and delivery vehicles.

Modifications will be submitted, however, only a 25 percent modification is being requested. 20-21 percent will remain as green space. The public sewer will be connected at East Avenue. Water will be from East Avenue and Pleasant Street. Reconstruction of curbing will be from Marston to Pleasant Streets to the site. A full landscaping/lighting/stormwater impact/analysis plan will be presented. The only item on the form that is requesting a modification is the Performance Guarantee. W/S Lewiston Properties, LLC requests the Performance Guarantee be modified such that the public improvements to be guaranteed only include any offsite roadway improvements required to be made by W/S Lewiston Properties, LLC.

A hydrogeological analysis is not warranted.

Ron Bissonnette stated that this parcel will be subdivided into two (2) and that this is not a subdivision.

There is no existing building on this parcel.

Copies of exiting deeds will be included in this application.

Al Palmer continued his presentation by saying that they want to minimize truck traffic along the face of the retail development. Loading docks will be located on both sides of the building. Truck circulation will include trucks entering only at the signalized intersection, turning at the loading docks, and then exiting at the intersection. In conclusion, Al Palmer referenced Public Works concerns and stated that trips generated at Marston Street, truck circulation, and both storm drain and site improvements will be included in the application.

Jeremiah Bartlett conducted a Scoping Meeting and Traffic Study. They analyzed the intersection of Lisbon Street and East Avenue, Webber Street at Pleasant, Lisbon Street at South Avenue, East Avenue at Webster Street, etc. Jeremiah Bartlett said that traffic counts were examined. They went over the peak traffic trips. Most of the traffic will not be new to this area.

They estimated new traffic to be about 1/3. The traffic volumes would be lower in real life. Aligning of the driveway to East Avenue is already in place. He continued his discussion on the installation of advanced warning signs. He said that skip lanes will channelize the traffic.

At this point in the discussion, Kristine Kimball asked, "What is the retail development?" Al Palmer stated that they are looking at a variety of tenants.

There was concern expressed with the design of people entering and exiting the third entrance.

Storm drainage will be discussed at the next meeting, which is scheduled for Tuesday, November 27, 2001.

Planning Board Student Member asked why there is no 15 mph zone posted in this school zone. There is none for Martel School, but there is one (1) further down East Avenue for the High School. It was decided that this item needs to be addressed before the project goes forward. It was also noted that there is a flashing light at the CVS Pharmacy.

There being no further comments from the Planning Board, the following public comments were made.

Robert McGraw (5 Pleasant Street) asked, "How do we deal with the noise level when there is a rave at the Central Maine Civic Center?" This area gets an impact with traffic.

Mark Sirois (10 Pleasant Street) does not want to see truck access at all. He said that the trucks that come down Lisbon Street are very disturbing. The traffic that comes down Pleasant Street is very fast. He went on to state that there is a potential for safety issues in this area and the safety of the people. In response to this concern, it was stated that trucks will be prohibited from entering the development from Marston Street. The peak of local traffic is around noon time. Most of the traffic will be coming to and from East Avenue. Also, night-time loadings can be presented at another meeting.

Planning Board Student Member Ethan Chittim left this meeting at 9:40 p.m.

Kristine Kimball asked if the thought was ever given to rotation of the buildings and changing of the curb cuts. In response to her thought, it was suggested that the back of the building should not be viewed from East Avenue and that the front should not face O'Connell Street. This has been looked at previously and was discussed with the City Council. The front of this development is proposed to face East Avenue. As mentioned earlier, the main entrance will align with the Lewiston Mall entrance.

Roland Hachey (8 Pleasant Street) said he has an issue with safety. He asked, "Has a crash study been looked at?" In response to Roland Hachey's request, it was stated that in 1998-2000 the MDOT records have been looked at. 2001 information is not included. However, information could be obtained from the Police Department on fatalities. Jeremiah Bartlett said that he will access the City records for 2001 on crash study information. Roland Hachey then mentioned a turn arrow on East Avenue. He said that one (1) is needed now before the development. It was mentioned that passenger cars will go out on Marston Street.

Dennis Mason asked, "What does CRF stand for?" Jeremiah Bartlett responded that it stands for Critical Rate Factor.

After these public comments were made, this item was then turned back to the Planning Board.

An Occupancy Certification is needed since construction is anticipated to be in the Spring of 2002 and the project will be completed by Fall 2002.

There were no issues expressed with the Scoping Study.

Pertaining to the Modification/Waiver Request Forms, which the facsimile copy dated

November 9, 2001, was included in the Planning Board packets, it is requested to eliminate the section on Covenants/Deed Restrictions and all other submission waivers that pertain to requirements for subdivisions, since this project is not classified as a subdivision. A cost estimate is needed. Reference was made to the Performance Guarantee, which is listed on the Request Forms as a Modification. Again, this is listed as a Modification, since W/S Lewiston Properties, LLC is requesting this be modified such that the public improvements to be guaranteed only to include offsite roadway improvements required to be made by them.

There being no further comments from either the public audience or the Planning Board, the following motion was made.

MOTION: by **John Cole**, seconded by **Roger Lachapelle** that the Planning Board grant the Modification/Waiver Request Forms, as submitted and amended; that the Planning Board concurs with the Traffic Scoping Session; and that a Determination of Completeness Hearing on the proposed Retail Development by W/S Lewiston Properties, LLC on East Avenue be scheduled for the November 27, 2001 Planning Board Meeting.

VOTED: 5-0.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. New Business:

1. Discussion concerning Planning Board Meeting Minutes. To be continued. John Cole said he would like to deal with the form (nature and extent) concerning the taking, recording, and distributing of the Planning Board Minutes by the end of this year.

2. Discussion concerning property acquisitions and dispositions. To be continued. Planning Board is awaiting a draft proposal.

3. LCIP process and naming Board Representative to the LCIP Committee. Included in the Planning Board packets was the schedule for the Department Reviews dated November 9, 2001. Since Mark Paradis is no longer on the Planning Board and has been the representative in the past, a new representative is needed. It is critical that the Planning Board have representation on this committee in order to be able to hear the Departmental presentations and make recommendations on the prioritization of the Capital Improvement projects.

This process includes items over \$100,000. There are four (4) meetings, which are scheduled for: November 27, 2001, November 29, 2001, December 4, 2001, and December 6, 2001. James Lysen commented that this is one (1) of the most fascinating meetings to be involved with in the City. This is an educational opportunity. Kristine Kimball mentioned that she is available and volunteered her time. The following motion was then made.

MOTION: That all the Planning Board Members are in favor of sending Kristine Kimball as the new Planning Board Representative for the LCIP process FY2003.

VOTED: 4-0-1 (Kimball Abstained).

4. Gas Works Redevelopment Project. This item was presented by James Lysen. He said that the City of Lewiston is in receipt of a \$30,000 "Smart Growth Challenge Grant" from the State Planning Office to create a redevelopment plan with a focus on implementation strategies to revitalize a 27-acre site of the "Southern Gateway", utilizing the closure of the Lewiston Gas Light Company site by Northern Utilities, Inc. to assist in the process.

In order to kick-off the project, Artspace Projects, Inc., an arts-based development company has been invited to conduct a preliminary feasibility evaluation of this and other sites (i.e. LA Arts and The Public Theatre) in Lewiston for their potential art uses. Artspace Projects, Inc. are

scheduled to arrive in Lewiston on November 27, 2001 and spend two (2) days doing the study.

This item was brought to the Planning Board to request that a workshop be scheduled at 6:00 p.m. on November 27, 2001 prior to the Planning Board Meeting scheduled for that evening. In order to provide input at this forum, all officials will be invited to attend this workshop to discuss potential projects and the economic and community development impact of the arts. This is a good initiative.

The following motion was made.

MOTION: by **Roger Lachapelle**, seconded by **Kristine Kimball** that the Planning Board schedule a workshop on November 27, 2001 with Artspace Projects, Inc. and that all City officials receive an invitation.

VOTED: 5-0.

After this motion, James Lysen stated that there will be a light dinner from 5:00-6:00 p.m. before this workshop, which will be from 6:00-7:00 p.m. Also mentioned was to incorporate the Smart Growth application in Planning and that it be done at the January 2002 Organizational Meeting.

PLANNING BOARD VACANCIES: As a reminder, there will be two (2) Planning Board Member vacancies at the end of this season. Both Lewis Zidle and Mark Paradis' membership will need to be replaced. If there are any recommendations, please submit these to the Mayor, since the Mayor appoints Planning Board Members to this Board.

VIII. READING OF THE MINUTES: *Reading of the Minutes from the October 9, 2001 and October 23, 2001 Planning Board Meetings.*

MOTION: by **Lewis Zidle**, seconded by **John Cole** to approve the Planning Board Minutes for both October 9, 2001 and October 23, 2001, as submitted.

VOTED: 5-0.

IX. ADJOURNMENT: This meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m. The next Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 27, 2001.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis R. Mason, Chairman

DMC:dmc\C:\MyDocuments\Planbrd\Minutes\PB111301MIN.wpd

