



Planning & Code Enforcement

2 York Street
Westbrook, Maine 04092
Phone: 207-854-0638
Fax: 866-559-0642

PLANNING & CODE ENFORCEMENT

WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD

Tuesday, November 4th, 2025, 7:00 P.M.
Westbrook High School – Room 114
125 Stroudwater Street

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

This meeting will be offered as a hybrid meeting, accommodating both in-person and remote participation.

Where public comment is permitted, members of the public attending remotely will have the opportunity to provide remote oral testimony. If you wish to speak during a Public Hearing or Public Comment, use the “Raise Hand” function through Zoom (or dial *9 on your phone) when instructed by the Planning Board chair.

Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81700741385>

Dial-in (audio only): 1-646-558-8656

Webinar ID: 817 0074 1385

Roll Call Attendance

Robin Tannenbaum	Present
Nancy Litrocapes	Absent
Jason Frazier	Present
Karen Axelsen	Present
Kevin Price	Absent
Lucas Schrage	Present
Oriana Farnham	Present
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Present
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Present

Staff: Jennie Franceschi; Planning Director, Rebecca Spitella; Senior Planner, Irlando Lobo; Planning and Code Office Coordinator.

2. Approval of Minutes – October 7th, 2025

Motion by John Turcotte
2nd by Oriana Farnham

Roll Call Vote

Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

REGULAR BUSINESS

3. **Becca read into the record:** 2022.30 – Site Plan Approval Extension Request – 860 Spring Street – Bolos Asset Management: The applicant is requesting a 1-year extension Site Plan approval granted November 1, 2022, for a 15,240sf building addition located at 860 Spring Street to extend the approval through November 1, 2026. Tax Map: 003 Lot: 101A Zone: Industrial Park District

Applicant Presentation

Aaron Hunter of Sebago Technics, representing Bolos Asset Management, requested a one-year extension to allow additional time to secure a tenant. He stated that the applicant has reviewed the staff comments and is willing to address them as part of the conditions of approval.

Staff Comment

Jennie Franceschi: Stated that, with the updated comments regarding the performance guarantee and sewer-related items, staff has no concerns with granting the requested one-year extension.

No Public Comment

No Board Comment

Motion by John Turcotte
2nd by Jason Fraizer

Roll Call Vote

Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

NEW BUSINESS

4. **Becca read into the record: 25-001160 – Subdivision Amendment – Rock Row South Campus – Dirigo Center Developers, LLC: The applicant requests a 3rd amendment to the subdivision plan approved by the Westbrook Planning Board on July 5, 2022 and amended on May 2, 2023 and November 5, 2024 to adjust lot lines of lots 2, 5, 6, 8, 14 and 15.**

Applicant Presentation

Jim Katsafikas of Perkins Thompson, representing Waterstone Properties and Dirigo Center Developers, presented several minor subdivision changes. Quarry Drive is shortened, and the portion previously extending along Lot 14 is removed. Lot 14 will be combined with Lot 13 (located in Portland) to create a larger lot and allow access to a future development there. The lot line between Lots 5 and 6 is removed, and Lot 8 is divided

into Lots 18 and 15. He noted that these adjustments are preparatory steps for Phase 3, which will be presented to the Board at the December 2 meeting.

Staff Comment

Jennie Franceschi: Stated that staff have no concerns with the application as presented. She informed the Board that for the December meeting, the applicant will submit a master plan overview for Phase 3, covering the area east of Nason's Brook, including a parcel extending into Portland. The Portland Planning Board will be invited to participate, either in person or via Zoom, to ensure both boards share a common understanding before moving into future site plan reviews.

No Public Comment

Board Comment

Jason Fraizer: Asked what the proposed changes will be?

Jim Katsafikas: Clarified that the primary change from the second to third amendment plans is the elimination of the lot line between Lots 5 and 6, creating a single lot. In response to a question about whether the overall master plan has changed, he stated that the adjustments are limited to lot line modifications in preparation for the next phase. The full master plan and related site plans will be presented early next year.

Jennie Franceschi: Clarified that no site plans have been approved for the lots undergoing lot line adjustments, and that these changes are being made in advance of future site plan submissions. She noted that while a residential site plan had previously been submitted for several lots near the tracks, it had not received final approval. Updated designs will be brought forward in conjunction with the revised lot configurations.

Motion by Lucas Shrage 2nd by John Turcotte

Roll Call Vote

Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

5. **Becca read into the record: 25-001051 – Site Plan, Subdivision, – 102 Chestnut Street – Flagship Chestnut St, LLC: The applicant is proposing an extension of the public street Chestnut Street to provide access to an existing lot to construct two new duplex units, for a total of 4 additional units located at 102 Chestnut Street. Tax Map: 032 Lot: 131 Zone: Residential Growth Area 1 Use: Dwelling, Two-Family**

Applicant Presentation

Dustin Roma of DM Roma Consulting Engineers, representing Flagship Chestnut Street, LLC, presented a proposal to construct two additional duplex buildings (six units total) at the end of Chestnut Street. The project includes creating a new ~10,000 sq. ft. lot with frontage on both John Kennard Street and Chestnut Street. The public way will be extended to improve access to the lot and to allow the City to better maintain the roadway; the applicant will coordinate with staff on the property transfer needed for the extension to become public. The project also includes utility service connections and new stormwater management features to address runoff and improve water quality. An existing single-family home on the site will be demolished to accommodate the duplexes. The applicant has reviewed staff comments and has no objections to the proposed conditions.

Staff Comment

Jennie Franceschi: Stated that besides the comments which were previously provided to the applicant, staff has no issues with the application moving forward.

No Public Comment

Board Comment

John Turcotte: Asked whether there will be public trash services once Chestnut becomes a public street.

Jennie Franceschi: Confirmed that is correct.

Motion by John Turcotte
2nd by Oriana Farnham

Roll Call Vote

Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

6. **Becca read into the record: 25-000546 – Site Plan, Subdivision, Village Review – 156 Conant Street – MJ Property Services, LLC: The applicant is proposing an 8-unit subdivision comprising of 4 duplex structures. Tax Map 031 Lot: 019 Zone: City Center District, Village Review Overlay Zone Use: Dwelling, Two-Family**

Applicant Presentation

Dustin Roma of DM Roma Consulting Engineers, representing MJ Property Services, presented a proposal for four duplex buildings with associated parking. He noted that the team worked closely with staff over the past several weeks to refine stormwater management and site grading, incorporating suggestions to increase green space, reduce pavement, and pull work back from the embankment to improve drainage and slope protection. Roma summarized recent discussions with the Village Review Board, which focused primarily on building window placement. He explained that additional windows were limited by interior layout needs but emphasized that window placement is focused on facades facing the internal drive and Conant Street. He also

reviewed the geotechnical evaluation completed by Summit Geoengineering, which confirmed that existing fill on the site is suitable for building foundations and that slope stability is adequate given the proposed grading. Some unsuitable materials were found in isolated test pits and will be removed during excavation. One test pit revealed a petroleum odor; as a precaution, all excavation will be monitored, and any suspect material will be removed and disposed of properly as hazardous waste if needed. Roma stated that the project team has responded to neighborhood concerns by adjusting driveway orientation, committing to replacement tree plantings at the entrance, and maintaining two-story hip-roof building designs consistent with surrounding homes. Finally, he noted that staff requested updated stormwater calculations after the addition of a second catch basin. The applicant has no objections and will provide additional analysis before construction begins.

Staff Comment

Jennie Franceschi: Staff have no further comments.

No Public Comment

Board Comment

Disclosure by Lucas Shrage

Robin Tannenbaum: Asked for the proposed plan for lighting the site.

Dustin Roma: stated that no additional parking-lot lighting is proposed. Lighting will come from fixtures on the buildings, including recessed porch lights. Each building will have approximately two recessed porch lights, totaling about eight fixtures around the parking area. He noted that ambient light from windows and porch areas is expected to be sufficient for the 20,000-sq-ft site and that the intent is to avoid over-lighting.

John Turcotte: asked what would occur if petroleum contamination were discovered during excavation of the lot. He asked whether the City would have jurisdiction in such a situation or if it would fall under DEP authority.

Jennie Franceschi: stated that any discovery of contaminated soils would fall under DEP permitting. The applicant would be required to work with regulators to either properly cap the soils or remove them to an approved facility.

Jason Fraizer: asked whether any soil samples from the noted area had been sent for laboratory analysis or if concerns were based solely on observed petroleum odor. He also inquired about the site's history for potential contamination sources and whether any preloading activities were planned.

Dustin roma: explained that several test pits were dug across the site, and only one test pit exhibited a petroleum odor. Nearby pits within about 25 feet showed no issues. He suggested the odor may have come from old pavement or mixed fill material. No additional testing was conducted because no tanks or other indicators of significant contamination were found.

He noted that fill had been brought to the site over many years by a previous owner, consistent with accounts from neighbors. The material has been in place for approximately 10–15 years. Based on the soils encountered and the proposed foundation design, the geotechnical engineers determined the existing soils were consolidated and suitable to support the planned buildings.

Jason Fraizer: asked for clarification on the stormwater outfall location, noting it was difficult to see during the site visit. He requested details on what the outfall discharges into and whether the existing stormwater system includes any oil separators or similar treatment measures.

Dustin Roma: explained that the stormwater outfall discharges into a flat, low-lying ditch area located between the site, the former rail bed, and the highway. The system includes sumps within the catch basins and a subsurface stormwater system with an isolator row—wrapped in fabric to trap sediment and debris before water enters the remaining underground chambers. The pipes are sized to allow for cleaning, providing built-in pretreatment.

Oriana Farnham: asked whether the project will provide rental housing and expressed appreciation for adding this housing type and density within a predominantly single-family neighborhood. She stated that the development is attractive, will fit well into the area, and contributes positively to Westbrook’s housing mix.

Dustin Roma: Confirms the project does provide rental housing.

Larry McWilliams: asked about safety measures related to the steep drop-off at the edge of the site. He inquired whether vegetation or another type of barrier is planned to prevent residents—especially children—from entering the area and to address potential safety concerns associated with the abrupt grade change.

Dustin Roma: stated that the steep drop-off is naturally blocked by thick vegetation and large trees, making it difficult to access. The only cleared area is a narrow section for a storm drain installation, which could be further secured with plantings or rocks. He indicated that this natural landscape largely serves as a deterrent to prevent people from going over the edge.

Jennie Franceschi: noted that plan views may not fully convey field conditions. Staff can inspect the site after construction and work with the applicant to address any safety concerns, particularly for slopes steeper than 3:1. If slopes are found to be reasonable and not hazardous, they can be confirmed in the field.

John Turcotte: asked for clarification on the tree protection fence shown on the plans, including its appearance and whether it would act as a barrier to access the slope.

Dustin Roma: explained that the tree protection fence is a temporary orange snow fence installed during construction to protect trees while their roots establish.

Jason Fraizer: commented that while safety is important, the steep slope is unlikely to pose serious risk. He noted personal experience with similar terrain and expressed that people generally avoid going over such drop-offs.

**Motion by Oriana Farnham
2nd by Jason Fraizer**

Roll Call Vote

Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

7. **Becca read into the record: 25-000624 – Site Plan, Subdivision, Village Review - 688-712 Main St – Ryan Le: The applicant is proposing two new multifamily structures to comprise of a total of 28 new residential units located at 688 and 712 Main Street with a new commercial use adjacent to Main Street. Tax Map: 033 Lots: 033 & 038 Zone: City Center District; Village Review Overlay Zone – Downtown District Use: Dwelling, Multiple-Family**

Lucas Shrage & Robin Tannenbaum Recused

Applicant Presentation

Andy Morrill and applicant **Ryan Lee** provided an update on the project, noting that the layout is largely unchanged since the July sketch plan, with a slight reduction in the number of units. The presentation was intended to inform the Board and gather feedback; no action was requested. Key points discussed included: Sewer Connection – There is uncertainty whether the existing sewer service for 688 Main Street is 4-inch or 6-inch. The applicant will coordinate with the Sewer District to determine the appropriate connection approach. Retaining Wall – The applicant proposed a retaining wall along the back of three interior lots not owned by the applicant to accommodate grading changes. The wall would be three feet off the property lines. While the applicant believes construction and maintenance are feasible, City staff has raised potential conflicts. The applicant seeks Board input. Stormwater – The site receives flow from an upstream watershed (Raymond parcel) toward three adjacent homes. The applicant proposes directing collected stormwater through a subsurface tank system under the parking area, treating it, and discharging it to Main Street. This approach avoids increasing runoff onto neighboring properties but may require a larger system than otherwise needed. The Board's input on this solution is requested. The applicant emphasized ongoing coordination with City staff to resolve these issues and welcomed Board guidance on retaining walls and stormwater management.

Staff Comment

Jennie Franceschi: Noted that comments from Village Review regarding the revised elevations have been included. The Board was asking for input on incorporating these recommendations, particularly regarding color preferences, into a follow-up submission.

Becca Spitella: Summarized Village Review's feedback on the revised building design. The original submission featured similar-looking buildings with steep roof pitches, which were not considered in scale with the site. The applicant revised the design significantly, and Village Review found the new design attractive and appropriate for Main Street and William Clark Drive. Village Review's final recommendations included: removing the third-floor color change on the bump-outs so that the siding is a single color on the William Clark Drive building. VROZ prefer the sage color on the front rather than the blue on the back to maintain cohesion while allowing each building to retain resident identity.

Public Comment

Robin Tannenbaum (34 Brown Street): Expressed strong support for the project, praising the applicant for developing challenging properties and providing housing downtown. she noted the contemporary design of the casement windows as a positive feature, suggesting the traditional-style stairwell windows be reviewed. She also mentioned a perceived low roof on Building One and recommended that future submissions include contextual elevations showing surrounding properties to better understand scale. Overall, she applauded the creative use of space and addition of housing.

Board Comment

Jason Fraizer: Asked about the proposed R-tanks, noting they appear innovative but potentially costly. He inquired whether the applicant had considered alternative stormwater management solutions.

Andy Morrill: Explained that multiple subsurface stormwater alternatives were considered, but space constraints and the need to manage the upstream watershed limited feasible options. The chosen R-tank system was determined to be the most practical solution, though it is costly.

Jason Fraizer: Commented that he prefers the two-tone blue color scheme for the buildings, noting that it makes the design stand out. He suggested that additional color could be used on the down-facing portions to enhance visual interest.

Oriana Farnham: Raised an equity concern regarding neighboring properties. She asked whether the project would increase stormwater runoff to the backyards of adjacent homes compared to existing conditions.

Andy Morrill: Confirmed that if water is allowed to continue flowing to the adjacent backyards, the project will not increase the volume of runoff; flow levels will match existing conditions.

Oriana Farnham: Asked whether allowing stormwater to continue flowing to adjacent properties without increasing volume is permitted under the City ordinance.

Jennie Franceschi: Explained that the post-development stormwater flow rate cannot exceed existing conditions. She noted potential concerns about channelization, where directing sheet flow into a pipe could create impacts on neighboring properties. She added that the applicant has not yet demonstrated that the site can handle a 25-year storm event, as required by ordinance. City engineers will work with the applicant to address both the stormwater generated by the new impervious surfaces and any additional upstream flow.

Oriana Farnham: Stated that, from a fairness perspective, the applicant is not obligated to fix existing stormwater issues on neighboring properties as long as the project does not worsen them. She noted that channelization remains a concern and should be addressed by the engineers to assess potential impacts on adjacent properties.

Andy Morrill: Stated that the preference is to prevent any stormwater from flowing to neighboring properties. However, doing so would require directing the water to Main Street or William Clark Drive, raising questions about system capacity and cost. He noted the applicant is working with City staff to find a solution and highlighted the challenge of addressing runoff that originates offsite, which could add approximately \$100,000 to the project.

Oriana Farnham: Raised questions regarding the planter bump-outs, specifically whether they would allow for a sufficiently wide, ADA-compliant walkway. She also inquired about the use of the existing parking lot to service the buildings. In particular, she asked whether residents of the Main Street building would need to park on the opposite side and walk along the walkway, or if adequate parking spaces would be available adjacent to the building. Additionally, she requested information on the height of the retaining wall, as residents would be walking alongside it. Oriana further asked about the internal sidewalk system, specifically

whether a sidewalk would extend to Main Street, noting that a staircase already provides access to William Clark Drive.

Andy Morrill: Acknowledged that the planter boxes shown on the plan were larger than appropriate and noted they would be revised to proper scale to ensure ADA accessibility while restricting vehicle access. He stated that nine parking spaces are proposed between the buildings, which may not accommodate all residents of Building B. Some residents may need to use the existing parking lot at 688 Main Street, requiring them to walk past Building A to reach their building. He confirmed that a ten-foot-wide sidewalk is provided along the edge of the retaining wall. Morrill also noted that the existing parking lot includes a staircase to William Clark Drive, and that sidewalks are provided in front of and behind Building B, including a connection to the Main Street sidewalk.

Oriana Farnham: noted that a continuous sidewalk system throughout the U-shaped area would be beneficial for residents, creating a more pedestrian-friendly environment rather than simply walking through a parking lot. She added that such a sidewalk system is required by ordinance, to the extent feasible.

John Turcotte: Asked what the City's position on the retaining wall is.

Jennie Franceschi: The concern right now is that building the retaining wall so close to the property line gives the applicant no space with which to maintain it in the future without having some level of easements on the adjacent property line. So that is the concern that city staff has brought up at this point as to its proximity.

Oriana Farnham: questioned the rationale for the two-tone color scheme, with gray on the first floor and blue and green on the upper floors. She asked whether it reflects an architectural trend or serves a functional purpose. She expressed concern that the design may become outdated within ten years and stated her preference for a single color. Oriana noted she supports using a different color for the bump-out and mentioned that the Village Review previously favored a single-color approach. She also observed that recent Avesta buildings have followed a similar two-tone scheme, which she feels may not age well.

Larry McWilliams: Asked about the proposed design and materials for the retaining wall. He inquired whether it would be constructed of brick or stone and expressed a preference for stone, noting the attractive design of an existing stone wall on Main Street near Cat's Meow. He acknowledged that stone would be more expensive, particularly for a taller wall, but suggested that a more visually appealing design would enhance the view from Wayside Drive compared to a plain concrete wall. He referenced similar walls in Scarborough, noting that while functional, they can appear monotonous, and emphasized the benefit of a more colorful or upgraded design.

Andy Morrill: Responded that they would be big three-by-five interlocking cement blocks.

Larry McWilliams: Asked about water runoff management and addressed Jenny, questioning why additional runoff could not be directed into Main Street. He inquired whether the existing sewer system is already at capacity, or if an ordinance could be amended to allow additional flow into Main Street. He noted that, given the development is in a City Center District, encouraging building in this area, he questioned why the city would object to directing extra water into the sewer system rather than to private backyards.

Jennie Franceschi: Responded that the city’s primary concern is the capacity of the existing piping system. She stated that it has not been determined that additional runoff to Main Street would be prohibited, but the site must manage its own impervious surfaces to prevent overwhelming the system. Jennie explained that stormwater detention is necessary to slowly release runoff into the city system and prevent street flooding. She noted that while a study would be required to evaluate additional flow to William Clark Drive—a state highway—the applicant must first demonstrate that the site can handle its own impervious surfaces and then explore engineering solutions for additional runoff, which may include a direct pipe. She concluded that the applicant still has work to do in this regard.

Andy Morrill: Explained that the originally submitted R-Tank design was intended as a compromise to manage stormwater. The design aimed to eliminate runoff to abutting lots, accommodate the 2- and 10-year storm events, and allow the 25-year storm event to flow to Main Street. He noted that this approach was intended to avoid constructing an oversized R-Tank system. Morrill acknowledged that the current design does not fully meet ordinance requirements and stated that the applicant needs to revisit the plan and develop an alternative solution.

Becca Spitella: Added that there are two distinct issues: managing the 25-year storm on the site and addressing flow from the abutting properties. She noted that these issues are sometimes discussed together but are separate considerations, and that finding a solution for one should help guide a solution for the other. Becca further clarified Jenny’s earlier comments, explaining that additional flow to Main Street is possible, but the key factor is the rate of flow. Stormwater must be detained and released at a controlled rate to prevent system backups, similar to allowing a faucet to drip continuously. While the duration of release may be longer due to increased impervious surfaces, the flow rate must remain consistent to avoid overloading the system.

Motion by John Turcotte
2nd by Orianna Farnham

Roll Call Vote

Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

WORKSHOP

Motion by Jason Fraizer
2nd by John Turcotte

Roll Call Vote

Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Jason Frazier	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Lucas Schrage	Yes

Oriana Farnham	Yes
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

8. **Becca read into the record: 25-001115 – Site Plan, Village Review, Shoreland Zone – Saccarappa Park – City of Westbrook: The City is proposing the redevelopment of a public park that has been utilized as a gravel parking area to include landscaping, hardscape pathways, a covered shade structure and an expanded Riverwalk view platform. Tax Map: 032 Lot: 114 Zone: City Center District, Village Review Overlay Zone, Shoreland Overlay Zone – General Development**

Applicant Presentation

Alex Delvecchio and **Craig Burgess (Acorn Engineering)** presented the Saccarappa Park proposal. The project site is located at Main and Bridge Streets in downtown Westbrook on a parcel previously used as a gravel lot. The property abuts the Presumpscot River and Saccarappa Falls and is envisioned as an important downtown green space linking the existing riverwalk to future westward extensions. The site is a brownfield due to historic use. The City received a Brownfields Cleanup Grant from the U.S. EPA, and an environmental assessment by Credere Associates identified urban fill and related contaminants. The City and design team conducted extensive public outreach, including a resident questionnaire, two public meetings, and several Brownfield Advisory Committee sessions. Initial analysis reviewed circulation, connectivity to sidewalks and neighborhoods, existing easements, and shoreland zoning constraints. Public input indicated preference for a smaller, flexible structure and an emphasis on open green space. Design concepts were developed in collaboration with Simons Architects and refined through community feedback. The preferred concept includes an open-air structure with a light, wood-inspired design, situated near the southern edge of the park. The plan preserves select existing trees, adds new plantings, and provides multiple gathering and passive-use areas. Key elements include as follows: a small parking area with two accessible spaces and a loading zone. A public plaza around the structure for events and assemblies. Lawn areas for passive recreation. A primary path toward the falls and a looping walkway around the green. Benches, bike racks, and trash receptacles. A butterfly garden along the river for quieter viewing and transition to the shoreline. Planting buffers on the west side to screen adjacent properties and connect with the Dana Street project.

No Staff Comment

No Public Comment

Board Comment

Lucas Shrage: Asked whether lighting is planned for the park. He also inquired about the area labeled “6,” noting the contrast between the proposed shrub/understory plantings and the adjacent lawn. He asked whether the entire area could be planted with shrubs to soften the edge rather than leaving part as standard grass.

Alex Delvecchio: Stated that a detailed lighting plan will be included with the full site plan submission later in the week. The current concept uses 12-foot pedestrian light poles placed outside the utility easement, providing point-to-point wayfinding lighting rather than full uniform coverage. Regarding the lawn area near the Dana Street project, Alex explained that the grass was intentionally included to create an open connection to the adjacent development, where outdoor dining and frequent activity are expected. The lawn is intended to serve both park users and the Dana Street project, transitioning into the shrub planting zone.

Lucas Schrage: Asked whether the shrub and understory planting area would also be composed primarily of native species, consistent with the native pollinator garden approach.

Alex Delvecchio: Confirmed that all shrub and understory plantings will be native species.

Lucas Schrage: Expressed support for including benches and asked whether design details are available. He noted the importance of avoiding hostile architecture, particularly given concerns related to housing insecurity and equity.

Alex Delvecchio: Stated that bench selections are still being finalized and will be included in the site plan application. The team is reviewing several options, including models from Victor Stanley and Forms + Surfaces. He emphasized that the intent is to provide comfortable, welcoming seating and to avoid any designs that could be considered hostile or unwelcoming.

Larry McWilliams: Expressed support for the project and noted he is eager to see the gravel lot replaced. He raised safety concerns about the existing crosswalk at Bridge Street and Main Street, explaining that visibility is limited for drivers coming around the corner. He suggested considering enhanced pedestrian safety measures—such as flashing beacons—given the anticipated increase in park activity and foot traffic. Aside from this concern, he stated that he likes the design and looks forward to reviewing the final plan and seeing the project move forward.

Robin Tannenbaum: Complimented the design and noted she was unable to attend the public workshops. She expressed concern about how the park will feel and function compared with Riverbank Park, which benefits from a strong buffer from Main Street. She noted that Saccarappa Park sits at a busy intersection and questioned how the design balances openness with a sense of comfort and separation from traffic. Robin asked what discussions occurred about buffering, and whether the pavilion—located close to the corner—was ever considered for placement deeper within the site.

Alex Delvecchio: Explained that the Portland Water District easement limited placement options for the pavilion and plaza. Public feedback emphasized keeping the area near the falls as a quieter, contemplative zone. The current design positions the pavilion and plaza closer to Main Street for more active use, while preserving passive areas along the water, including a butterfly garden and planted buffer along the diagonal path and boardwalk. Alex noted plans to add larger trees along Bridge and Main Streets to enhance a sense of enclosure and separation from traffic.

Robin Tannenbaum: Acknowledged that Saccarappa Park will have a more urban character compared with Riverbank Park. She asked staff—specifically Jennie—whether the city and Public Works are prepared to maintain the park, including trash removal and general upkeep, noting concerns about the area’s historical conditions and ongoing maintenance needs.

Jennie Franceschi: Confirmed that Public Works has been actively involved in the park’s design and that landscaping decisions—such as including more grass—were influenced by maintenance considerations. She stated there is a clear understanding and expectation that Public Works will be responsible for ongoing upkeep to meet community standards.

Jennie Franceschi: Complimented the design of the pavilion, noting the storytelling in the structure’s low and high sides, and asked the applicant to briefly explain that design concept.

Alex Delvecchio: Explained that the pavilion’s arc is oriented east toward the rising sun, reflecting the park’s name and the Presumpscot River’s history. The design also incorporates rainwater collection, which is directed to

a peripheral rain garden. Interpretive signage is planned throughout the park, including the pavilion and butterfly garden, to highlight these sustainable features and the site's history, including the brownfields cleanup.

9. **Becca read into record: 25-001113 – Site Plan – 405 Bridgton Rd – Vaughn Dibiase: The applicant is proposing a new 7,500sf multitenant commercial structure and associated site improvements located at 405 Bridgton Road. Tax Map: 057 Lot: 022A Zone: Highway Services**

Applicant Presentation

Dustin Roma (DM Roma Consulting Engineers), representing Vaughn Tobias, provided an overview of the preliminary discussions regarding the proposed development at 405 Bridgton Road, a 0.75-acre site along Route 302 between Elmwood Avenue and Pride's Corner. He noted that key considerations at this stage include site access and traffic integration with Route 302, with a transportation engineer evaluating one-way entrance and exit options and potential queuing impacts. The site is outside the sewer service area, requiring on-site wastewater disposal, and stormwater management is being carefully designed to avoid impacts on neighboring properties. The proposed building is intended for speculative tenants and will prioritize low-traffic, low-waste uses, such as construction services or similar trades, which are compatible with surrounding residential and mixed-use properties. Neighbor concerns regarding lighting, noise, and waste have been considered, including the location of dumpsters and overall site layout. Existing drainage patterns will be maintained, with potential adjustments to avoid overloading neighboring culverts, and the building footprint may be refined to address grading and pavement constraints. Detailed traffic analysis and building plans will be submitted with the formal application, and discussions with staff and neighbors will continue to ensure a responsible site design.

Staff Comment

Jennie Franceschi: Noted that the parcel is located on Route 302 in a heavily trafficked area. Staff will review the traffic analysis provided by the applicant's engineer, focusing on the proposed site access and potential alternative options to improve safety. Staff are available to answer any questions from the board.

Public Comment

Pauline & Paul Barrows (409 Bridgton Road): Expressed concerns, particularly in relation to traffic, drainage, and site design. They noted that the area is heavily trafficked, with multiple driveways and businesses nearby, and emphasized the potential hazards of additional vehicles entering and exiting the site, especially given the proposed 25 parking spaces. They also raised concerns about a natural drainage course that runs behind their property, referencing past legal actions to preserve its flow, and questioned how site grading, stormwater management, and the septic system would affect this drainage. Additional concerns included the proximity of the dumpster to their property and potential for pest issues, as well as site lighting and its impact on neighboring homes. While acknowledging discussions with the applicant and willingness to cooperate, they requested assurances regarding the future use of the building and its tenants.

Brendan Kerley (31 Summit Circle): Spoke in support of the Barrows' traffic concerns. He noted that the intersection near 405 Bridgton Road is heavily used, with limited sight lines, speeding vehicles, and previous mailbox damage in the area. He expressed concern about how site traffic and potential landscaping or noise mitigation measures could further impact visibility and safety for drivers and mail delivery. While acknowledging that the property has long been expected to be developed, he emphasized that traffic patterns and safe access remain his primary concern.

Board Comment

Jason Fraizer: Referenced Google Maps and street view images of the site and noted his experience with similar high-traffic highway projects, where adding two lanes in each direction with a center turn lane significantly reduced accidents. He observed that there appears to be sufficient space on Bridgeton Road for such improvements, including a right-turn lane onto Elmwood Avenue, and inquired whether staff and the applicant have considered re-stripping the road to enhance traffic flow and safety.

Dustin Roma: Responded that the traffic engineers are still evaluating all options for site access and traffic flow. He confirmed that the team will investigate potential lane configurations and other solutions to determine the safest and most effective approach before returning to the board with a refined plan.

Oriana Farnham: Questioned whether having separate one-way entrance and exit lanes is considered best practice for safety, noting that such a configuration may be confusing for drivers who are unfamiliar with the site.

Dustin Roma: Explained that the suitability of separate one-way entrance and exit lanes depends on the type of use. For businesses with frequent customer traffic, such a configuration may be less intuitive, while for low-traffic operations with predictable daily users, it can function effectively. He noted that the design focus is on how each access point interacts with Route 302 traffic, and that a one-way system may provide operational benefits if supported by signage and clear patterns for northbound and southbound drivers. Roma emphasized that this is one reason the project is being geared toward low-customer-traffic uses. He acknowledged community concerns about traffic but noted that, in his experience, vehicles tend to slow near the traffic light and that regular users of the site would likely navigate the access points safely.

John Turcotte: Noted that existing speeding issues on Route 302 are not the applicant's responsibility, acknowledging that drivers commonly accelerate toward Windham after passing nearby businesses. He stated that, despite heavy use, the area functions reasonably well and Elmwood Avenue may even provide a buffering effect. Regarding the site itself, he emphasized the need for adequate buffering for the Barrows property, particularly to prevent headlights from circulating vehicles from shining into their yard at night. He expressed confidence that lighting could be appropriately designed and indicated overall support for the proposed five-bay business use, noting that the site has been for sale for many years and is suitable for this type of development.

Robin Tannenbaum: Stated appreciation for the building's orientation, noting that the short side faces Route 302 in a manner consistent with surrounding development. However, after reviewing the area on Google Maps, she observed that nearby properties are predominantly residential in scale. She encouraged the applicant to consider a more appropriate architectural form, so the structure does not appear as a stark metal storage building. Robin questioned the purpose of the green-rendered front area shown on the plan and noted that it appears to be a substantial planting zone. She referenced the Audette landscaping project on Route 302 as an example of a simple building improved through thoughtful design and landscaping. She emphasized that the proposed structure should not be treated as if it were located on a more rural county road.

Larry McWilliams: Reiterated concerns about the amount of proposed parking. For a 1,500 sq. ft. building, he would expect only a few spaces—perhaps two or three—especially if the use involves limited staff or simple drop-offs. He noted that providing around 25 spaces appears excessive. He suggested that reducing the parking area or reorienting the building might help avoid the steep drop-off near the rear turnaround.

Dustin Roma: Noted that some parking spaces located in front of the building, particularly along Bridgeton Road, could likely be removed. He explained that the current parking layout fills available space between the access road and the building and is intended to prevent tenants from parking in front of other units' overhead doors. Because the building is designed for multiple tenants, some dedicated spaces are necessary to avoid conflicts and maintain site circulation. He acknowledged that many spaces may go unused—some tenants may only have a single vehicle—but additional parking helps prevent congestion on the one-way internal drive and avoids

situations where tenants might park in drive aisles. He stated that they will review options to reduce parking and incorporate more green space while still ensuring safe, efficient traffic flow.

Larry McWilliams: Raised additional concerns about drainage, noting the natural drainage ditch on the site and its proximity to neighboring property. He stated he had not yet walked the site but wanted clarification on whether the ditch's current location reflects the natural topography and direction of water flow, or whether the project will alter drainage patterns.

Dustin Roma: Assured the Board that the project will properly accommodate site drainage and avoid issues such as blocked flow that have occurred in the past. He explained that stormwater enters the site near the midpoint of the building, requiring the installation of a culvert to receive and redirect flow. The plan is to route water around the building through additional culverts, potentially discharging it behind the second building on the adjacent southern property. He noted that the neighboring property owner supports this approach, as it could improve an existing problem with a small culvert currently directing water under that building. Dustin stated that, if feasible, they intend to resolve the existing culvert issue while managing site drainage.

Larry McWilliams: Reviewed standard concerns regarding lighting and confirmed expectations that it will not impact neighboring properties. He also addressed the proposed dumpster location in the rear corner and noted that, because the area is residential, the Board would like to avoid nighttime or early-morning trash collection. He asked whether a daytime pickup standard could be established to prevent noise disturbances from early-hours dumpster service.

Dustin Roma: Stated that there would be no need for overnight or early-morning dumpster pickups for this type of use. He explained that the dumpster was placed in the proposed rear corner because it is the farthest practical location from surrounding buildings, minimizing impacts on adjacent properties.

10. Becca read into record: 25-001114 – Site Plan, Subdivision – Berkshire Way – HTM Partners, LLC:
The applicant is proposing a 33-unit residential complex comprising of single family and two-family structures located on a parcel with a private driveway access off Berkshire Way. Tax Map: 019 Lots: 031, 033 & 034; Tax Map: 059 Lot: 042 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2 Use: Dwelling, Single-Family & Dwelling, Two-Family

Applicant Presentation

Nancy St. Clair (St. Clair Associates) for HTM Partners and landscape architect, **Keith Smith.**

Nancy St. Clair introduced the project team, including owners Tim and Marie Flaherty and landscape architect Keith Smith. Nancy presented a 33-unit condominium development on a 63.5-acre parcel, located on the southeasterly knoll of the property. The project includes 19 single-family units, 7 duplexes (14 units), and retention of one existing home on Brook Street. Access will be through Berkshire Way, connecting to two new private ways (Somerset Ridge—acceptable name—and a second road that will be renamed). Stormwater management includes three grassed underdrain soil filters, one bioretention cell, and roof-dripline BMPs for all homes. A Maine DEP stormwater permit has been submitted and is under review. The team requested Board feedback. The project will use public water with a new hydrant; shared subsurface wastewater systems with pretreatment are planned. Upcoming submissions will include architectural plans and condo documents. Existing snowmobile trails will remain open only until construction; afterward, trails will be pedestrian-only due to safety and liability concerns.

Landscape Overview – Keith Smith

Keith described street trees at each unit, an orchard-style bioretention area, and a community garden/open space across from it. Four streetlights are planned, with possible additional lighting on Adirondack Way. Typical unit

landscaping will include foundation plantings; some areas will naturalize as meadow. A central mailbox area is proposed pending USPS approval.

No Staff Comment

Public Comment

Brendan Kerley (31 Summit Circle; also mail carrier): Raised questions about the proposed development, seeking clarification on the existing house on Brook Street that will be incorporated into the neighborhood, including its address and whether mail delivery would shift to Somerset Ridge. He commented on the proposed centralized mailbox location at the Adirondack/Somerset Ridge intersection, noting USPS guidelines encourage centralization to reduce delivery costs and expressing concern that residents might drive to the boxes. Curley also asked whether the parcel west of the end of Somerset Ridge is planned for future development and requested clarification on the location of Adirondack Way relative to existing homes at 110–126 Berkshire Way.

Dawn Lounsbury (79 Wildwood Circle): Expressed concern about late public notice for the project, noting she received a letter dated October 24th on October 31st, which prevented residents from reviewing plans or providing input in time for the previous meeting. She also raised traffic concerns, stating that the plan now proposes a single exit onto Berkshire Way instead of two exits, potentially creating significant congestion with 33 units (approximately 66 cars), particularly in combination with other nearby developments. Lounsbury noted that Berkshire Way may not be designed to handle the additional traffic and questioned how construction vehicles would access the site, whether via Wildwood Circle or Berkshire Way.

Nancy St. Clair: Clarified that the existing Brook Street home will continue to receive mail at its current mailbox, while all new units will use the centralized mailbox location. She noted that it would not make sense to combine the two delivery locations.

Larry McWilliams: Asked for clarification on the centralized mailbox location, specifically whether it is proposed at the corner of Somerset Ridge and Adirondack Way.

Nancy St. Clair: Explained that the centralized mailbox will be located slightly west of the Somerset Ridge/Adirondack Way intersection, adjacent to the proposed orchard area, rather than directly at the corner. She noted that the 24-foot-wide road allows vehicles to stop temporarily for mail pickup, and that sidewalks and crosswalks provide safe pedestrian access connecting Somerset Ridge and Adirondack Way.

Larry McWilliams: Asked whether future development is planned for the westerly end of Somerset Ridge, specifically whether the hammerhead might be extended or another entrance added.

Tim Flaherty (property owner): Stated that future development at the westerly end of Somerset Ridge is possible after completing the current phase, so additional access or expansion may occur later. Regarding construction traffic, he confirmed that all equipment will be directed to exit via Adirondack Way and Elmwood, avoiding Wildwood Circle, similar to procedures used in the previous Berkshire Way phase. He noted that staff previously indicated any future phase would require an additional exit onto Brook Street, which he agreed would help distribute traffic.

Jennie Franceschi: Asked the applicant to clarify the notification process for the public meeting, noting that a resident had experienced an issue with receiving the notice.

Tim Flaherty (property owner): Acknowledged that public meeting notices were mailed late last week, resulting in at least one resident receiving it only the day before the neighborhood meeting. He noted that in a previous phase,

only one person attended the Zoom neighborhood meeting. Tim expressed a willingness to hold another meeting if necessary to ensure proper notification.

Larry McWilliams: Asked what the standard notice period is for public meetings.

Becca Spitella: Explained that there is no codified standard for neighborhood meeting notice periods. Notices are required by ordinance, but the city cannot guarantee receipt. Typically, notices are sent 1.5–2 weeks before a planning board meeting to balance sufficient lead time without being too early. She noted that neighborhood meetings are organized by the applicant, not the city, and are intended to provide an informal opportunity for public input prior to the formal city process.

Tim Flaherty: Stated that he is available to meet with abutters at his office or at Pride’s Corner at any time. He noted that all plans are available for review and that he welcomes questions or discussions from any interested residents.

Becca Spitella: Reminded attendees that all plans are available for review at the Planning Department. She encouraged residents to contact her or Planner Jennie for a more detailed review, noting that digesting all project information during the workshop can be challenging.

Board Comment

John Turcotte: Asked about the concept of “stacking neighborhoods,” noting that the new development would branch off a single access point from Berkshire Way. He inquired whether the city has any standards or guidelines for adding traffic from 33 new units (approximately 66 cars) to an existing neighborhood of roughly 38 homes, and how such impacts are addressed.

Jennie Franceschi: Explained that the existing Berkshire Way road system is built to public road standards and can accommodate significant traffic beyond the current neighborhood. She clarified that the new roads within the proposed development will be private driveways, not public roads, and therefore standard dead-end road distance limitations do not apply to this condominium project.

John Turcotte: Asked the applicant to clarify whether the existing Brook Street property will be part of the condominium development.

Marie Flaherty (property owner): Stated that the Brook Street home will be modified to complement the project but remain a separate entity with its own address. She noted that whether it will be formally incorporated into the development is still under consideration with their attorney.

Jennie Franceschi: Explained that the Brook Street property must be formally designated either as a separate lot or incorporated into the condominium association. If it remains separate, it would not be subject to the same condominium fees or obligations, but if included, it would follow the association’s rules. The final structure will need to be determined.

Lucas Shrage: Asked the applicant for a preliminary breakdown of bedroom layouts for the 33 units, inquiring whether there will be uniformity between single-family and duplex units or variation in the number of bedrooms.

Marie Flaherty (property owner): Explained that the development will include eight smaller duplexes with one-car garages, each having two bedrooms and two bathrooms on a single level. Three larger duplexes will also have two bedrooms and two bathrooms, with potential for a third bedroom. The single-family units will generally have two bedrooms and two bathrooms, with the option to add additional living space in the lower levels. Subsurface waste systems are being designed to accommodate potential future expansion of bedrooms.

Larry McWilliams: Inquired about the anticipated price range for the units in the development.

Marie Flaherty (property owner): Stated that the units will be cottage-style, with the eight smaller units intended to be more affordable, particularly for buyers needing less space. She noted that exact pricing is uncertain due to rising construction costs, but the goal is to offer relatively affordable options, though prices will reflect current market conditions.

Meeting Adjourned.

MINUTES MAY NOT BE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. SECTIONS MAY BE PARAPHRASED FOR CLARITY.

A COMPLETE RECORDING MAY BE OBTAINED BY CONTACTING PLANNING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT at 207-854-0638 and ilobo@westbrook.me.us