

Standish Town Hall

175 Northeast Road [Rte 35], Standish, ME 04084

ph: (207) 642-3461

fx: (207) 642-5181

Planning Board Meeting Minutes 05-14-2012

Town of Standish
Continued Planning Board Meeting
May 14, 2012

Chairman Steve Nesbitt called the meeting to order at 7:13 p.m. Present were Carol Billington, Diana Allen, Alta Harding and Brian Libby. Staff present were Bud Benson, Town Planner and Jackie Dyer, Secretary to the Planning Board.

Standish Collision Center/57 Northeast Road- Map 10, Lot 60- Site Plan Amendment

This was introduced at the last Planning Board meeting on May 07, 2012 and a site walk was done on Saturday May 12, 2012. A workshop was held tonight and there was discussion with some of the adjoining neighbors about buffering, parking and the plan itself along with things about trees dying that had been planted and not replaced, as they were on the previously approved plan. There was discussion about the facade of the building and matching up the front of the building with the existing structure as far as siding and buffering the east side of the property and adding more trees up to the front on the right where parking will be. Mr. Nesbitt asked Mr. Pomerleau if he had anything he would like to add. He said they have been there since 1993 and are looking for an addition onto the building as the business is growing. He has hopes to add another worker or two with an expansion. Mark Plourde, an abutter spoke and said his issues and concerns about this application are that Mr. Pomerleau has failed to comply with previous approvals or conditions of approval specifically to the buffering strip of trees along the property. He sees the new plan with eight parking spaces added where the buffer strip was supposed to go. He said he came to the Planning Board 15 years ago, he had written a letter and brought with him dated May 04, 1997, and he wishes before any plans are approved or permission granted, that the Board make Mr. Pomerleau come into compliance with the previous conditions of approval stated back in 1997. He said that some of the trees planted quickly died and were never replaced. He said he had asked the Board 15 years ago to consider having Mr. Pomerleau put in a stockade fence, which he feels is a permanent solution. Mr. Plourde said that he feels the other abutter, Ray Cole may feel the same way. He says that he sees an expansion and use of services and he would like to see better buffering. He says that he supports Mr. Pomerleau in running a business but would like to see some buffering that was part of the previous approvals. Mr. Nesbitt told him that the Board did get his previous memo from 1997 and offered it to anyone from the public to read if they want. Ann Farrar from Sunrise Corner spoke and reminded the Board that they needed to be consistent with previous rulings regarding site plan applications and violations. She was in violation back in August 2008 and she had to fix what was wrong and stop doing what she was doing at the time until the issue was fixed. She feels that Mr. Pomerleau should have to fix what wasn't done in 1997 and he shouldn't be able to move forward with his project until he is in compliance. She said she hated to be hard, but she felt that everyone should be treated the same. She feels that coming into compliance would make the abutters happy. There were no other public comments. Mr. Pomerleau asked to respond to Mrs. Farrar but Mr. Nesbitt told him it's up to the Planning Board to cite violations and set forth plans that the CEO would enforce. If there are any plan non-conformities, it's up to the CEO to address those. The CEO (Code Enforcement Officer) would address those issues. Mrs. Billington said that she feels that people think the CEO rides around Town looking for violations, but really it's up to the abutters to let him know if something is wrong. Mr. Pomerleau said he thought that a written report had to be filed with the CEO and he didn't know of any written reports pertaining to him since he has been in business. Mr. Nesbitt said that there are no violations on file and Mr. Benson said that there is no record of any violations on file. Mrs. Harding asked if the trees were a violation and Mr. Benson said it was. Mr. Nesbitt said that needs to be directed to the CEO. Mr. Benson said this was done during an application process and the Planning Board has to ask Mr. Pomerleau to replant those trees. He had replanted some in 1997 and in 2005 on the property line, which the abutters said he didn't. He has pictures of trees on the property line dated 2005. Those trees were there for years after, there are a few of them that are now gone. He said he will replant those missing trees, but he feels that it is a code enforcement issue and hopes that this will not stop his project from going forward. He has pictures that dispute that he did plant trees in 1997, but he will replant those if that's what it takes. Mr. Plourde said he would like that done before the building permit is okayed. Mrs. Billington asked why Mr. Benson had given them some photos. Mr. Benson said there was another issue about a drainage issue between the two neighbors and a drainage bed had been put in prior to the workshop, after the site walk. Mr. Benson says that the Board could require buffering in that area, and screening along that property line. He said buffering should be done along both property lines, eastern and western. Mrs. Billington said that she remembered Mrs. Farrar's situation and that the application was tabled for a period of time until she was in conformance. It was a very different issue than this, but it was a compliance with a previous approval. She said the Board needs consistency with things. She said this is not a new use, just an expansion. There have been new uses added over the years. She feels that there are many uses on the property and wants to know when this may become a safety issue for pedestrians in the site as far as walking around and trucks moving around also, at

what time does it become unsafe ? She said there are two abutters, one on either side, and they are trying to have residential uses on their property. She said this is a high impact site and she feels that substantial buffering needs to be done on both sides as she feels this will help to calm the situation with them. She feels that abutters play an important part in site applications. Mr. Nesbitt said that Mr. Benson had made a suggestion, that before they approve the application, that they ask Mr. Pomerleau to add trees for buffering before the application is found complete. Mrs. Billington said that adding trees can be done very quickly, but she would like to see a substantial amount of trees put in, not just a few and then in 15-20 years, not have it be an effective buffer. Mr. Pomerleau came back up with pictures of his property line that had a substantial buffer on the easterly property line, but those trees were removed about six months ago and not by him. He said he had substantial buffering that is now gone. Mr. Nesbitt said that the concerns are about Mr. Pomerleau's property and Mr. Pomerleau said that he would do buffering, whatever it takes rather it be stockade fences or trees. Mrs. Billington said that trees get prettier every year and stockade fences don't. Mr. Nesbitt asked the two abutters their opinion over the stockade fence of trees. Mr. Plourde said he would prefer a stockade fence and said that he would let Mr. Cole speak for himself, but he was concerned about all the required parking spaces as to whether they would displace the buffering. Mr. Nesbitt said that the parking spaces are approximately 15 feet from the property line. Mr. Plourde asked if there is a drainage easement over the property. Mr. Benson said that he didn't see any drainage easement on the plan but that there is a 50 foot right of way and the parking is set back 15 feet from the right of way. He sees no drainage easement at all. Mr. Plourde said he believes that the drainage easement is 60 feet and hasn't changed. The right of way is 60 feet by Cowan Drive. There is a drainage easement on the original plan, but not on the new site plan. The drainage easement is simply an easement over someone else's property that can be used for drainage, which has a 30 foot right of way. That drainage easement doesn't preclude trees being planted there. Mr. Pomerleau said that Cowan Drive is not build up to Town standards, it's just a little driveway that goes to the back of the property. It was put there to get access to buildings down back and never built to Town standards. It has been there for 20-30 years. Mrs. Harding wondered about the parking spaces being defined like with the planting of shrubs, a fence or maybe even a sign that says "parking." She feels that there needs to be room for compromise and she asked the abutters just what their complaint is. Is it the noise, the color of the house, etc? She feels that there has to be a plan and continuity in the plan. Does Mr. Pomerleau need to put up a fence or plant trees ? Mr. Pomerleau said that he has a 8-9 foot drop from the Cole's property to his and the Cole's would be looking right over the top of the fence, so what would that accomplish ? The Cole's property actually comes right up to the septic on his property. Mr. Nesbitt asked if they really want a fence or trees, as the fence will eventually become shabby looking and there is no enforcement saying it would have to be replaced. Mr. Nesbitt said he would rather see the trees, but with more density than what is in the ordinance. Mr. Benson said that in reading the buffering requirements, it says that if existing buffering does not exist, a landscape buffer natural in appearance shall be installed every hundred feet including its vegetation. This does not include stockade fencing if you are sticking to the standard, Mr. Benson said that the buffering this is talking about in a code for the Town Gateway is natural, not structural. Mr. Nesbitt said he agreed with that and Mr. Plourde said he did not come to pick apart Mr. Pomerleau's property, just that it's been 15 years and the time has come and gone to plant a natural buffer, which he feels never happened. He feels that a stockade fence would solve his concerns other than worrying about whether trees will stay growing. Mrs. Billington made a motion to find the application complete, seconded by Mr. Libby. All in favor. The conditions of approval are as follows :

ARTICLE XII, Standards

§ 181-73. Conditions for approval. [Amended 12-9-2003 by Order No. 194-03; 10-10-2006 by Order No. 89-06; 10-10-2006 by Order No. 90-06]

No preliminary or final site plan shall be approved unless, in the judgment of the Planning Board, the applicant has proven that all of the following conditions are found to exist regarding said plan:

- *The provisions for vehicular loading, unloading and parking and for vehicular and pedestrian circulation on the site and onto adjacent public streets and ways will not create hazards to safety nor will impose a significant burden upon public facilities.*

Mr. Nesbitt said that he would like to see the indoor parking spaces added to the plan and the display lot limited to stalls 9'x18' in size for trailers. The parking needs to be delineated ,no fencing required ,pins would be okay to mark the corners .Mr. Pomerleau said he will do something to show the 4 corners .Mrs. Billington made the motion that Condition A is met with the condition that all parking spaces inside the building be marked and on the plan. And that the display be delineated in some fashion with stall measuring 9"x18" each-18 stalls. This motion was seconded by Mrs. Allen. Mr. Nesbitt brought up the sidewalks, which is not part of the plan and feels that the sidewalk doesn't need to be added at this point. Mrs. Billington said that there is an ordinance that called for the installation of a sidewalk ,but it doesn't say how it's supposed to be installed .Mrs. Billington amended her motion that a sidewalk not be added by the applicant at this time. This was seconded by Mr. Libby. All in favor of amendment for condition A. Without an ordinance change to reduce the parking requirement for an auto display area we should consider a condition of approval limiting the 5000 SF auto display area to 18 parking stalls of (9'x18') in size. See suggested condition of approval "A" below.

B. The bulk location and height of proposed buildings and structures and the proposed uses thereof will not be detrimental or will impose undue burdens on the public facilities.

Mrs. Billington made a motion that Standard B has been met, seconded by Mr. Libby. All in favor.

C. The provisions of on-site landscaping and screening do provide adequate protection to neighboring properties from detrimental features of the development.

Mr. Nesbitt said that the Planning Board had talked about adding some buffering on the east and west sides of the property. Mrs. Billington said there are two things to think about; the actual configuration of the screening and does it need to be done prior to the

application being found complete ? Mrs. Billington said it is not typical for the Planning Board to design the screening ,but have the applicant do it and then have the Board either agree or disagree. Mr. Pomerleau said that he would rather do some fencing ,but isn't sure whether he would want to fence in around his house and barn as he has a lot of lawns and trees there, which is substantial on the Cole property. He wondered if he could fence from the barn down to the collision center building or from the driveway to the back of the barn on the easterly side. On the westerly side he would fence from the collision center to parking lot #21 and then to the street. There are already a clump of trees buffering that side. He would be able to back his parking up to the fence. He didn't want to go through the middle of the parking area, but would use trees as a more natural buffer. Trees have to be planted every 100 feet in 2 groups of 3 at least 2" in caliber or 8' evergreens in 2 groups of 3, or 2" tall shrubs in 6 groups of 3. Trees will be planted in the display lot and then a stockade fence from the collision center to the display lot from lot 21 to display lot. This would be the same buffering requirement as natural buffering. Mr. Nesbitt made a motion that a stockade fence be installed on the easterly side beginning at the existing tree line up to the display lot and from the display lot, 2" caliber trees in 2 groups of 3 will be planted. On the westerly side a stockade fence will be installed from the collision center to the rear of the barn and then 2" caliber trees in groups of 3. It's a little more than 100 feet as the trees were removed by Mr. Cole to make room for his motor home. Mrs. Billington made the motion that Standard C has been met and delineated by the chair and the buffering be put in place prior to the addition being put on at the collision center. This was seconded by Mr. Libby. Mr. Pomerleau wanted clarification that the new driveway was being left alone. The Board asked Mr. Pomerleau to update the plan before the signing of fact at the next meeting. Mrs. Harding had a concern about the north side ,saying the fence should be put in after the new addition. The fence will be installed before as there is adequate room. The abutters are in agreement .Mrs. Billington said that the Board needed to be careful that the abutters are not dictating what they should be doing .All in favor.

- *The site plan adequately provides for the soil and drainage problems that the development will create.*

Mr. Libby made a motion that Standard D is met ,seconded by Mrs. Harding. All in favor. Although the new 1856 SF building requires about 10 new parking stalls there is no requirement to pave them. Most of the area proposed for the new building is currently packed gravel and mostly impervious thus minimal new impervious area is proposed.

- *The provisions for exterior lighting will not create undue hazards to motorists traveling on adjacent public streets nor are inadequate for the safety of occupants or users of the site nor will such lighting damage the value and diminish the usability of adjacent properties.*

Then plan shows additional lighting on the building and these must be concealed .A motion was made by Mr. Libby that Standard D is met, with an amendment that lighting must be concealed. This was seconded by Mrs. Billington. All in favor.

The site plan shows four wall pack lights on the building. Only concealed source lights should be used.

F. The applicant has provided reasonable evidence of his financial capabilities to complete the development as planned and approved.

Motion made by Mr. Libby that Standard F is met and seconded by Mrs .Billington. All in favor.

G. The proposed development will not create undue fire safety hazards by not providing adequate access to the site or the buildings on the site for emergency vehicles or by failure to meet other fire safety ordinances or laws. The Fire Department shall file a written report with the Planning Board prior to the hearing.

A motion was made by Mrs. Billington that Standard G has been met, seconded by Mrs. Allen. All in favor. The applicant must get the fire chief's approval before occupancy.

The area currently is serviced by fire hydrants. See fire department report.

H. The proposed development has made adequate provision for sewage disposal.

A motion was made by Mr. Nesbitt that Standard H has been met and seconded by Mrs. Billington. All in favor.

Existing system is functioning properly.

I. The proposed site plan will not alter the existing character of the surrounding zoning district or division to the extent that it will become a detriment or potential nuisance to said zoning division or district. A motion was made by Mrs. Billington, with the stipulation that the siding remain consistent with the existing siding. Seconded by Mr. Libby. All in favor.

Many of the current residents in the area also run businesses from their homes.

- *The proposed development has made adequate provision for water supply, including an adequate supply of water for fire-protection purposes.*

Motion made by Mr. Libby that Standard J is met and seconded by Mrs. Allen .All in favor.

Fire hydrants serve this area.

- *No plan shall be approved by the Planning Board as long as the applicant is in default on a previously approved plan.*

Motion made by Mr. Libby that Standard K is met and seconded by Mr. Nesbitt. All in favor.

Applicant is not in default.

*L. Architectural drawings showing exteriors of proposed new nonresidential/commercial buildings in the Village Center District shall be compatible with a Colonial New England design. Such design can be achieved by incorporating features such as, but not limited to, broken rooflines, clapboard siding, steeply pitched roofs, roof overhangs, small pane windows, dormers, window shutters. **NOT APPLICABLE***

This project is not within the village center district. NA

M. Within the Standish Corner District, the plan must meet all of the following additional standards:

(1) The proposed development complies with the regulating plan and the applicable SCD street frontage type standards within the Standish Corner District.

The Board feels the application meets this standard.

(2) The proposed development, both public and/or private buildings and landscaping, contributes to the physical definition of rights-of-way as civic spaces within the Standish Corner District.

The Board made a decision on this item.

(3) The proposed development adequately accommodates automobiles, while respecting the pedestrian and spatial form of public areas within the Standish Corner District.

*(4) If the lot to be developed shall be divided from a greater parcel, access to the parcel, or the "Pioneer Lot" (See conceptual Connectivity Master Plan in §-181-7.1.), shall be from an allowable SCD street frontage type perpendicular to the existing SCD street or arterial. Existing curb cuts are allowed to be continued to be used by existing uses. For new use(s) where the closure of the curb cut is triggered by the conditions of approval, standards contained within Chapter 252 (Streets and Sidewalks) or by Planning Board supplemental review, the perpendicular SCD street shall be built to the minimum block length and other SCD street frontage type standards and serve both as access to the parking area for the development as well as for parking for the development. The applicant shall build the perpendicular SCD street to the required standards and provide for maintenance of the same until such time that the road is accepted by the Town as a street. #4 **NOT APPLICABLE***

No division proposed

*(5) Provisions shall be made for phased construction such as conduit extensions and stubs. This information shall be located and noted on the approved site plan recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds(#5 **NOT APPLICABLE**)*

NA

- *Underground utilities.*

Motion made by Mrs. Billington that M, 1-6 Standards are met. Seconded by Mr. Libby., All in favor.

N. This approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application and supporting documents submitted and affirmed by the applicant (either orally or in writing) and that any variation from the plans, proposals, and supporting documents is subject to review and approval by the Planning Board, except for minor changes which the Code Enforcement Officer may approve. Application has been approved.

Standish Auto Parts/127 Ossipee Trail West-Map 10, Lot 13 B-Site Plan Application

This was introduced on May 07, 2012. There was a site walk held on Saturday May 12, 2012 and a workshop held tonight on May 14, 2012. The applicant is looking to build a 60'x100' building for retail sales and warehousing. The current zone is Standish Corner District and gateway. The Board talked about adding lights and buffering at the workshop and the applicant will add those to the plan. Part of this application is also to add a conceptual right of way to the building because of the building size. Mr. Phil Pomerleau spoke on behalf of the applicant, saying that he does a lot of business with him. He feels that it's a very good company and one of the oldest companies in Town. He feels that it's a great thing to have businesses expand and want to stay in Standish and hopefully jobs will be added. His concern to the Board is the sidewalks that may have to be built with this business. He feels that a sidewalk should not have to be built as this is so far from the Village Center District and the connecting to this one, if Mr. Whiteley has to build it, would be a very long time coming. There were no further comments from the public. Mrs. Billington made the motion to find the application complete, seconded by Mr. Libby. All in favor. Mr. Nesbitt told Mr. Whiteley that this is a very nice site plan. The conditions of approval are as follows :

*§ 181-73. Conditions for approval. [Amended 12-9-2003 by Order No. 194-03; 10-10-2006 by Order No. 89-06; 10-10-2006 by Order No. 90-06]
No preliminary or final site plan shall be approved unless, in the judgment of the Planning Board, the applicant has proven that all of the following conditions are found to exist regarding said plan:*

A. The provisions for vehicular loading, unloading and parking and for vehicular and pedestrian circulation on the site and onto adjacent public streets and ways will not create hazards to safety nor will impose a significant burden upon public facilities

A motion was made by Mrs. Harding that Standard A has been met and seconded by Mrs. Allen. Mrs. Billington said there is no sidewalk plan by the Town and the sidewalk requirement should be waived. She made an amendment to wave the sidewalks and this was seconded by Mr. Libby. All in favor.

A parking table has been added to the plan..

B. The bulk location and height of proposed buildings and structures and the proposed uses thereof will not be detrimental or will impose undue burdens on the public facilities.

A motion was made by Mrs. Allen and seconded by Mrs. Harding that Standard B has been met. Applicant has shown pictures what the building will look like. All in favor.

C. The provisions of on-site landscaping and screening do provide adequate protection to neighboring properties from detrimental features of the development.

The applicant has proposed to plant trees and shrubs along the frontage and around the sign .A motion was made by Mrs. Billington that Standard C has been met and seconded by Mr. Libby. All in favor.

D. The site plan adequately provides for the soil and drainage problems that the development will create.

A motion was made by Mr. Libby that Standard D has been met and seconded by Mrs. Harding. All in favor.

- The provisions for exterior lighting will not create undue hazards to motorists traveling on adjacent public streets nor are inadequate for the safety of occupants or users of the site nor will such lighting damage the value and diminish the usability of adjacent properties.

The applicant needs to add lighting to the front (concealed source) and will have that put on the plan prior to the signing of the Finding of Fact. Mrs. Billington made a motion that Standard E has been met and seconded by Mr. Libby. All in favor.

Only concealed source / full cut off lights should be used LED lights encouraged. See proposed condition of approval "A".

F. The applicant has provided reasonable evidence of his financial capabilities to complete the development as planned and approved.

A motion was made by Mr. Libby that Standard F has been met and seconded by Mrs. Allen. All in favor.

G. The proposed development will not create undue fire safety hazards by not providing adequate access to the site or the buildings on the site for emergency vehicles or by failure to meet other fire safety ordinances or laws. The Fire Department shall file a written report with the Planning Board prior to the hearing.

A motion was made by Mrs. Billington that Standard G has been met and seconded by Mrs. Harding. All in favor.

The proposed new building is less than 2000 SF from an existing fire hydrant. See fire department report.

- The proposed development has made adequate provision for sewage disposal. There is a septic system on site and a new one will be added.

Mr. Benson said a new one will be installed and the applicant is in the process of having a design done. A motion was made by Mr. Libby that Standard H has been met and seconded by Mrs. Allen. All in favor.

Existing system is functioning properly. A new system is proposed but not shown on the plan.

I. The proposed site plan will not alter the existing character of the surrounding zoning district or division to the extent that it will become a detriment or potential nuisance to said zoning division or district. A motion was made by Mrs. Harding that Standard I has been met and seconded by Mr. Libby. All in favor.

J. The proposed development has made adequate provision for water supply, including an adequate supply of water for fire-protection purposes

A motion was made by Mrs. Billington that Standard J has been met and seconded by Mr. Nesbitt. All in favor.

The fire hydrant that serves this area is about 1800 ft. away.

K. No plan shall be approved by the Planning Board as long as the applicant is in default on a previously approved plan.

A motion was made by Mr. Libby that Standard K has been met and seconded by Mrs. Billington. All in favor.

L. Architectural drawings showing exteriors of proposed new nonresidential/commercial buildings in the Village Center District shall be compatible with a Colonial New England design. Such design can be achieved by incorporating features such as, but not limited to, broken rooflines, clapboard siding, steeply pitched roofs, roof overhangs, small pane windows, dormers, window shutters. **NOT APPLICABLE**

This project is not within the village center district. NA

M. Within the Standish Corner District, the plan must meet all of the following additional standards:

A motion was made by Mr. Libby that Standard 1 M has been met with adding the wording "conceptual right of way" and this was seconded by Mrs. Harding. All in favor.

(1) The proposed development complies with the regulating plan and the applicable SCD street frontage type standards within the Standish Corner District.

(2) The proposed development, both public and/or private buildings and landscaping, contributes to the physical definition of rights-of-way as civic spaces within the Standish Corner District.

(3) The proposed development adequately accommodates automobiles, while respecting the pedestrian and spatial form of public areas within the Standish Corner District.

(4) If the lot to be developed shall be divided from a greater parcel, access to the parcel, or the "Pioneer Lot" (See conceptual Connectivity Master Plan in §-181-7.1.), shall be from an allowable SCD street frontage type perpendicular to the existing SCD street or arterial. Existing curb cuts are allowed to be continued to be used by existing uses. For new use(s) where the closure of the curb cut is triggered by the conditions of approval, standards contained within Chapter 252 (Streets and Sidewalks) or by Planning Board supplemental review, the perpendicular SCD street shall be built to the minimum block length and other SCD street frontage type standards and serve both as access to the parking area for the development as well as for parking for the development. The applicant shall build the perpendicular SCD street to the required standards and provide for maintenance of the same until such time that the road is accepted by the Town as a street.

No division is proposed.

(5) Provisions shall be made for phased construction such as conduit extensions and stubs. This information shall be located and noted on the approved site plan recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds. **NOT APPLICABLE**

NA

(6) Underground utilities.

(a) On new frontage type SCD streets, utilities shall be buried.

NA not a new street.

(b) All developments shall be served by public water.

NA This is an existing lot and not a portion of a new development.

(c) Except for existing Town Center SCD street frontage type, the requirements for buried utilities and the provision for a project to be served by water can be waived by the Planning Board if the applicant can demonstrate all of the following:

[1] The project is more than 2,000 feet in road distance from an existing public water line; and

NA The project is about 1800 ft from the last fire hydrant on Rte 25.

[2] Subsurface conditions, such as ledge, make the extension of waterlines or buried utilities cost prohibitive.

Mr. Benson told the Board that because the building is over 5,000 square feet, that it triggers a supplemental Planning Board review. He believes that Mr. Whiteley has met all of those standards.

(7) For any project triggering supplemental Planning Board review within the Standish Corner District the review and approval shall be as follows:

(a) On Town Main, Town Gateway and existing and proposed Town Avenue SCD street frontage types, building footprints are allowed up to 5,000 square feet. Applicants for developments with buildings that have a footprint greater than 5,000 square feet must demonstrate compliance with the following standards:

The proposed building is more than 5000 SF so it must meet the following additional seven standards.

[1] Thirty percent of off-street parking shall be shared. After business hours, 100% of the parking shall be shared except for designated spaces for dwelling units.

See site plan note #.

[2] All existing curb cuts on the frontage shall be closed, and one shared driveway shall access the shared parking. The applicant has the one curb cut in existence today.

Applicant is currently sharing a curb cut.

*[3] If the building is on a corner parcel, a shared driveway shall be created on the secondary SCD street. **NON APPLICABLE***

Building is not on a corner parcel.

[4] The shared access shall be built to an allowable SCD street frontage type if the development abuts future developable land, an existing street or a proposed right-of-way shown on a Planning Board approved Connectivity Master Plan. Such streets shall provide for the proper continuation of streets from adjacent subdivisions and built-up areas and proper projection of streets into adjacent unsubdivided and open land.

This site plan shows a proposed right of way providing for proper projection of street into adjacent un-subdivided and open land. It should be noted the Surveyor's plan also shows the adjacent discontinued Skip Road and the applicant is using this historic right of way as part of his connectivity master plan. At the point that the applicants property line interests with the historic Skip Road the applicant has chosen to provide only 23 ft of width in order to preserve a minimum 15 ft setback between the existing building and a future street. The abutter would need to provide the additional width necessary for the future street. By approving this site plan the Board is also approving the plan as a Connectivity Master Plan and the finding of fact should reflect that the applicant's plans meet this standard.

[5] Parking areas shall include connections to existing or future parking areas on adjacent parcels.

There is only one abutting property and the applicant shares a common curb cut with that property owner. The plan includes a connection to the existing parking area. The 50 ft right of way also provides potential connections to adjacent future parking areas. .

[6] The building shall meet the applicable SCD street frontage type building form and SCD streetscape standards.

The Building Form standards are not applicable for the SCD Town Gateway Street type. See - K. Town Gateway TG standards – (10) Building form standards. The Standish Corner Conceptual Sidewalk Plan (as referenced in the Standish Town Code Streets and Sidewalks Chapter 252) doesn't show the area in front of this business as requiring a sidewalk.

[7] The applicable SCD street frontage type SCD streetscape standards shall be installed and maintained at the cost of the developer. No sidewalks at present are being proposed.

A motion was made by Mr. Libby that all Standard M 1-7, has been met and seconded by Mrs. Harding. All in favor.

N. This approval is dependent upon, and limited to, the proposals and plans contained in the application and supporting documents submitted and affirmed by the applicant (either orally or in writing) and that any variation from the plans, proposals, and supporting documents is subject to review and approval by the Planning Board, except for minor changes which the Code Enforcement Officer may approve. Application has been approved.

Mr. Nesbitt said that concludes all of tonight's business. Mrs. Billington mentioned that the Sebago Lake Village Design public forum is being held on Tuesday May 15, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. and invited all those interested to please attend. There will be an Ordinance Committee meeting on May 15, 2012. Elections are coming and if anyone is interested. They can contact Mary Chapman. Mr. Libby made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Harding. All in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.