

# **Auburn Planning Board Meeting Minutes March 27, 2018**

## **ROLL CALL:**

**Regular Members present:** Mia Poliquin Pross, Robert Bowyer, Evan Cyr – Presiding, Samuel Scogin and Nathan Hamlyn

**Regular Members absent:** Marc Tardif

**Associate and other Members present:** Dustin Boutin,

**Associate and other Members absent:** Christopher Lewis and Bilal Hussein, Planning Board Student Representative

**Also present representing City staff:** Zach Mosher, Auburn City Planner

Chairperson Cyr called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm and asked for a roll call from the members. He explained that due to inclement weather, the March 13 meeting had been rescheduled to tonight.

## **MINUTES:**

### **February 13, 2018 Meeting Minutes Approval Request**

A motion was made by Samuel Scogin and seconded by Mia Poliquin Pross to approve the February 13, 2018 meeting minutes as presented. After a vote of 6-0-0, the motion carried.

Chairperson Cyr explained the process of the Planning Board meeting and asked Zach Mosher to present the staff report.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS & NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1. Major Final Subdivision Plan for Woodbury Heights Phase IV. George Bouchles, Surveyor and agent for Bouffard and McFarland Builders, is seeking approval for 7 residential lots and a new 668 ft cul-de-sac street) at the corner of Woodbury Road and Danville Corner Road (PID: 110-009) and a portion of an adjacent lot (PID: 110-011), pursuant to Chapter 60, Division 4 Subdivision; Sections 1359 Subdivision and 1362 Major Final Subdivision Plan of the Auburn Code of Ordinances.**

Zach went over the staff report and presented slides via PowerPoint.

George Bouchles, Surveyor and agent for Bouffard and McFarland Builders explained the waiver request for the road.

Sean Thies, Engineer from CES Inc. spoke about the storm water management plan.

Several questions were asked by Board members and answered by the applicants.

(26:00 on Recording)

**Open Public Input**

A motion was made by Samuel Scogin and seconded by Robert Bowyer to open the public input part of the hearing. After a vote of 6-0-0, the motion carried.

Kimberly Dube-Bustamonte of 784 Old Danville Road said she had sought the opinion of an independent engineering firm, Acorn Engineering from Portland. She said Acorn highlighted 6 specific items that she feels is significant and concerning as an abutting property owner. She read the last paragraph which referenced Section 60-1359 (4) of the City's subdivision guidelines. She said she is very concerned that the run-off is headed straight to her property. Another concern she has is that the waiver is going to be approved without specific issues being addressed especially where it says that the plan doesn't meet City subdivision guidelines.

Ms. Dube-Bustamonte asked who has the expertise to monitor the storm water management plan and make certain that it's done correctly without incurring more cost to her? She spoke about having a buffer of trees placed on the property line to prevent long term water issues as suggested by Acorn.

Chairperson Cyr suggested that Ms. Dube-Bustamonte give a synopsis of the 6 items listed by Acorn Engineering for Public Record. The following 6 items are taken directly from Acorn's Independent Stormwater Review:

1. Per Section 11 of the MaineDEP SLODA application, subdivision projects with lots less than 2 acres where subsurface wastewater disposal is proposed require a Class A High Intensity Soil Survey. It is recommended that the soil survey boundaries be added to the Stormwater Plan to define which Hydraulic Groups were used for the HydroCAD model. The letter by George Bouchles dated February 28, 2018 does not suffice as a High Intensity Soil Survey.
2. The time of concentration path used in the post development calculations within the HydroCAD report for Subarea 1 does not travel from the most remote part of the watershed and does not account for the entirety of subcat. The sheet flow component of the concentration path is more accurately represented by the flow off the roadway highpoint then transitioning into shallow concentrated flow through the vegetated ditch and into the buffer in Lot 26. The path as modelled currently assumes a higher time of concentration that potentially correlates with a lesser peak flow at Summation Point 1 than compared to a more accurate model. It is recommended that the HydroCAD model be revised accordingly and other stormwater management practices be implemented to further mitigate peak flows at Summation Point 1.
3. Stormwater entering the Lot 26 buffer will sheet flow for the 75-foot design path before entering a steep, sustained slope of 27% for 300'. It is recommended that the buffer is repositioned as to redirect runoff away from the steep slope that directly outlets into the abutters' property.
4. C700 shows regrading of the existing house lot and structure on Lot 19 to redirect flow into Bioretention Cell 2 and away from Subarea 3. Acorn doubts the feasibility of regrading a lot with an existing structure so that it raised from its existing finished floor elevation and recommends that the engineer elaborate how this is constructible
5. It is unclear where and how the water from the bioretention cells is to drain. As modelled in

HydroCAD, Bioretention Cells 1 & 2 are to drain to Summation Point 2 via a 100-foot 6" stormdrain. Based on the latest version of C700, the 6" outlets are not long enough to reach the design invert and empties into a steep slope (approximately 250' at 25%) without note of any energy dissipation device to convert the concentrated pipe flow to sheet flow into the abutting property. Bioretention Cell 3 is modelled in similar fashion with the too-short, 100-foot 6" pipe outletting into the same steep slope without adequate erosion control devices to mitigate concentrated flow off the slope. It is recommended that the bioretention cells redirect flow away from the sustained steep slope and that an outlet pipe greater than 6" be used to minimize chance of clogging and backlogged flow into the biocell.

6. The existing site topography flows from the edge of proposed roadway to the rear of the house lots (proposed Lots 23-25, existing Lot 19) but the HydroCAD model reverses the stormwater flows to the front of the lot and assumes that the entirety of the new rooftops is tributary to the respective stormwater BMPs. It is recommended that additional information such as swales, spot grades, etc. be added to the proposed contours on C700 to provide more context on how the runoff is to be redirected.

Ms. Dube-Bustamonte gave each Board member a hard copy of the review by Acorn Engineering, Inc.

(39:40 on Recording)

Shawn Dube of 760 Old Danville Road said he really thinks it's important to have a buffer in place. He said he built his house in 2007 and has never had an issue with water until now. He suggests that this subdivision not be approved until all the recommendations from Acorn Engineering are met and the storm water run-off is in place. He said the trails that were supposed to be installed by the developers for the first 3 phases aren't there so how can he be certain that the developer will fulfill his obligation to the City to make sure his back yard doesn't become a flowing river. He reiterated that he wasn't against the subdivision, he just wants it done right. Mr. Dube commented that granting the variance for the road would make things even worse for the run-off.

A motion was made by Robert Bowyer and seconded by Samuel Scogin to close the Public Input part of the hearing. After a vote of 6-0-0, the motion carried.

After a lengthy discussion between Board members and staff, the following motion was made:

(69:50 on Recording)

A motion was made by Robert Bowyer and seconded by Samuel Scogin to table the proposal until more information is provided by the City's Engineering Department and the City's 3<sup>rd</sup> party Engineering firm of Woodard and Curran regarding the storm water management plan that was submitted by Acorn Engineering, Inc., and get clarification for the need of sidewalks in a subdivision of this size.

After a vote of 6-0-0, the motion to table carried.

- 2. The Auburn Planning Board has initiated a Future Land Use Map Amendment from New Auburn Village Center to Neighborhood Business (NB) and Zoning Map Amendment from Multi-Family Urban (MFU) to Neighborhood Business (NB) for the property located at 33 Dunn St (PID # 221-195), pursuant to Chapter 60, Article XVII Amendments of the Auburn Code of Ordinances.**

The Board members took a short recess and the meeting reconvened at 7:20 PM

Zach presented the staff report and presented slides via PowerPoint.

Mia Poliquin Pross asked about the conditions listed and Zach gave an explanation.

(87:00 on Recording)

**Open Public Input**

A motion was made by Samuel Scogin and seconded by Mia Poliquin Pross to open the public input part of the hearing. After a vote of 6-0-0, the motion carried.

Mr. and Mrs. Hinkley of 17 Oak Hill Drive in New Gloucester, Maine said their goal was to have the property at 33 Dunn Street rezoned so they could sell muffins and lease out office space.

Kevin Lynch of 59 Fourth Street asked what else could go there in case they don't proceed with the proposed coffee shop. He commended the Hinkley's for trying to bring something positive to the area but was concerned that the zone might encroach further down the neighborhood bringing with it unknown businesses.

Sam Scogin read the Neighborhood Business Zoning Ordinance section.

Chairperson Cyr explained that this zone has conditions attached which requires a new business to be harmonious with the neighborhood. He added this makes it more restrictive than the General Business Zone.

Mr. Lynch stated he felt more at ease now that he realized the rezoning would specifically be for 33 Dunn Street and not include other properties in the area.

A motion was made by Samuel Scogin and seconded by Dustin Boutin to close the Public Input part of the hearing. After a vote of 6-0-0, the motion carried.

Mia Poliquin Pross clarified that a bakery is listed under Special Exception uses in the Neighborhood Business District, therefore if they wanted to pursue selling baked goods, they would have to come back to the Board for review and approval.

(101:00 on Recording)

A motion was made by Samuel Scogin to forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council a Future Land Use Map Amendment from New Auburn Village Center to Neighborhood Business (NB) and Zoning Map Amendment from Multi-Family Urban (MFU) to Neighborhood Business (NB) for the property located at 33 Dunn St (PID # 221-195), pursuant to Chapter 60, Article XVII Amendments of the Auburn Code of Ordinances.

Mia Poliquin Pross asked to amend the motion to include the Findings listed on page 7 of the staff report and Mr. Scogin concurred with the amendment. The motion was seconded by Nathan Hamlyn. After a vote of 6-0-0, the motion carried.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

Chairperson Cyr explained that at the previous month's meeting, Board members were tasked with coming up with a list of priority actions they felt should be taken up by the Planning Board. Each member went through their lists and shared their ideas. After a lengthy discussion, the members agreed that Ms. Pross would take everyone's ideas, categorize them and at the next meeting, members would go over the list in each category and decide the order of importance.

**MISCELLANEOUS:**

None

(149:15 on Recording)

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Samuel Scogin and seconded by Mia Poliquin Pross to adjourn. After a vote of 6-0-0, the motion carried.