

**SANFORD PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**MEETING – August 5, 2015 – 7:00 P.M.**  
**City Hall Annex Third Floor Chambers**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John McAdam, Chair  
Lenny Horr, Vice Chair  
Kelly Tarbox, Secretary  
Richard Bergeron  
Lucas Lanigan  
Dianne Connolly  
Dana Peterson (Arrived late)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** James Q. Gulnac, AICP, Planning & Development Director  
Michael Casserly, Asst. City Engineer

**STAFF ABSENT:** None

\*\*\*\*\*

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair McAdam called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

**II. PUBLIC HEARING**

**1. File #19-14-RU: Matt Pepin, R. Pepin & Sons, P.O. Box 729, Sanford, Maine.**

Chair McAdam called for a representative to present the project.

Staff member Gulnac wanted to let the applicant and Board members know that Board member Peterson would be late to the meeting.

Matt Pepin, R. Pepin & Sons, said the property owner, John Rivard approached him about developing some property behind his home for future use by his children. Mr. Pepin stated that by working with Mr. Rivard, Mr. Rivard will be able to obtain usable space by having R. Pepin & Sons remove gravel, which in turn would help the company. Mr. Pepin said it was a ten-acre site with about 300,000 yards of material to remove. He said John Rivard, property owner would like to address the Board to explain his intentions.

John Rivard, owner of property, said it is not his intention to operate a gravel pit, but to provide house lots for his children as they finish school. He is only looking to remove as much gravel as needed to be able to create the lots as quickly as possible with the least amount of impact to his neighbors.

Chair McAdam said the last plan he saw was from the water district. He said it looked like he was digging a hole because it was close to the water level and wanted to know how he intended to build a house here. Mr. Rivard responded the land curves up as it moves away from the road, which is at the base level. Mr. Rivard says they just want to make the property level. Staff member Gulnac added that there was a lot of discussion regarding this at the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) meeting earlier in the day and the elevation level has been addressed. Discussion followed on the elevation levels and final reclamation plan.

Board member Tarbox asked how quickly they intended to finish the extraction process in terms of years. Mr. Pepin replied that the term is currently written for a five-year period with the opportunity to come back before the Board after five years. He felt the operation could be completed within five years.

Chair McAdam asked if there were any other questions.

Board member Connolly asked if there would be any blasting. Mr. Pepin stated he didn't think there would be any need because early testing has not shown ledge-like materials. He said if there was any ledge, they would not be able to blast in this area.

Board member Tarbox asked how much open area they were planning at one time and if he had a reclamation plan in place. Mr. Pepin answered he was asking to keep ten (10) acres open at one time and explained why.

Chair McAdam asked if there would be any rock crushing taking place at this location. Mr. Pepin replied he was hoping to set up a screener and crusher if possible, but he felt it may not be feasible to run the crusher in order to keep with local noise ordinances and due to the close proximity of neighbors. He added that he left the verbiage in the operations manual to allow crushing in case they are able to find a way to crush material.

Board member Tarbox asked what he is proposing for operating hours. Mr. Pepin replied 6:00 AM to 5:00 PM standard operating hours Monday through Friday and operating from 7:00 AM until noon on Saturday, but he has notes included in the manual specifying certain allowed operations at different times of the day. Discussion followed.

Board member Connolly asked if trucks were going to be traveling on Bernier Road before 6:00 AM. Mr. Pepin felt trucks would be traveling on Bernier Road around 6:00 AM. Board member Connolly asked how many trips per day were going to take place. Mr. Pepin stated an average of sixty (60) trips per day. Mr. Pepin explained how he reached the trip total and situations that may increase the need for more trucks. Discussion took place on truck traffic.

Board member Lanigan asked staff member Casserly if Bernier Road was able to handle the proposed truck traffic. Staff member Gulnac asked if this could be discussed later during the meeting because both the applicant and Dave Parent, Superintendent, Sanford Water District had additional information to present regarding this topic as well as the entrance location and felt these should be discussed together. The discussion went back to truck traffic.

Staff member Casserly asked for clarification on the number of trips for truck traffic. Mr. Pepin replied it would be round trips, so the truck traffic would be 60x2 for a total of 120 trips per day and added this was a worst case scenario. Discussion took place. The applicant agreed to modify the proposed number of truck trips, leaving a clause in the manual that will allow a request to increase the number of trips per day should there be a need.

Staff member Gulnac updated the Board on the discussion that took place during the SPRC meeting earlier in the day. The number of trips being requested by the applicant is not currently taking place on this road. Matt Hill, City Engineer was asked to see if the entrance location to the pit could be moved. It didn't look feasible to do so because Mr. Parent, Sanford Water District said the well heads appear to be close to the no-refueling area and explained why. Mr. Pepin offered to follow-up with his

traffic engineer to confirm the entrance could not be relocated. He continued to say that if the entrance cannot be relocated, he could leave a large buffer between the entrance and the neighbor to alleviate noise issues and start work in the pit toward the back and progress towards the roadway. Discussion followed.

Board member Bergeron asked if there was going to be any blasting in the pit; Mr. Pepin responded there would be no blasting and believed this was also stated in the operations manual.

Staff member Gulnac followed up on Board member Lanigan's comment regarding the sustainability of Bernier Road with the proposed truck traffic. Staff member Casserly paraphrased a letter from staff member Hill. The letter addressed the following:

- A performance guarantee would have to be posted for the repair of Bernier Road at a negotiated cost.
- In lieu of a performance guarantee, a deal could be worked out to use gravel to repair the road.

Discussion followed.

Board member Lanigan said this answered a part of his question. He then asked if Bernier Road is a posted road. Staff member Casserly stated he wasn't positive, but based on the list of posted roads, thought this road was. Board member Lanigan asked Mr. Pepin if pit operations would stop during this time; Mr. Pepin stated hauling gravel would not take place but the pit could still run the screening and processing operations.

Mr. Pepin then addressed the road issue. He said they could offer to do some things to repair the road. One option was to possibly donate 5,000 yards of material from the pit to help rebuild the road. Mr. Pepin doesn't feel the company is responsible for maintaining or taking care of the road and explained why. Mr. Pepin went on to say there are a number of companies traveling city roads with heavy equipment and are not responsible for maintaining these roads. Chair McAdam said running 60+ trips a day on Bernier Road will cause damage to the road and felt Mr. Pepin should be held accountable for the repair; other Board members agreed. Mr. Pepin responded saying there are things the company can do but didn't feel he should be 100% responsible; discussion followed.

After discussion on the subject of the type of performance guarantee that should be used for the repair of Bernier Road, it was decided to make this a condition of approval until the details of the possibility of using gravel instead of a monetary guarantee could be worked out.

Board member Connolly asked Mr. Rivard, property owner if there were any private cemeteries on his property; Mr. Rivard replied there was not.

Chair McAdam asked Dave Parent, Superintendent, Sanford Water District to speak. Mr. Parent clarified that even though his response letter is lengthy, it does not mean the District has issues with the project. He said through discussions with city staff and the applicant, most – if not all – the issues were addressed so he prepared a new memo for tonight's meeting. The new memo states all previous issues were addressed, it was a well thought-out application, and feels they would be good neighbors to them. The item he did want to address tonight was the relocation of the refueling station. The wellhead protection zone covers 2/3 of the property and the remaining 1/3 of the property is the section close to the abutter's house. After the

SPRC meeting, he reviewed all the regulations that pertained to this and found a statement in our groundwater ordinance that prohibits refueling in this wellhead zone. Mr. Parent stated if the entire property was in the protected zone, they would try to come to an agreement with the applicant to allow them to operate a gravel pit on the property. Since this is not the case and there is an area out of the protected zone to put the refueling station, Mr. Parent was asking the Board not to relocate refueling pad.

Chair McAdam asked if anyone present would like to speak for the application; there was no one.

Chair McAdam asked if anyone present would like to speak against the application.

David Houle, maintenance person at Apache Campground and son-in-law of the owners of the campground as well presented his comments and concerns:

- He felt that Mr. Rivard could build on the property as it is without removing gravel.
- The number of road trips used by the trucks. He said Bernier Road is used for bicycling, walking, etc. not only by his campers but also the residents in the neighborhood.
- He described the current condition of Bernier Road today and what he believes it will look like once the road has been extensively traveled on by the heavy trucks.
- He also had concerns with safety and the financial burden to the city.

Mr. Houle added that when the original owner, Bob Libby, of the existing neighboring gravel pit was going through the review process, the approval was conditioned to not allow processing, crushing, or screening operations. Mr. Libby also put in an access road that led to Route 4 to address the concerns of safety issues on Bernier Road. When the current owner took over operations, Mr. Houle said they are now able to do crushing, screening and processing and the noise is unbearable at times.

Chair McAdam asked if anyone else would like to speak against the application.

Charles Kasinowicz, resident at 298 Bernier Road said the project would mainly impact him. He has an issue with the truck trip total, the noise, and had the same concerns as Mr. Houle regarding the usage of Bernier Road for recreational purposes and the safety concerns the heavy equipment pose to the people using the road.

Vice Chair Horr asked staff member Casserly if anyone has measured the noise coming from the operations at the existing Gorham Sand & Gravel pit. Staff member Casserly said he has measured the noise in the past but has not been there in a while. He also said that he has not been there at 6:00AM in the morning to measure the noise. He did say that anytime he has been to the pit, there was little to no noise taking place. Mr. Casserly said he will look into the noise level to respond to the abutters' noise concerns.

Board member Connolly asked Mr. Casserly what the speed limit is on Bernier Road. Mr. Casserly responded he wasn't sure if it was 35 MPH but another person responded it was 25 MPH.

Discussion took place on if it was possible for the Rivard's proposal to tie in to the access road of the Gorham Sand & Gravel pit. The current owner of Libby Pit has no interest in working out a plan with the Rivard's.

Board member Peterson asked if the proposed area was directly adjacent to the campground. Mr. Pepin replied it was not and described where his property was in relation to the campground.

Board member Lanigan asked Mr. Pepin which direction the trucks would be traveling. Mr. Pepin responded that the trucks have to travel towards New Dam Road because there is a weight restriction on the bridge in the opposite direction.

Mr. Pepin then expressed to the Board that his operation would not be on the same scale as the Shaw brothers' operation is and explained the differences.

Board member Tarbox asked if there was going to be any equipment parked onsite. Mr. Pepin said a front loader may be parked there, but no trucks will be parked overnight. Board member Tarbox asked which pieces of equipment would be refueled onsite. Mr. Pepin said the front-loader and possibly the screener.

Board member Lanigan asked if it would be detrimental to his operation if they scaled back his production during the peak travel season for the campground. Mr. Pepin responded this time is also peak construction season. Mr. Pepin said he would be willing to change his start time request to no earlier than 7:00 AM, but would not go later than that for a start time.

Board member Lanigan then asked if the drive to open this pit was the pending new high school construction. Mr. Pepin said that is not the main reason for opening this pit, having material close by to their other operations is beneficial to the company as a whole.

Board member Peterson asked Mr. Pepin if in a year or two he would be having crushing, screening, tailgate slamming, etc. taking place at this location. Mr. Pepin stated he could not guarantee these processes would not take place, but the size of this pit will limit the extent of the operations that could happen here. Board member Tarbox also said that Mr. Pepin would have to come back for Board approval if any changes take place in the operations manual.

Chair McAdam asked if anyone else from the public wanted to speak.

Rick Southwick, 35 Varney Drive, said he is very concerned as to what happens to Bernier Road, or any other road in the city. He said at the SPRC meeting earlier in the day it was said that Bernier Road would not be able to sustain the amount of truck traffic being proposed. Mr. Southwick added that he did not think receiving gravel from the applicant as compensation to fix the road was a good idea and explained why.

Chair McAdam asked if anyone else from the public wanted to speak; there was not.

Chair McAdam closed the public hearing.

**After discussing the Planning Director's report, the Planning Board talked about the next steps for this project. The Board felt they needed more information on the road condition.**

Board member Lanigan made a motion to table the project until a later date.

Board member Tarbox seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0.

### III. NEW BUSINESS

There were no new business items.

### IV. OLD BUSINESS

1. **File #18-12-R: R. Pepin & Sons, Inc., c/o Matthew Pepin, P.O. Box 729, Sanford, Maine.**

Chair McAdam called for a representative to present the project.

Staff member Gulnac recapped the project before the applicant spoke. He said it was left at the last meeting that Matt Pepin and Mike Casserly, Asst. City Engineer would provide a revised, updated operations manual to the Board.

Matt Pepin, R. Pepin & Sons, Inc. updated the Board on the changes that were made to the reclamation of the pit. Mr. Pepin said the revisions mainly dealt with how to reclaim the pit and timeframe he needed to follow, taking more time on the timeline for Section 3.

Chair McAdam asked staff member Casserly if he approved the proposed changes.

Staff member Casserly said Mr. Pepin has worked on the area of the pit he had concerns with at this time and he was satisfied with the proposed timeline given by Mr. Pepin.

Chair McAdam asked if there were any questions; there were none.

Chair McAdam called for a motion.

Board member Tarbox made a motion that the Planning Board has reviewed the request by Matthew Pepin, representing R. Pepin & Sons Concrete to revise the operations manual, application file #18-12-R and accept the revised operations manual.

Board member Lanigan seconded the motion.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed 7-0.

2. **File #07-15-U: Christopher Smith and Bryce Legere, d/b/a G-Force Farms, LLC, 31 Birchwood Lane, Springvale, Maine.**

Chair McAdam called for a representative to present the project.

Staff member Gulnac stated that both applicants have provided their state designation as caregivers information to the city and this information is now in the file. This is in response to a question asked during the site walk.

Chair McAdam asked if there were any other questions.

Board member Tarbox said she believes all questions were answered during the site walk and felt it was helpful to have the Chief of Police there to answer the safety and security questions the Board had.

Chair McAdam asked staff member Casserly if he had looked at the filtration system. Staff member Casserly replied he has and it should be fine once completed.

Board member Connolly said she called the company that made the filters the applicant is using. She asked the applicant how high the fans were going to be placed in the building. Mr. Smith explained where the equipment was going in the building. She asked how often the filters were going to be changed. It was confirmed that the filters were going to be changed every six (6) months.

Board member Lanigan wanted to verify if the majority of the odor was not going to be towards the abutter's house. Mr. Smith explained the different phases of plant growth in regard to odor and said the room closest to the neighbor was going to have the least amount of odor produced.

Vice Chair Horr said the site walk was helpful in understanding how the process worked and how the operation was going to be run. Board member Lanigan added the applicants seemed like they were setting some good standards and thanked the applicants.

Board member Connolly admitted that she was struggling with this request. She said she has done her homework and talked to medical professionals but is still having an issue with the federal part of the issue.

Chair McAdam called for a motion.

Staff member Gulnac reminded the Board of the following for clarification purposes:

- the proposed activity is a permitted use
- the location is on a site the Board has previously granted site plan approval to subject to the applicants getting conditional use approval
- the finding of facts are based on conditional use only, asked the Board to vote on the finding of facts first, then make a motion on the request itself

Discussion followed.

Staff member Gulnac read the following suggested finding of facts:

- They provided a copy of the lease in which they have been authorized to submit the application for a conditional use permit to the Planning Board.
- They have provided an approved site plan which has been verified by the Site Plan Review Committee.
- The proposed use is considered under NAICS code 325411 Medicinal and Botanical Manufacturing and is a conditionally permitted use in the Urban zone.
- That the proposed parcel is R15 lot 12B is in the Urban zone.
- The Planning Board therefore has accepted the request by the applicant for the submittal of a formally prepared site plan and accepts the recommendation of both the Planner and the Site Plan Review Committee and grants the waiver requested, in other words the Planning Board accepts the site plan that was previously approved.
- The Planning Board held a site visit scheduled for Monday August 3, 2015. A quorum of members attended the site visit and reached the following conclusions:
  - The building will be a secure structure with some minor additional lock features as suggested by the Police Chief.
  - The site itself was a secure site fully fenced with a locked gate.

- The location of the vent for the filtered air was on the side of the building away from the residents.
  - The applicant provided a spec sheet for the filtering system to the city engineer indicating that this system is used in other similar facilities and considered one of the best available.
  - Therefore, the two outstanding issues of odor control and site safety were being adequately handled by the applicant.
- The Planning Board shall approve a conditional use application, approve it with conditions; if it makes a positive finding, based on the following information presented, that the proposed site with any conditions attached meets the following standards:
  1. The proposed use will not place a burden on municipal services which due to its location and the characteristics of the site or proposed development is significantly greater than the burden that would result from a similar use in other situations.
  2. The proposed use will not create hazards to vehicle or pedestrian traffic on roads or sidewalks serving the proposed use as determined by the size and condition of such roads and sidewalks, lighting, drainage, intensity of use by both pedestrians and vehicles and the visibility afforded to pedestrians and operations of the motor vehicles.
  3. The proposed use will not cause water pollution, sedimentation or erosion, contaminate any water supply or reduce the capacity of the land to hold water so that a dangerous, aesthetically unpleasant or unhealthy condition may result.
  4. The proposed use will not create unhealthful conditions because of smoke, dust, or other airborne contaminants.
  5. The proposed use will not create nuisances to the neighboring properties because of odors, fumes, glare, hours of operation, noise, vibration, fire hazard, or unreasonably restricted access of light or air to neighboring properties.
  6. The proposed location for the use has no particular physical characteristics due to its size, shape, topography or soils which will create or aggravate adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding properties.
  7. The proposed use has no characteristics that are atypical of the general use category that will depreciate the economic value of the surrounding properties.

Chair McAdam asked if there were any questions on the finding of facts.

Board member Bergeron asked the applicants if DHS looks at the location before they start; the response was DHS does not.

Board member Connolly stated that both she and Board member Lanigan noticed that when the applicants left the facility after the site visit with the Planning Board, neither of them checked to verify the gate was secure and locked. She requested that in the future, they wait until the gate is secure upon entering and leaving the site. Both applicants responded they would do this from now on.

Board member Lanigan asked if disposal was addressed. Staff member Gulnac referenced item #s 4 and 5 under the finding of facts listing. Although it doesn't specifically state trash, it does state will not create unhealthful conditions or create nuisances to abutting properties. Mr. Gulnac went on to say that the state regulates

this particular activity and the Board will reference the applicants have to follow state regulations. Discussion followed.

Board member Peterson said he isn't sure that item #7 would be factual since this is a relatively new activity. Staff member Gulnac agreed that this is unknown at this time. Discussion followed.

Chair McAdam called for a motion.

Board member Tarbox made a motion that the Planning Board accept the Finding of Facts as enumerated by Jim.

Board member Lanigan seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0. Board member Connolly voted in favor of the motion with regret.

Staff member Gulnac read the following motion: The Planning Board moves to accept the Finding of Facts, recently just approved, and based on them moves to grant Chris Smith, d/b/a G-Force Farms, File #07-15-U, a waiver of preparing a new site plan and grants a conditional use permit to open and operate a medicinal and botanical manufacturing operation in building #4 at 27 Hancock Lane subject to the following conditions:

1. That all review fees are paid.
2. Comply with any and all state regulations.
3. The owner of the building will comply with any and all building codes.

Board member Tarbox made a motion to accept Jim's reading of the motion.

Board member Bergeron seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0.

3. **File #05-15-R: Gaye Letendre, c/o Paul Gadbois, P.E., PLS, P.O. Box 327, Saco, Maine.**

Chair McAdam called for a representative to present the project.

Paul Gadbois asked if the Board had any questions for either he or the applicant, Gaye Letendre.

Chair McAdam asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Staff member Gulnac said one of the outcomes of the site visit was some changes to the site plan. He said he hasn't had a chance to review any of the changes, and staff member Casserly has not either. He asked the Board that if they should approve the application, to condition the approval upon the review and approval of the plans by staff.

Staff member Casserly asked if the waivers should be voted on tonight. Staff member Gulnac replied if the Board was going to take action on the application, the Board would need to approve the waivers.

Staff member Casserly read the applicant's waiver requests:

- Chapter 272-2-33B(2) Curb cut limitations

- Chapter 272-2-33C(2) Curb cut with requirements (to accommodate WB-50 trucks)
- Chapter 272-2-40B(4) Number of parking spaces
- Chapter 272-1 Article 1; Chapter 272-1-7B(3.b.7) Major trees

Board member Tarbox wanted clarification on the number of parking spaces. Discussion followed.

Staff member Gulnac requested the Board make a motion on the waiver requests separately from the project approval request.

Board member Tarbox made a motion to approve the waiver requests as read.

Vice Chair Horr seconded the motion.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed 7-0.

Staff member Gulnac said he was comfortable with the Board approving the project conditioned upon the requested changes being made (changing the geometry along the roadway, changing the designation of the parking spaces, adding waivers on the plan, showing the dumpster fenced in on the plan, putting the dumpster on a concrete pad, adding paved aprons adjacent to existing road).

Board member Tarbox made a motion that the Planning Board approve this application with a strong emphasis that the changes that Mike and Jim are looking for must be shown on the plan before any final approval is granted.

Board member Lanigan seconded the motion.

Staff member Gulnac requested the Board add to the motion to include approval of the waivers that were just approved and approval of the Finding of Facts included in his report (below):

- The applicant has provided proof of ownership and has standing to present the application.
- The property is located in the Urban zone.
- The proposed activity has been designated NAICS Code #561990 and is an allowed use in the Urban zone.
- The application was reviewed by the Site Plan Review Committee and forwarded to the Planning Board for review of the waiver request to permit more than one driveway into the property.
- The Planning Board considered the application at their July 15, 2015 meeting and, after hearing the testimony of the applicant and the comments from staff and public, scheduled a site visit to consider the waiver requests for reduced parking and driveway entrances.
- The consensus of members present at the site visit was to approve the site plan with some minor adjustments to specific alignments and layout and to grant the waivers.
- They also felt that a conditional approval of the final plan subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer would be acceptable, especially considering that Mr. Casserly would be on vacation over the next week.
- It is noted that the neighbor from across the street was enthusiastically in support of the application during the site visit.

Board member Tarbox made a motion to accept Jim's proposed changes.

Board member Lanigan seconded the amended motion.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed 7-0.

## V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – June 17, 2015 and July 15, 2015

Neither set of minutes were ready for approval.

## VI. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

James Gulnac, Director of Planning & Community Development presented the following:

### 1. File #09-15-H: Lloyd Brushwein (Lloyd's Auto Sales)

Staff member Gulnac explained the proposal to the Board. The applicant is proposing to add a building off the back of his current building. He will also be closing off his septic and will connect to city sewer. He is expanding his existing business so there is no change in traffic.

Staff member Gulnac then explained the items submitted under the new application process for this type of request and said the motion would be subject to engineering, codes, and fire marshal requirements.

Chair McAdam asked if the Board was okay with the proposal.

Board member Peterson asked how big the addition was and what the addition would be used for; staff member Gulnac stated it was 50' x 55' or 2,750 square feet and the building would be used for auto repair.

Chair McAdam called for a motion.

Board member Tarbox made a motion that the Planning Board give to the Planning Director the authority to sign off on this minor site plan change.

Board member Lanigan seconded the motion.

A vote was taken, and the motion passed 7-0.

### 2. Comp Plan: Transportation

Jim asked each that Board member who has not already submitted copies of their review to turn them in to the Planning Department. He would like to schedule the public hearing and gave the timeline of the approval process for this comprehensive change for the transportation section only.

Board member Bergeron wanted clarification on how the proposed changes would be integrated into the current document. Jim explained the process and why the changes are being done.

Mr. Gulnac discussed item #2 so the Planning Board could make a recommendation on these three items together.

He explained that the IR zone was not included in the Urban zone change because the city did not want warehousing included in all areas the Urban zone was in but realized it was an important part in the mill area. The changes being proposed are using the NAICS codes instead of the current table of land uses

and use the list of permitted uses in the Stone contract zone as a basis for redefining uses for the mills to allow for vertical mixed use.

The Board also discussed the upcoming agenda for the August 19, 2015 meeting:

- Public hearing on the comp plan
- Public hearing on the IR zone update
- Public hearing for St. Ignatius redevelopment
- Public hearing on Cottonwood Meadow preliminary

The Board requested the IR zone public hearing be held in September to allow St. Ignatius redevelopment to be heard.

**3. Discussion on IR zone**

This item was discussed under item #2.

**4. Goodall Brook & Stormwater Management**

This item was not discussed and it was decided this item would not be included on the agenda for the next meeting.

**5. School Dept.: MCS School Portable Trailer** (This item was heard after item #1)  
Jim described the proposal. He said Margaret Chase Smith School's site plan has not been formally updated in some time. He knows he has made some minor approvals over the years, and with this request it was time to get an as-built site plan approved along with the current request. The changes done over time that are reflected in this site plan are:

- Changes to the back parking lot
- A shed that was previously approved
- Designated fire lane
- The left portable trailer is already on the lot

Staff member Gulnac then pointed out the new portable trailer being requested for approval and explained that it will be used as a classroom for the older kids in order to provide space for a pre-K program. He added that this is a temporary situation until the Sanford School Department completes the changes in the entire school system.

Board member Connolly asked how temporary the situation is; Mr. Gulnac stated he could not answer that question.

Board member Lanigan asked if this trailer placement will take place since the target pre-K enrollment number was not reached; Mr. Gulnac was not able to answer this question either. Discussion followed.

Board member Lanigan asked if the portable would be replacing the playground. It did not seem to be after looking at the plan.

Board member Connolly stated she was concerned with adding more trailers to school properties when it was said building a new high school would remove the need for using portables as classrooms. Discussion followed. Some of the concerns the Board had are no restrooms in the portables, how the classrooms would be used (i.e. as labs, regular classes) and the location of the portable on the site.

Discussion took place on the level of review the Board wanted for this project.

Board member Tarbox made a motion that the Planning Board grant staff review for this project.

Board member Peterson seconded the motion.

A vote was taken and the motion passed 7-0.

**VII. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 9:12 P.M.