



## City of Auburn, Maine

Economic & Community Development

60 Court Street | Auburn, Maine 04210

www.auburnmaine.gov | 207.333.6601

**To:** Auburn Planning Board  
**From:** Megan McLaughlin, City Planner II  
**Re:** 1524 Minot Avenue (PID 194-001), Coleman's Collision Addition, Special Exception & Site Plan Review Amendment in the Minot Avenue (General Business II) Zoning District.  
**Date:** July 9, 2019

---

- I. **PROPOSAL** – Jim Titus/Coleman's Collision is applying for a Special Exception/Site Plan Review Amendment in accordance with Sec. 60-45 and 60-499(b)(2) to remove three small existing sheds (817 square feet total) and construct a 3,530 square foot addition designed to improve the roof structure of a major portion of the existing building and provide contiguous improved working space.

Coleman's Collision has been in business for several years in Auburn. During the file review, it appears the last approval was granted by the Planning Board on September 15, 1988 for a 4,200 square foot addition to the already existing automobile body repair building.

Automobile repair and service stations are permissible in the GBII District as long as they are approved by the Planning Board as a special exception. Planning Staff can review Special Exception proposals administratively if the expanded area is less than 10% of the existing footprint. The existing building footprint is 12,169 square feet, the proposed footprint is 14,882 square feet, which exceeds the 10% expansion. Therefore, Planning Board approval is required for this proposal.

II. **DEPARTMENT REVIEW** –

- a. Police – No comments.
- b. Auburn Water and Sewer – No comments.
- c. Fire Department – The Fire Department requested jersey barriers be in place for a buffer between the propane tanks and the parking lot. Planning Staff asked for a spec. of the jersey barriers that would be required to address the concern. It does appear three sides of the propane tanks are protected with jersey barriers currently.
- d. Engineering – No comments.
- e. Public Services – No comments.
- f. Economic and Community Development – Article V. Sec. 60-607(12)(d) of the ordinance says: *“Where, in nonresidential districts, parking is planned to occupy a portion of the required front yard area, parking shall not be placed nearer than ten feet from the street right-of-way line. The area between the parking area and the street right-of-way line shall be landscaped.”* The original 1988 approval included a couple of landscaped areas (see attachment). Looking at the aerials, included below, it appears there was some landscaping but it has since been removed. The PB should determine if the Applicant is responsible for restoring landscaping in the front setback per the ordinance requirement cited above. In addition, the original 1988 approval had 19 parking spaces in the front and 24 spaces in the back for vehicle storage. This proposal includes 15 parking spaces in the front and does not appear to show parking spaces in the back. The ordinance requires one parking space per employee and 50% of daily customer traffic.



Figure 2: 1998 Aerial



Figure 1: 2001 Aerial



Figure 3: 2006 Aerial



Figure 4: 2013 Aerial



Figure 3: 2018 Aerial

III. **PLANNING BOARD ACTION** – The proposed project requires review and findings for approval of Sections 60-1277 and 60-1336:

**A. Site Plan Review, Section 60-1277:**

1. **Does the site plan protect adjacent areas against detrimental or offensive uses on the site by provision of adequate surface water drainage, buffers against artificial and reflected light, sight, sound, dust and vibration; and preservation of light and air?**  
No change. The Applicant is not proposing any changes to exterior lighting or signage.
2. **Is the convenience and safety of vehicular and pedestrian movement within the site and in relation to adjacent areas adequately addressed?**  
See discussion above regarding parking spaces for the establishment.
3. **Are the proposed methods of disposal for wastes adequately addressed?**  
No change.
4. **Does the site plan provide adequate protection of environmental features on the site and adjacent areas?**  
No change. They are staying under the one acre of disturbance/impervious threshold.

**B. Special Exception, Section 60-1336: The board shall require evidence of the following:**

1. **That the special exception sought fulfills the specific requirements, if any, set forth in the zoning ordinance relative to such exception.**  
See discussion above regarding parking.
2. **That the special exception sought will neither create nor aggravate a traffic hazard, a fire hazard or any other safety hazard.**  
See discussion above regarding landscaping in the front setback. The PB should determine if a condition is necessary to address the ordinance requirements.
3. **That the special exception sought will not block or hamper the master development plan pattern of highway circulation or of planned major public or semipublic land acquisition.**  
The proposal will not block or hamper a master development plan.
4. **That the exception sought will not alter the essential characteristics of the neighborhood and will not tend to depreciate the value of property adjoining and neighboring the property under application.**  
The proposed expansion will not alter the existing image of this area.
5. **That reasonable provisions have been made for adequate land space, lot width, lot area, stormwater management in accordance with section 60-1301(14) green space, driveway layout, road access, off-street parking, landscaping, building separation, sewage disposal, water supply, fire safety, and where applicable, a plan or contract for perpetual maintenance of all the common green space and clustered off-street parking areas to ensure all such areas will be maintained in a satisfactory manner.**  
See discussion above regarding parking.
6. **That the standards imposed are, in all cases, at least as stringent as those elsewhere imposed by the City building code and by the provisions of this chapter.**  
No issues.
7. **That essential city services which will be required for the project are presently available or can be made available without disrupting the city's master development plan.**  
City services are present at the location.

IV. **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS** – The Staff recommends the Planning Board find that the Site Plan for the proposed development, meets the requirements of Sec. 60-1277, and further that the application meets the requirements of Special Exception Law, Sec. 60-1336, and APPROVE the project application with one condition. Staff recommends the following condition:

- The Applicant shall submit a plan for a landscape buffer in accordance with Article V. Sec. 60-607(12)(d) between the parking area and the street right of way line. Automobiles shall not be parked nearer than ten feet from the street right-of-way line.

---

Megan McLaughlin  
City Planner II