

**CITY OF LEWISTON
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES for March 27, 2001 - Page 1 of 10**

- I. ROLL CALL:** This meeting was held in the City Council Chambers, was called to order at 6:36 p.m., and was chaired by Dennis Mason.
- **Members In Attendance:** Mark Paradis, Dennis Mason, John Cole, Muriel Minkowsky, Lewis Zidle, Rob Robbins, Roger Lachapelle, and Planning Board Student Member Ethan Chittim.
 - **Staff Present:** Gil Arsenault, Deputy Development Director; James Andrews, Community Development Director; Lincoln Jeffers, Economic Development Specialist; James Lysen, Planning Director; James Fortune, Planning Coordinator; and Doreen Asselin, Administrative Secretary - Planning Division.
- II. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA:** Item VI. Other Business, A. New Business, 2. Presentation concerning the proposed expansion of the LePage Bakery manufacturing plant, Lisbon Street, including the discontinuance of a portion of Birch Street (Site Plan amendment) - This item was postponed to a future meeting.
- III. CORRESPONDENCE:** The following three (3) items were distributed at this Planning Board Meeting:
- A. Project Review Form from Chris Branch, Public Works Director for the Lewiston Sun-Journal Expansion - Phase I.
 - B. Petition for Rezoning in regards to the proposal to rezone 1154-1160 Sabattus Street from the Resource Conservation (RC) District to the Neighborhood Conservation (NCA) District.
 - C. Correspondence dated March 27, 2001 in reference to LePage Bakeries, Birch Street and their request for tabling of their presentation at this Planning Board Meeting.
- MOTION:** by **Mark Paradis**, seconded by **Rob Robbins** to place the above correspondence on file to be read at the appropriate time.
- VOTED:** 7-0.
- IV. PUBLIC HEARING:** *Public Hearing concerning the FY2001/2002 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program and make a recommendation to the City Council.* This item was presented by **James Andrews**, Community Development Director for a recommendation to the City Council. The Review Committee included James Andrews, Planning Board Members Muriel Minkowsky and Dennis Mason, Assistant City Administrator **Phil Nadeau**, and Deputy Development Director Gil Arsenault, who made the recommendations. As a background to this presentation, Jim Andrews said that back in September the City Council put together a CDBG Committee, as well as a Housing Committee. The City Council is looking to fund the CDBG in a manner that will be project-oriented, instead of a scattered approach, meaning one (1) project over in one (1) part of the City and one (1) project in another. This will be focused on project-based initiatives. One (1) such project is housing in the downtown area. There are some changes in the direction of this budget for this year, as opposed to other years, which are highlighted and shown on the sheets entitled, "CDBG Development Block Grant Comparison of Funding Request for Fiscal Year 2001 and 2002" (three sheets).
- Another issue that came up in these meetings was the funding of public service agencies. Historically this has been funded in the amount of 15 percent of the grant for the fiscal year and program income for the previous year. This process goes through the CDBG meeting and City Council workshops. There was a consensus that the public service agency budget would be capped

this year at \$200,000. In previous years, it was 15 percent of allocation, plus program income for that year. In previous years, this has gone up to as far as \$225,000. Last year was \$213,625. This is reflected in the recommendations made by the Review Committee. Again, Jim Andrews stated that the need for this item to be brought to this Planning Board Meeting is for a request for a recommendation to take forward to the City Council. This needs to be before the City Council prior to May 15, 2001. This funding has to be presented to HUD in Manchester, New Hampshire by May 15, 2001. Jim Andrews mentioned that this needs to go to the City Council and if two (2) meetings are required, he is hoping for it to go to the April 17, 2001 and May 1, 2001 City Council Meetings.

Dennis Mason asked if Jim Andrews had any comment statutorily as to the lack of people attending this years meeting. Jim Andrews commented that it is statutory required to place the public notice in the newspaper one (1) week before and one (1) day before this meeting. He stated that he never discourages people from attending this meeting. He did comment that he feels people will probably show up at the City Council Meetings for deliberations.

Dennis Mason pointed out changes from lasts years CDBG budget. On Page No. 2 of the Comparison of Funding Request for Fiscal year 2001 and 2002 in regards to the Neighborhood Improvement Section. This section includes the housing project at Maple and, Blake Streets. Also, on the same page, Dennis Mason made reference to the Pierce Street Park Upgrade, which is right behind the proposed housing project. Jim Andrews commented that the Neighborhood Improvements is the main place where the changes have taken place. As to acquisition/demolition, this was funded last year at \$100,000 and that was also the request for this year. However, this was rolled into the Neighborhood projects, therefore, part of that money (\$381,709) may be used for acquisition/demolition. The Housing Sub-Committee request for the Sisters of Charity Health System (SOCHS) housing project also requested \$100,000, and this was initially looked at for putting \$100,000 into that, but that \$100,000 will also roll down into the Neighborhood projects.

The LPD - Enhanced Neighborhood Policing (ENP) item was put out as separate to show that that is part of that neighborhood and is part of the bigger projects. Neighborhood policing is being done in that neighborhood and will be part of these projects.

Under the Sisters of Charity Health System/Lots To Gardens, the \$7,000 also is a separate line item that this project is targeted for that neighborhood.

There are also two (2) other pieces that Jim Andrews brought to the Planning Boards attention. These two (2) other pieces pertain to the following.

1. The Lewiston-Auburn Transit Committee (LATC) request. This was placed in the Public Service Agencies and now has been moved into the Economic Development request. There is no funding that has been recommended for that this year. The other piece that has been changed is the following.
2. Pathways Extended Employment was placed in Economic Development and is now back in to Public Service Agencies. Historically is has been in Economic Development. This does fit into the Public Service Agency piece.

This item was then opened to the Planning Board for discussion, comments, and questions.

Rob Robbins made reference to Code Enforcement placed under Housing Rehab. There was nothing requested, however, the Review Committee has recommended \$50,000. Jim Andrews stated that there was no request initially for any funding. This piece includes some salary and administrative costs that are not directly related to Community Development, i.e. Community Development's salary and staff. The actual Code Enforcement's request, if it were in there, would be close to \$90,000. They are compromising and cutting it to \$50,000. Hopefully, this will be pulled entirely out of next years budget. This is a tough year for this years City budget and this is a way to make this work. This involves one (1) Code Enforcement Officer which is the closest to

being directly involved in CDBG issues in the downtown area in the two (2) Census Tracts of 201 and 204. This is also a reduction of \$26,000 from last year.

This information for Fiscal Year 2002 is public information and can be made available to the public. This is not published for the Planning Board Meetings, since it is a recommendation from a committee that goes to the Planning Board. Once it is recommended by the Planning Board, it is published for the City Council Meetings. The Planning Board does the final recommendation to the City Council.

Mark Paradis referred to Page No. 1. Moneys have been pulled out for Public Service Agencies and have gone into Code Enforcement and Neighborhood Improvements. There is a deduction to the \$200,000, which is rounded off to \$18,000 +/- total, as calculated by Gil Arsenault. The multiplier formula is 91.4. The question was asked, "Is there another way to fund the LA Transit Committee (LATC)?" Jim Andrews said that he would check into this. He will be doing research on this to see if this will be staying in there. Other numbers could be adjusted if this piece is taken out and put into another area. This should be included in the recommendation to the City Council.

This item was opened to the public. John Cole mentioned that he knows all the work that is involved in this and stated that he relies on the Sub-Committee for their hard work. He stated that he was prepared to vote on this. However, before a recommendation was made, the following comments were made by the following present in the audience.

Joel Packer was present on behalf of Pathways. He wanted to know if there was a formula used. Jim Andrews responded that it was a reduction by a multiplier of 91.4. Pathways total request amounts to two percent (2%) of the budget. Joel Packer thanked everyone for their continued support. He stated that the Pathways Extended Employment is a program for people with disabilities. This was originally placed under Public Services and is now under Economic Development. This program is worth \$400,000, which for every \$1.00 the City puts in, it is seven (7) times the multiplier. This has been funded every year for the \$10,000 level. Last year, it went down to \$5,000. This program provides 48 jobs for people in the Lewiston area. This is sort of a social service agency. He recommends that the Lewiston/Auburn Transit Committee (LATC) be placed somewhere else. He would like to be funded for \$10,000.

The following were also present for this meeting and asked for the amount that the Review Committee recommended:

1. Norwich House - \$10,968. They received \$12,000 last year.
2. Advocates for Children - \$2,285. They have two (2) requests: one request is for the Parent Resource Center and the other for Healthy Families And. The amount recommended by the Review Committee was the same for each.
3. **Melissa Robbins** was present on behalf of the Sexual Assault Crisis Center. Their request amounts to four percent (4%) of the budget. The Review Committee has recommended \$1,828. Melissa Robbins stated that she has been there for 2-1/2 years. There have been 44 individuals from Lewiston alone. There is no charge for this service. It is low income people that they deal with. Melissa Robbins stated that sexual assault jumped drastically last year.

Lincoln Jeffers arrived at 7:07 p.m.

Melissa Robbins stated that there are more adolescents than any other age group. They had a 36 percent increase in their reporting rate. Melissa Robbins said that she is not involved in the financials. John Cole then asked Melissa Robbins, "Are there any competing applicants on this

list?” Melissa Robbins responded with, “No”. In closing, it was stated that any funding at all is appreciated.

The public portion of this hearing was then closed and opened back up to the Planning Board for further discussion and a motion.

Joel Packer commented that the percentage done to the total agencies was fair. Joel Packer agreed that all these requests are worthwhile. Joel Packer stated to the Planning Board that if they follow his suggestion and take Pathways Extended Employment and fund it for \$10,000 under Economic Development, that would leave another \$5,000 to add to social service funding. This could be taken either out of Bates Mill Redevelopment or the LATC. Making this one (1) move would be good. He does not understand why his request is not considered Economic Development. Dennis Mason then asked Joel Packer, “How much more he could do with \$25,000 than he could with \$5,000 or \$10,000?” Joel Packer responded that he could convince a few more companies and bring in another 10-15 jobs. Both the economy and job market are good right now. This would really be hard to predict.

Ethan Chittim arrived at 7:20 p.m.

Rob Robbins then asked James Andrews, “Where, exactly, would the LATC likely go if it didn’t go with the public service agencies as it is now?” Jim Andrews responded that it could go with Economic Development, as with what was done with LATC-Fixed Route Bus Replacement. This could be funded through some other means through the City. Jim Andrews said that City funding could be used for the \$3,656. If not, then some would have to be taken out of Neighborhood Improvements. Jim Andrews said that he would recommend that this is taken out totally for this budget.

John Cole suggested that the Planning Board move to accept the CDBG recommendations as presented to the Planning Board, but to report to the City council and invite the City Council to hear from Joel Packer and to hear from Jim Andrews with respect to the proposed changes and allocations. He stated that this stops with the City Council and not with the Planning Board, therefore the following recommendation was made.

MOTION: *by John Cole, seconded by Mark Paradis that the Planning Board send a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the CDBG program budget as recommended by the Review Committee, subject to the City Council hearing from Pathways Executive Director, Joel Packer and Community Development Director, James Andrews regarding the proposed changes and allocation requests.*

VOTED: 7-0.

In closing, Jim Andrews stated that this will be presented to the City Council at their April 17, 2001 and May 1, 2001 Meetings and both these meetings will be published.

James Lysen arrived at 7:25 p.m.

John Cole recused himself from the Planning Board on this item, due to a conflict.

V. *Pre-Application Hearing and Determination of Completeness: Determination of Completeness and Pre-Application Hearing concerning the proposed expansion of the Lewiston Sun-Journal - Phase I, including the proposed discontinuance of Middle Street.*

In summary to James Fortune's memorandum dated March 21, 2001, the Lewiston Sun-Journal - Phase I consists of a new 17,000 square foot newsprint inserting operation and shipping facility and the development of new parking areas. The proposed project requires the demolition of two (2), multi-family buildings and the former Elks building on Middle Street and the discontinuance of Middle Street between Park and Ash Streets. The proposed expansion will take place on the land occupied by the demolished buildings and Middle Street.

It is anticipated that the City Council will act on the street discontinuance at their April 3, 2001 Meeting. Therefore, the Planning Board has asked for their recommendation concerning the street discontinuance as part of the approval process at this meeting.

The traffic impact has been addressed by Taylor Engineering Associates and was included in the Planning Board packets as correspondence dated March 14, 2001. Their analysis indicates that there will not be any significant impact from the project. Currently the parking requirement for this overall site is 256 spaces. There are only 112 currently available. The proposed development will result in a parking requirement of 197 spaces, with 144 to be provided on site. Although there will be still be a net deficit in parking requirements, there will be an additional 22 spaces provided on-site and a significant reduction in the overall parking demand.

On-street loading activities will be eliminated as a result of this project. This proposed expansion will provide for off-street loading and truck maneuvering within the site.

The Fire Department, in its initial review, has asked that all existing and proposed fire hydrants be shown on the plan.

Present at this meeting were **Jan Wiegman**, P.E., from Taylor Engineering Associates, Inc.; **Frederick "Rick" Hayden** from Dario Design; **Ed Snook** from the Lewiston Sun-Journal; **Ron Landry** from the U.S. Postal Service - Ash Street, Lewiston Branch; **Mrs. Paul A. Cote**, 54 Pine Street, Lewiston, and on behalf of the City of Lewiston, Economic Development Specialist **Lincoln Jeffers**.

Jan Wiegman made the presentation on the proposed expansion, while Lincoln Jeffers was available regarding the discontinuance of Middle Street. Jan Wiegman made reference to the workshop that was held at the last Planning Board Meeting on February 27, 2001. He said that both the proposed expansion and the requested discontinuance of Middle Street are being presented at this meeting.

Jan Wiegman stated that this project encompasses three (3) acres of land in the downtown. Some of the buildings have already come down. This project involves 14 properties, but does not include 54 Pine Street, the Bradford House (Paul A. Cote building). Jan Wiegman went on to say that this project, as stated above, will be a 17,000 square foot facility to the rear of 104 Park Street. This facility will serve as a mail room, receiving area, and storage area. Jan Wiegman then reiterated the tight parking, as mentioned above. This project will increase the amount of spaces and decrease the parking demand. Jan Wiegman went on to say that the Utility Plans shows the new routing of these services. The storm water will be redirected appropriately. The present lighting will remain in the existing parking lot.

In summary to Lincoln Jeffer's memorandum dated March 23, 2001, regarding the discontinuance of Middle Street - Pine Street to Ash Street, he states that this section needs to be discontinued to allow the Lewiston Sun-Journal to expand their facility in downtown Lewiston. Lincoln Jeffers request was for a recommendation on the street discontinuance so that the City Council can take their action at their April 3, 2001 Meeting. In his memorandum he states that there are three (3) abutters on the portion of Middle Street to be discontinued which are the United States Postal Service (U.S.P.S.), the Lewiston Sun-Journal, and Paul A. Cote. All these abutters are in agreement to discontinue this street. There are currently negotiations underway between the abutters

to work out a Joint Use and Maintenance Agreement.

This item was opened to the Planning Board for questions and comments from the Board Members. James Lysen commented that the Lewiston Sun-Journal is reducing their parking deficit and that this project meets the requirements of the code. There was a question as to lighting being mounted on the building. Jan Wiegman said that lighting will be located under the canopy and that there may be security lighting at the entrances. This lighting will need to be reflected on the plan. Dennis Mason asked, "What will Middle Street look like?" Jan Wiegman explained the plan presented to the Planning Board, including the landscaping. He stated that you will not be able to tell that there was a street there when this is completed. Lincoln Jeffers also explained on the plan presented to the Planning Board that with the moving of the curbing back, this will allow for additional parking on the Cote property. Lincoln Jeffers said that it is critical, by the way that the building is designed, to discontinue Middle Street. Jan Wiegman commented that there is sufficient room to maneuver trucks in the loading area. Also mentioned was that there is a proposed Maintenance Agreement between the United States Postal Service, the Lewiston Sun-Journal, and the Cote's. This will be available for Planning Board review at the Final Hearing.

Comments from the audience included: **Mrs. Paul Cote** of 54 Pine Street on behalf of herself and her husband, Paul. She stated that they both are very pleased with the expansion. They have no concerns.

Ron Landry from the U.S. Postal Service - Ash Street Branch stated that they are in full support of the Lewiston Sun-Journal expansion and also have no concerns. The street will be divided by the abutters. This project will increase their parking. They are in full agreement with the expansion. Ron Landry stated that both the Lewiston Sun-Journal and the U.S.P.S. will be co-owners of the existing Middle Street. He is very satisfied with the way this project is moving.

Lincoln Jeffers suggested that the Planning Board's action be contingent on development of the Maintenance Agreement. Ron Landry commented that the Postal Services Real Estate Specialists are writing up the Maintenance Agreement.

James Lysen went over the comments received from **Chris Branch**, the Public Works Director. His comments were: 1. On Drawing C-1, Site Plan to confirm that tractor trailer access is adequate and direction - where will it be entering the site. 2. On Drawing C-2, Utility Plan to see the Lewiston Fire Department's approval for the hydrant location shown on the plan. He would also like to get the Lewiston Water Division's approval for the hydrant type. The existing lines at the property line shall be capped. He would like to see calculations or a direct statement in drainage calculations stating that the existing system has adequate size to take new flows. 3. On Drawing C-3, Grading, Drainage & Erosion Control Plan, to have the Lewiston Water Director's approval for the materials to be used for sanitary sewer and water. 4. On Drawing C-5, Site Details, that a two foot (2') sump (minimum) catch basin be shown and for it to be cascade square granite.

Jan Wiegman commented that with the telephone pole being gone, they have placed a fire hydrant there. This will allow more flexibility in maneuverability. It was requested to have the fire chief address the location of the fire hydrant. Again, the Planning Board will have all comments from the various departments by the time of the Final Hearing.

There being no further comments, following actions were taken.

MOTION: by **Rob Robbins**, seconded by **Roger Lachapelle** that the Planning Board grants the necessary waivers and modifications regarding the application for the proposed expansion of the Lewiston Sun-Journal - Phase I, including the proposed discontinuance of Middle Street from Pine Street to Ash Street.

VOTED: 6-0.

MOTION: by **Lewis Zidle**, seconded by **Roger Lachapelle** that the Planning Board determines the application and Site Plan for the Lewiston Sun-Journal - Phase I, including the proposed discontinuance of Middle Street, from Pine Street to Ash Street to be complete and to schedule this application for review at a Final Hearing at the April 10, 2001 Meeting.

VOTED: 6-0.

MOTION: by **Rob Robbins**, seconded by **Mark Paradis** that the Planning Board recommends that Middle Street be discontinued between Pine Street and Ash Street to facilitate the proposed expansion of the Lewiston Sun-Journal - Phase I, subject to an acceptable Joint Use and Maintenance Agreement drawn up between the three (3) parties involved.

VOTED: 6-0.

John Cole returned to the Planning Board for the remaining agenda items.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. New Business:

- 1. Proposed to rezone 1154-1160 Sabattus Street (Tax Map 37, Lot Nos. 4 and 6) from the Resource Conservation (RC) District to the Neighborhood Conservation "A" (NCA) District and possibly schedule it for a Public Hearing.** James Fortune went over the information sent previously to the Planning Board Members for both the March 13, 2001 and March 27, 2001 Planning Board Meetings. The Planning Board Meeting for March 13, 2001 was canceled at Planning Board Chairman Dennis Mason's request.

This item has been brought to the Planning Board by **Maurice Dulac**, who is requesting that the City initiate a proposal for rezoning. A copy of the proposal and correspondence dated March 5, 2001 from City Councilor Renee M. Bernier (Ward 2) was previously delivered to all the Planning Board Members. According to Renee Bernier's correspondence, the parcel of property at 1154-1160 Sabattus Street has their own water and sewer hookups. Maurice Dulac would like to construct a single-family or two-family unit, if allowed. Renee Bernier also stated in her correspondence that this is an opportunity for new construction and expansion of housing opportunities within this community.

In addition to the above, James Fortune stated in his memorandum dated March 8, 2001 that the two (2) parcels have 220 feet and 340 feet of frontage on Sabattus Street. Maurice Dulac would like to rezone the front portion of both parcels to a depth of 200 feet. Maurice Dulac would like to recoup some of the value of his land by placing a single-family or two-family home on the vacant parcels. Along with the above, a map showing the approximate boundary of the proposed rezoning and how it relates to the wetland area (No Name Brook and the outlet of No Name Pond) were also forwarded to the Planning Board Members.

In addition to the memorandum by James Fortune dated March 20, 2001 and placed in the Planning Board packets, distributed at this meeting was a Petition for Rezoning form, in which an acceptable number of residents on this form were verified at the City Clerk's office. This item has been brought to the Planning Board to be scheduled for a Public Hearing.

A wetlands delineation was done in June of 2000 after the Sabattus Street reconstruction was completed. Maurice Dulac has also applied to the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) for a revision to the flood plain maps. This information should be available at the Public Hearing. Based on the City's shoreland area maps, the area proposed for rezoning would lie outside the wetland area, except for a small portion on 1160 Sabattus Street. Shoreland regulations would allow residential construction and any principal or accessory structure must remain 100 feet from the upland edge of the wetland.

Maurice Dulac does not propose to create any new lots and both of the existing lots clearly meet the minimum 40,000 square feet, have the proper road frontage, and have greater than 200 feet of shore frontage.

This item was closed to the Planning Board and opened to the public.

Present at this meeting were **Maurice Dulac** and **City Councilors Renee Bernier** (Ward 2) and **Joyce Bilodeau** (Ward 6). This property is located just beyond Golder Road. Councilor Renee Bernier stated that she feels the Planning Board has all the information that they need for this rezoning.

The question to ask is, "Should this be residentially developed?", since No Name Pond drains out of this wetland. It is downstream of the pond. Basically one (1) lot can be made conforming and the other lot developed. There will be no changes to the lot lines.

James Lysen commented that this situation makes sense to "split-zone" the lots.

Maurice Dulac has resided here since 1934. The only comment that Maurice Dulac said was that the sewer and water are already there.

There being no further comments from the public, this item was then opened to the Planning Board and the following motion was made.

MOTION: *by John Cole, seconded by Mark Paradis that the proposal by Maurice Dulac, 1154-1160 Sabattus Street to rezone his property from the Resource Conservation (RC) District to the Neighborhood Conservation "A" (NCA) District be scheduled for a Public Hearing on April 10, 2001.*

VOTED: 7-0.

2. ***Presentation concerning the proposed expansion of the LePage Bakery manufacturing plant, Lisbon Street, including the discontinuance of a portion of Birch Street (Site Plan amendment).*** Distributed at this meeting and listed under Item III. Correspondence was the letter dated March 27, 2001 from Technical Services, Inc. on behalf of LePage Bakeries requesting that this item be tabled, due to a number of technical issues which need to be resolved.

3. ***Review changes to the City of Lewiston Planning Board Handbook Rules of Procedure.*** The Draft copy of the City of Lewiston Planning Board Handbook was delivered to the Planning Board Members in a separate delivery from the March 27, 2001 delivery, since the March 13, 2001 Planning Board Meeting was canceled. This handbook contained the changes that were requested at the January 9, 2001 Planning Board Meeting. These changes include: a change to Section 3.D with respect to accepting additional information and documentation for

development reviews at the Planning Board Meeting; a change to Section 3.G with respect to taking official Minutes at the Planning Board workshops; a change to the order of business in Section 3.E; and an update to the Code of Ethics from the AICP and ICMA. Also included were appropriate sections of the Planning Board Protocol with the sections renumbered. This appears on Page Nos. 8 and 9.

It was suggested that Staff incorporate any amendments made to the code in this handbook. The only revision made was on Page No. 4, Section 4.09. In the last sentence delete the word, "his" and replace it with the word, "their".

The following motion was made.

MOTION: by **Roger Lachapelle**, seconded by **Mark Paradis** that the Planning Board accepts the Planning Board Handbook, as amended.

VOTED: 7-0.

Also, the following is a continuation of the discussion which had taken place at the January 9, 2001 Planning Board Meeting. At the January 9, 2001 Planning Board Meeting, Planning Board Member Rob Robbins mentioned that in changing the wording in Article VII, Section f, the new wording must be consistent with the City Charter. The code amendment for Article VII. Planning Board was included in the Planning Board packets delivered for the March 27, 2001 Planning Board Meeting. This code amendment has been revised by Planning Board Staff for Article VII, Section 3 (f). This section shall now read, "The Planning Board shall adopt appropriate rules of procedure and statements of policy consistent with provisions of the City Charter and this Code to enable it to carry out its functions."

The following motion was made.

MOTION: by **Roger Lachapelle**, seconded by **Muriel Minkowsky** that the Planning Board recommends this change to the City Council and for it to be heard in conjunction with the other code amendment at the appropriate time.

VOTED: 7-0.

4. Continue discussion concerning Planning Board responsibilities associated with providing recommendations on the acquisitions and dispositions of real estate by the City of Lewiston. Gil Arsenaault stated that this is in reference to the disposition

of all public ways. This is in the code. It is a requirement. John Cole mentioned the state statute and, as to when a public way is discontinued, a public easement is distinguished. James Lysen commented that it is easier to get rid of a public street than a paper street. This needs a recommendation from the Planning Board that this be kept the way that it currently is.

James Lysen suggested having the Land Committee removed. There is more value in maintaining the Planning Board's role, specifically since this is public information and it is in the evening when the public can attend. Mark Paradis commented that often when the Planning Board does their job, the City Council somehow does not receive the information. James Lysen stated that the action made at the Planning Board Meetings are part of the recommendation to the City Council, and important recommendations should be part of the motion.

John Cole stated that the Planning Board is empowered to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council does not even have to receive a recommendation. The City Council can act without the Planning Board's recommendation. James Lysen then referred to Page CDA 184. James Lysen said that the Planning Board needs to initiate the action 15 days after a motion has been taken. This is listed under (e), Vote Requirements.

Dennis Mason commented that this has been placed on the Planning Board agendas in reference to the correspondence received from Phil Nadeau, Assistant City Administrator.

Rob Robbins stated that he does not feel that the Planning Board needs to make a recommendation as to a change. Life should not be made difficult for the City Council. There needs to be a solution as to what would be reviewed, i.e., every two foot (2') strips of land, dollar value, etc. Mark Paradis said that he would like to streamline the process and review after six (6) months, as he has previously stated in the past. Dennis Mason agreed that the Planning Board needs to come up with parameters for review, i.e, dollar value, etc and to not create so much paperwork. This takes up Staff time, etc. However, he feels the Planning Board should be kept informed. As a result of what Dennis Mason mentioned about keeping the Planning Board informed, John Cole requested that both Gil Arsenault and James Lysen check back for the past six (6) months on any acquisitions the Planning Board has not acted on. Mark Paradis asked, "How can we change something we have not been doing?" He again suggested this be done for six (6) months and then see how much burden it is for Staff. He also suggested that this should be done this year with the current Planning Board Members. In closing this discussion, it was decided that this item be placed on the agenda for the first meeting in November 2001, which is November 13, 2001. If it is not a problem, then dispose of it.

B. Old Business:

1. Determination of Completeness and Final Hearing concerning a fill project at the Stetson Brook Estates Mobile Home Park. This project was tabled at the 8/22/00, 9/25/00, and 11/28/00 meetings and will be placed on the May 8, 2001 Planning Board agenda. This item is currently awaiting a response from the D.E.P.

2. Receive a copy of the final draft of the No Name Pond Watershed Management Plan and schedule it for a Public Hearing. This will be placed on the April 10, 2001 Planning Board agenda. James Lysen stated that this will be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. This will be received at the April 10, 2001 Planning Board Meeting and will be scheduled to be heard on the April 24, 2001 Planning Board Meeting.

VII. READING OF THE MINUTES: *Draft Minutes from the February 27, 2001 Planning Board Meeting.* The acceptance of these minutes was postponed until the April 10, 2001 Planning Board Meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT:

The following motion was made to adjourn.

MOTION: by Mark Paradis, seconded by John Cole to adjourn this meeting at 8:55 p.m.

VOTED: 7-0.

The next Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 10, 2001.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Paradis, Secretary

