

Town of Scarborough

Planning Board

December 13, 2010

AGENDA

1. Call to Order (7:00 P. M.)
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes (November 22, 2010)
4. Higgins Beach Market, Shawn and Kristin Walker request site plan amendment review for changes to the existing market at 82 Spurwink Road*
5. McDonald's Restaurant requests Planned Development review for rebuilding the existing structure at 221 U. S. Route One*
6. Sparkle Clean Car Wash (formerly Sudzie Auto Wash), Cliff Antonell requests site plan amendment review for changes to existing site at 285 U. S. Route One*
7. Administrative Amendment Report
8. Town Planner's Report
9. Correspondence
10. Planning Board Comments
11. Adjournment

*Public comments will be allowed on these items.

NO NEW ITEMS SHALL BE TAKEN UP AFTER 10:30 P. M.

Town of Scarborough

Planning Board

December 13, 2010

MINUTES

Members Present

Mr. Chamberlain
Mr. Fellows
Mr. Mazer
Mr. Paul
Mr. Thomas

Staff

Mr. Chace, Assistant Town Planner
Ms. Logan, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order

Mr. Paul called the meeting to order at 7:00 P. M.

2. Roll Call

The Recording Secretary called the roll; all members were present.

3. Approval of Minutes (November 22, 2010)

Mr. Paul moved to approve the minutes of November 22, 2010; Mr. Mazer seconded.

Voted 5-0

4. Higgins Beach Market, Shawn and Kristin Walker request site plan amendment review for changes to the existing market at 82 Spurwink Road*

Mr. Chace explained that the Zoning Board had approved the takeout window and the storage unit in the rear, as well as relocation of items at the rear of the building. He stated that the Zoning Board required a substantive vegetative buffer at the takeout window.

Attorney Richard Olson, who represented the Walkers, stated that there were planters in the front and at the side of the building. He stated that Northeast Civil Solutions suggested that the plantings were substantive though they were in planters. He stated that the site was all impervious surface with sewer lines beneath and it would be difficult to dig into the ground to plant a buffer. Mr. Olson stated that any permanent plantings would not survive because this was a seasonal business and there would be no one there year round to take care of them and they would be close to the road. He stated that plant roots would not get oxygen because of the concrete and the barrels would be a better solution. He stated that they would put the requested signage on the plans if the Board wished.

Mr. Chamberlain confirmed that the request for selling Christmas trees had been withdrawn. To a question from Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Olson replied that the buffer was at the request of the neighbors who had issues about noise and the buffer was intended to block some of the noise. Mr. Chamberlain stated that he did not think the window would be visible from that resident and he was fine with the barrels. Mr. Fellows stated that he was satisfied given the seasonal nature of the use and the planters seemed a reasonable solution. Mr. Thomas and Mr. Mazer agreed.

Mr. Paul stated that his concern was pedestrian safety and he did not feel that two planters would provide safety at the takeout window. He stated that he had no problems with the planters but would like to see something that looked more like a wall of planters that were parallel to the last parking space to create a walkway between the planters and the building to protect people from vehicle traffic. Mr. Walker stated that he could put a barrel at the corner and two additional barrels at the left and rope off the area. Mr. Paul noted that the parking spaces were not marked though the curbing was an improvement. He stated that he would like to see enough planters so that no one could nose his car into the window area of the building. Mr. Olson stated that they would put a note on the plan regarding the signage and the barrels.

Mr. Paul moved to approve the amended site plan with the following conditions:

1. That a revised site plan be submitted to the Planning staff for review and approval prior to the implementation of any of the proposed site improvements. The revised plan shall include the following:
 - a. an enhanced landscape buffer or planters associated with the takeout window to protect pedestrian traffic;
 - b. revised plan notes to address Planning staff's written comments pertaining to the signage for the takeout window.
2. Prior to release of the building permit, the applicant shall submit electronic copies of the approved plans for the Town's record.
3. The applicant shall meet with the Fire Department to discuss the monitoring of the fire suppression system and the dedication of fire lanes.

Mr. Thomas seconded.

Voted 5-0

5. McDonald's Restaurant requests Planned Development review for rebuilding the existing structure at 221 U. S. Route One*

Mr. Chace explained that a Planned Development review was required for drive-through restaurants in the TVC Zone; he stated that a site inventory phase and a master plan phase were required as well as the site plan review phase. He stated that the first two phases could be combined and there should be a vote on the master plan. He stated that this was an opportunity for the Board to note some things that would be needed for site plan review.

Mr. John Kucich, of Bohler Engineering, explained that the existing building was 30 years old and needed to be upgraded. He stated that they wanted to tear down the building and rebuild. He stated that the building was 3,900 square feet with 59 parking spaces and three access points. He showed the existing conditions and noted that not too much would change but there would be access improvements and more green space. He stated that the building would be in the same location but a little closer to the front of the site. Mr. Kucich stated that they would eliminate 12 parking spaces for a total of 47 spaces. He stated that they would have two ordering stations which would reduce the queuing and there would be a recirculation lane so vehicles did not have to go out into Route One from the rear or turn back into the site for people to eat in their cars.

Mr. Kucich stated that the architecture had been improved with a more modern version of brick and architectural features in the front; he also displayed a New England style building with clapboards and bricks which had been designed for the Gallery Boulevard site and they were willing to build that style if necessary.

Mr. Paul noted the following requested waivers from the site inventory process: 1. The standard boundary survey; 2. The existing restrictions and easements; 3. Vegetation on the property; 4. Location of utilities. Mr. Paul stated that all of those requirements could be presented at site plan review.

Mr. Paul questioned whether some of the requirements were necessary at all: 1. A ground water study; 2. An assessment of historical buildings. Mr. Paul stated that this was an existing site and he did not think these studies were necessary. The Board agreed.

Mr. Kucich stated that for pedestrian connectivity they proposed a sidewalk from the street sidewalk to the front of the restaurant. He stated that the access doors would serve the parking and the frontage. He stated that there were no sidewalks behind the site but they could put in a sidewalk through the landscape islands. Mr. Mazer asked about pedestrian conflict with the circulation lane; Mr. Kucich replied that they would create the sidewalk at the point of the best sight lines and erect signage. To a question from Mr. Mazer, Mr. Chace replied that there were currently two nonconforming driveways and the site plan ordinance sought to reduce curbcuts to one per lot. Mr. Chace stated that there was a driveway separation issue. He stated that this was a different use than what was usually looked at when addressing curbcuts and the Board should question whether the driveways were safe as is or should be minimized. Mr. Chace stated that it would help to know the five year crash data at the three accesses and the traffic counts for McDonald's peak hour.

Mr. Kucich stated that they felt the one way flow of traffic was best; he stated that the two Route One driveways were preferred; he stated that one of them could be enlarged to have two way traffic but that would force all the cars to go around because of conflicts and for loading and emergency vehicles to move around the site. Mr. Mazer suggested cutting off the one way in curbcut and using the plaza driveway and using the Route One out access for exiting. Mr. Kucich stated that that would be a detriment to the delivery trucks and impulse customers needed an entrance on the main street. Mr. Paul stated that he did not understand why tractor trailer trucks unloaded close to the drive-through windows. Mr. Kucich stated that trucks did not block the windows because they delivered at off-hours and the drive-through could operate efficiently. Mr. Mazer suggested another entrance on Plaza Drive which could be seen from Route One.

Mr. Thomas stated that he liked the front and the rear walkways and noted that they should be of stamped material rather than painted on. Mr. Chace stated that there was a Plaza pedestrian plan and the applicant should determine whether they could be incorporated into that plan. Mr. Thomas stated that he understood the necessity of the Route One entrance but the rear entrance could be highlighted; he stated that he understood the traffic patterns which worked now. He stated that he liked the New England version of the building which blended in with the Route One corridor and gave a two-story feeling. He stated that lighting would be important.

Mr. Fellows stated that he liked the idea of an analysis of the traffic circulation to be done by Bill Bray; he noted that there was an upcoming Oak Hill Pedestrian Plan. Mr. Fellows stated that he preferred the proposed architectural design with further enhancements. He stated that he would like to see different options to include eliminating one of the Route One curb cuts. Mr. Chamberlain stated that when driving into the site from the Plaza he noticed that the markings on the pavement made it look like a one-way out access because it was so narrow. He stated that one would have to do a complete loop around the building to use the takeout windows which seemed inefficient; he stated that midway down the site would be an excellent place for the access for the takeout lane rather than to go around the building. He noted that there could be one two-way access on Route One. Mr. Kucich stated that they were trying to create green space and an access in the middle of the site would make it difficult for some parking spaces and for large vehicles to maneuver. He stated that the drawback to an entrance in the middle of Plaza Drive was the space for queuing. To a question from Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Kucich replied that trash would be in the

same area and would be walled in on three sides. Mr. Chamberlain suggested more plantings along Plaza Drive; he stated that he liked the New England style rather than the modern style. To a question from Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Kucich replied that the new restaurant would open between 90 and 100 days from razing the existing building.

Mr. Paul noted the waivers as listed by Mr. Chace: Section VII. E.F.2.c, the Preliminary Infrastructure Plan; Section VII.E.F.2.e, the Environmental Assessment; Section E.F.2.f, the Development and Design Standards with the remaining to be submitted prior to final approval.

To a question from Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Chace replied that the abutters had been notified and the project had been discussed with the Fire Department, Public Works and the Sanitary District, all of which had no concerns. Mr. Paul noted that the master plan was a little skewed because of the existing development on the site; he stated that the issues would be more for site plan review. Mr. Paul stated that the applicant should coordinate with the master plan for the Plaza to connect into their walkways. He stated that accident rates should be considered for determining the curbcuts; he stated that he would like one curbcut along Route One to get closer to the Ordinance regulations and it would make sense to have access on Plaza Drive. He noted that people often used the in or out accesses to go the wrong way but more signage might help. Mr. Paul stated that he liked the circulation in the front but the parking spaces close to the curbcuts might be a problem. He stated that lighting should be staged for the off-hours. He stated that he preferred the architecture that was proposed for the Gallery Boulevard store but it needed to be adjusted to meet the TVC design standards

Mr. Paul moved to approve the Master Plan including waiving the Site Inventory Analysis as requested. Mr. Paul stated the condition that the Site Plan Phase shall be enhanced to comply with the pedestrian-oriented design standards as required for Planned Developments within the TVC Zone. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion.

Voted 5-0 to approve the Master Plan

6. Sparkle Clean Car Wash (formerly Sudzie Auto Wash). Cliff Antonell requests site plan amendment review for changes to existing site at 285 U. S. Route One*

Mr. Chace stated that the applicants wanted to amend the campus directional signage and to add self-service vacuum cleaners which are considered outside accessory display and could be approved as a service by the Board. He stated that there were five criteria for outside display and the units could not be operated in required parking spaces.

Ms. Nancy St. Clair, of Sebago Technics, stated that in 2009 there were amendments to the menu board; she stated that there were two menu boards on the south side of the access and a third one was added on the left side to improve the ability to view the offerings and determine which line should be used for their service. She explained that with the change in the economy more people wanted an express wash which was approved in 2009 and the two lanes were segregated and more signage was added on the left side. Ms. St. Clair explained that the applicant would like to eliminate three signs and replace them with one sign in the middle to direct customers to their lanes.

Ms. St. Clair stated that they proposed three vacuum stations on the west side of the building which would allow five customers to use them separately from the wash with one vacuum for use after the wash area. She stated that these vacuums would add a service to help sustain the business. Ms. St. Clair stated that the estimate of parking needs dropped by three and the business would still have one more parking space than required so the loss of spaces for the vacuum stations would not impact the parking.

Mr. Paul stated that he agreed with most of the assessment on parking but there were no standards for carwashes and experience showed him that this site sometimes had no parking spaces available. He suggested that the applicant show the staff where three or four spaces could be created if necessary. Ms. St. Clair stated that she would work with the staff.

To a question from Mr. Paul, Ms. St. Clair replied that there was a brochure for the vacuum in the Board's packages. Mr. Antonell stated that the vacuums were blue and yellow stainless steel with vinyl roofs and the sign would be blue. Ms. St. Clair stated that the vacuum systems were 40 inches wide and 10 to 12 feet long and the canopies were seven feet high which was lower than the building height. To a question from Mr. Paul, Ms. St. Clair replied that the vacuums could not be placed near Sawyer Road because they would not meet the required setback. Mr. Paul confirmed that the existing temporary vacuum cleaners would be eliminated. To a question from Mr. Paul, Ms. St. Clair replied that the utilities for the vacuums would be an underground power service.

To a question from Mr. Mazer, Ms. St. Clair replied that the leases for the other businesses were for five years. Mr. Mazer noted that the whole complex could change in five years. Mr. Paul stated that if there were changes the Board would have to review the plans. Mr. Mazer stated that he had no issues with the signage changes.

Mr. Fellows stated that he supported Mr. Paul's request for future parking to be shown to the staff and had no issues with the sign change. He asked whether there was a need for additional signage for the vacuum stalls; Ms. St. Clair replied that they felt there was no need for additional signage. Mr. Thomas stated that he was in favor of reducing signage and saw the need for vacuums.

To a question from Mr. Chamberlain, Ms. St. Clair replied that they had considered putting the vacuum units before the wash bays but there was not enough space to meet the setback. To a question from Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Antonell replied that they would not turn off the vacuums at night but the use would be during daytime hours; he stated that no one used them after 9:00 P. M. and there would be lighting under the canopies. To a question from Mr. Chamberlain, Ms. St. Clair replied that they anticipated the light pole interference and positioned the vacuums behind it and the shrubs and tree would be relocated.

Mr. Paul moved to approve the site plan amendment with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant provide a revised site plan demonstrating that the provisions of Section XI.(C) of the Zoning Ordinance were met. The revised plan shall demonstrate where six parking spaces can be accommodated onsite should the parking demand require they be developed. The revised plan is to be reviewed and approved by the Planning staff prior to the implementation of any of the site improvements.
2. Prior to release of the building permit, the applicant shall submit electronic copies of the approved plans for the Town records.
3. The applicant shall provide color renderings and dimensions of the vacuum stations for staff approval.

Mr. Mazer seconded.

Voted 5-0

7. Administrative Amendment Report

There was no report.

8. Town Planner's Report

Mr. Chace noted that it was time to elect new officers for the year 2011. Mr. Paul asked that Mr. Thomas present a slate for Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary at the next meeting.

Mr. Chace noted that the Town would be initiating an Oak Hill Pedestrian Study and the Town had adopted the establishment of a committee and would like to have a member from the Planning Board. He stated that the committee would probably meet four or five times over six or seven months and an outside consultant would be hired.

Mr. Chace noted that the staff had presented the Running Hill Transportation Study to the Town Council.

9. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

10. Planning Board Comments

Mr. Mazer stated that he would volunteer for the Oak Hill Study. To a question from Mr. Mazer, Mr. Chace replied that the Town Council had voted not to adopt the zone change for 20 Elmwood Avenue and had referred it to the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Committee for review.

Mr. Thomas stated that he was at the Running Hill meeting and was amazed at the turnout for that and the Higgins Beach parking issue; he stated that it was good to know that so many people cared. He stated that the Town Council did an excellent job.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 P. M.