

**TOWN OF WATERBORO**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**September 1, 2004**  
**7:30p.m.**

Chairman, Susan Dunlap called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Attendance from the board is as follows: Teresa Lowell, Everett Whitten, Tim Nelson and Kurt Clason

**II. APPOINTMENTS**

**Shawn Grant for Calvin Tingley for a 30% expansion review on Map 39 Lot 13**

The board reviews proposed plans and calculations. This property is located within the shoreland zone. The sitewalk committee has held a sitewalk on this property on September 10, 2004. The CEO has provided calculations that have been verified with current assessing records.

Tim motions to approve this expansion, going no closer to the water than currently located and not to exceed the allowed 30%, per Section 7.01 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**SAD 57 Middle School Map 7 Lot 61E** Steve Drane from Semple & Drane Architects introduces Tom Greer from Pinkham and Greer, Building Committee Members, Ken Bissell, Gloria Dyer, Dominic Vermette and Bruce Lamb. Engineer, Dana Morton is also present.

Mr. Drane explains that this building will be positioned approximately in the middle of this lot. The first floor will be approximately 77,000 square feet. The building will be steel frame structure with brick veneer on the entire structure. The roof will have a fairly flat pitch with rain being directed to the stormwater management system. The board reviews the floor plan layout of the school.

Tom Greer states that they are still at the design/development stage with the Bureau of General Services and are finalizing the scope. Mr. Greer states that they are at the beginning stages with the Department of Transportation and they have a scooping meeting coming up. Mr. Greer further states that today they did a final submittal to D.E.P. They have submitted the septic design to D.H.S. for review. D.H.S. will also send the design to D.E.P. to review the nitrate analysis.

As part of the D.E.P. approval process SAD 57 has also held a neighborhood meeting to address concerns of people living in the area. The board reviews arial photographs showing the area layout.

The proposed school will have 2 entrance/exits. One onto Sokokis Trail and one onto the

Old Alfred Road, connecting with an internal loop road that will have an intersection to control traffic. There is a wetland on site that will be used as a training tool for the science program.

The site pitch on the lot is in a north to south direction with the groundwater flowing in the same direction. The abutters to the south have expressed that there was a significant drainage problem when their houses were first built. The applicant feels that a large ditch to divert runoff, coupled with the small infiltration basins they have designed for around the fields will control runoff.

The applicant states that another abutter has expressed concern that pedestrian access be controlled from Sokokis Trail. The applicant states that if this becomes a problem it will be dealt with by the school administrators at that time.

The athletic fields will be irrigated using wells from the south end of the lot and will be serviced by underground power/electric. The exits from the school will have left and right turning lanes.

The applicant states that at this time they would like the board to accept this application as complete, schedule a sitewalk and public hearing and send out for whatever peer review the board would like to have done. The overall schedule the applicants are hoping for is approval sometime in December, sending out requests for bids in early January with construction commencing in March of next year and opening Fall 2006.

Sue asks the applicant to summarize the Archeological and Historical survey. The applicant states that as part of the D.E.P. process they are required to submit letters to Maine Historical Committee. If there are feature found on the site that indicate there may have been Native Americans living on the site, a more in depth study would be required. The report states that no artifacts were found on this site.

Sue inquires why a botanical study was done but not a wildlife study. The applicant states that Inland Fisheries and Wildlife checked the site for rare and endangered habitat. Teresa points out that in the conclusion of a letter it stated that a lack of data may indicate a lack of survey efforts rather than confirming the absence of rare botanical features. The applicant states that this is a standard comment meant to trigger more studies.

Sue informs the applicant that a straw pole has been done and feels the 2 entrance/exit plan will be a big issue. The board would like to see one entrance/exit. Teresa informs the applicant that on the plan Sokokis Trail is listed as State Rt 5 and on plan sheet C1.1 the Townhouse Rd is labeled Buxton Road. Teresa inquires if there will be an elevator in the school and the applicant states that there is one planned and shows the location on the plan.

Teresa inquires as to where the students will be exiting the building to get on busses. The applicant states that the intent is to have the students arriving use the main front entrance

and students leaving at the end of the day will use the side exits. Teresa expresses concerns about the students walking between 4 rows of busses at dismissal. The applicant states that there will be walking lanes, isles and islands to facilitate safe entrance to the busses. The busses will also be leaving as a fleet, not staggered

Teresa states that this lot is twice the size required and the original intention was to allow room for possible future expansion but feels that the current design is too sprawled to allow for room for growth. The applicant states that they have worked with the building committee and have done several sketches as to how that might possibly work.

Teresa inquires if the Planning board will be notified when the traffic scooping meeting will take place. The applicant states that they probably will not be notified and that the scooping meeting is normally done between the traffic consultants and M.D.O.T. Teresa asks if there will be minutes available that the board can review and the applicant states that they will get the traffic consultant to do that. The applicant states that they will decide at the scooping meeting how far the traffic study needs to go and that they have already done a lot in researching the data. The intersection most closely being looked at is Old Alfred Road. Teresa states that the Comprehensive Plan identifies the intersection of Old Alfred Road and Rt. 202 and the intersection of Old Alfred Road and Townhouse Road as high crash areas. Teresa says that at the informational meeting that the turnout lane going onto Old Alfred Rd from Rt.202 had had alleviated the problems with that intersection. Teresa states that that lane has been there for a decade and the calculations are still showing it as a high crash area. The applicant states that that will all be reviewed in the traffic scooping meeting. The board would like documentation showing that the crash rates have been reduced the last couple of years.

Teresa asks if there is a primary and secondary entrance into the school and the applicant states that according to a traffic study, the traffic will be more or less split equally between Old Alfred Road and Sokokis Trail. Teresa asks what the general consensus at the neighborhood meeting with regards to the increased amount of traffic expected on Old Alfred Road. The applicant states that it was mentioned along with the speed limit on the road but that it was not a major issue.

Don Boilard speaks as an abutter and states that Old Alfred Rd is not designed to support the weight of the busses. Sue informs Mr. Boilard that as chair of the Board she conducts the meeting. Sue asks Mr. Boilard to make sure his comments are contained to subjects he has personal knowledge of and tells Mr. Boilard that it will be up to the applicants to prove that the road can support the increased traffic and weight. Mr. Boilard states that this project is interfering with his property. Sue informs Mr. Boilard that unless the applicant violates any town laws, he should confine his comments to what is applicable to him.

Sue asks if there is space for possible future portable classrooms if the need should ever arise. The applicant points out a grassy area located on the lot that may be a possible location. Sue is concerned that this location would create a hazard with kids crossing

parking areas to get to the portable.

Kurt asks if this building will be designed with the capacity to add a 4<sup>th</sup> floor. The applicant states that it is not and that there is room for expansion off the classroom wing if it is ever needed. This school is designed to comfortably fit 800 students and there are currently 650 students.

Sue would like to state that while the board welcomes comments from the public, she had a discussion with Mr. Boilard prior to this meeting and made it clear that public input tonight would be limited and that he would have the opportunity at the public hearing and sitewalk to voice his concerns. Sue does not want to encourage using these meetings improperly. Sue further states that Mr. Boilard has previously submitted his concerns in writing and the board has been aware of them.

Kurt points out that on the Electrical plan ES 101 an entrance sign is placed 6 feet away from a 6 foot high fence. The applicant states that this was an error and the sign location will be changed to the other side of the fence.

David Woodsome, a member of the public inquires as to why the school will have a flat roof and says he feels that that a few years down the road it could lead to major problems. The applicant replies that State guidelines and criteria dictate the design of the school. The applicant further states that a building of this size with a pitched roof would generate significant amount of stormwater runoff as well as snow problems.

David Woodsome points out that the running fields at the school would be getting substantially more use than the softball and baseball fields. Mr. Woodsome asks if the softball/baseball fields would be able to be used as running fields if needed. The applicant states that they are intended to be used as "double duty" fields.

The board discusses the need to schedule a site walk and public hearing. The site walk is scheduled for Saturday, October 2, 2004 at 9:00 a.m. The Public Hearing is scheduled for Wednesday, October 6, 2004 at 7:30 p.m.

Sue asks the applicant if there will be any information from D.O.T. available prior to the October 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. The applicant states that they have to expect something.

Sue states that an interpreter has been requested to be present at the sitewalk and the public hearing. The planning board secretary will inquire about getting one

Mr. Boilard inquires if the proposed sidewalk will be going on his front lawn. Sue informs him that the only sidewalks will be going on school property.

Dana Morton asks if the board will be submitting the information for peer review and Sue informs him that the board will be. The board discusses possibilities for Peer Review. The board decides on using Sevee and Maher to do the peer review work on the Hydro,

stormwater and septic review. Tim Nelson also recommends sending the plan to Southern Maine Regional Planning for confirmation of compliance with the town ordinance.

At this time the board does a review of the checklist.

### **III. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

August 18, 2004 - Teresa motions to approve the minutes of this meeting. Everett seconds and the motion carries with a 4-0-1 motion with Kurt abstaining as he was absent for this meeting.

### **IV. REPORT OF OFFICERS**

### **V. OLD BUSINESS**

Town Planner possibilities - Sue and Patti will draft a proposal to send to the selectmer Ossipee Landing - The board would like assurance that the 2 plans are the same with the only change being the name change on the plan and the removal of the ballfield. Teresa motions to send both plans to S.M.R.P. to review both sets of plans. Tim seconds and the motion carries with a unanimous vote. After the vote it is noted that S.M.R.P. was originally involved in the planning process of Ossipee Landing. Tim moves to reconsider the vote to send the plans to S.M.R.P. and Teresa seconds. Tim motions to ask Doug Webster, or an equally qualified person, to review both sets of plans for conformity with the only change being the removal of the ball field. Teresa seconds and the motion carries with a unanimous vote.

### **VI. COMMUNICATION**

There is a letter from the Hollis Planning Board telling them of a 5 lot subdivision that is being proposed off the Townhouse Road that is located partially in Waterboro. The meeting will be held at the Hollis Town Hall on September 7 and the Waterboro planning board has been invited to attend. Sue would like to find out if Waterboro Planning board is required to have a quorum in order to participate in the meetings. Patti states that all meetings shall be held jointly by both municipalities, however, the reviewing authority of both town may waive the requirement for joint meetings and hearings. Patti states that the parcel of land that is in Waterboro is a small piece of land. Sue states that she will go to the Hollis Planning Board meeting to review the plans

### **VII. MISCELLANEOUS**

### **VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

## **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

Teresa made the motion to adjourn at 9:30 p.m. Tim seconded and the motion passed with a unanimous vote in favor.