

**TOWN OF YORK PLANNING BOARD
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2002, 7:00 P.M.
YORK SENIOR CENTER**

Board Vice-Chairman Dave Marshall presided over the meeting in Glenn Farrell's absence. Al Bibb, Barrie Munro, Dave Marshall, and alternates Dan Remick and Mike Estes were in attendance. At Mr. Marshall's request, Mr. Remick voted in Mr. Farrell's place, and Mr. Estes voted in Torbert Macdonald's place. Selectmen Michelle Moody and Tom Manzi also attended. Town Planner Steve Burns and Land Use Technician Brett Horr represented Staff. Patience Horton was the Recording Secretary. The meeting was neither televised nor tape-recorded. *Secretary's note: Points of discussion are highlighted in these minutes. Changes to the Proposed Amendments were made by Steve Burns and are obtainable on documentation available through the Planning Office.*

The meeting was called to order at 7:15.

Minutes. Review and approve minutes of the September 26, 2002 meeting.

Barrie Munro and Dan Remick moved and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 26, 2002 Planning Board meeting. All voted in favor of the motion, 5-0.

Business

Site Plan & Subdivision Regulations. Discuss possible amendments to these regulations.

Steve Burns handed out a 10-page draft document containing strikeouts, titled Proposed Amendments—Site Plan & Subdivision Regulations. He explained that if the new zoning ordinances pass on November 5, certain ordinances will “disappear.” They will have to appear in the site plans, instead. He had arrived upon this list of proposed amendments by going through site plan regulations and other standards, as well as Route One standards, and figured out design issues. If certain regulations are not covered in the site plan regulations, there will be holes, he said. When these amendments pass, he will recommend a Public Hearing for further discussion.

Dave Marshall and Al Bibb shifted to the fence vs. vegetative buffer argument, apparently influenced by the pending extension of a fence installation company into York. Barrie Munro said a buffer is intended for the improved appearance of Route One. Mike Estes suggested creating an amendment that all Route One properties have to have a landscape plan. Steve Burns said that all businesses have to have a landscape design, anyway. Brett Horr said that in the case of Enterprise Rent-a-Car, the product, which is cars, requires showing off autos in a parking lot. With the building looking like a log cabin, some of it needs to be shielded. Barrie Munro said "site plans" apply to both site plans and subdivisions. Steve Burns said that the new zoning has no Route One ordinance. Every building in town that is 5,000 sq. ft. or greater comes under site plan regulations. Barrie Munro added that site plan regs are easier to use and more compatible than ordinances. Dave Marshall brought up internally lit signs, which Michelle Moody said were limited to dark backgrounds with white lettering, as was appearing at *Finest Kind*.

1. §8.2, Driveway Design Standards. Brett Horr had brought maps of the State Urban Compact Area and pointed out the 2 arterials, Route One and I-95. There was discussion of driveway standards for safety, site distances, and driveway radii. Getting rid of limited arterial standards and maximizing them for all roads was discussed. Barrie Munro asked about traffic patterns and how they have changed. Low, medium and high volume numbers are most likely an antiquated denominator. Mike Estes brought up wider driveways for getting onto certain roads, adding that the quickest and easiest way off the road is also the safest. Steve Burns said that the paved apron and the curved radii make it easiest to get off the road. He wanted to make apartments and condo complexes subject to the same standards and that §8.2 will apply to site plans only.

2. §8.1.8, Loading Areas, was briefly discussed. Steve Burns explained that trucks could not park in the street while loading out onto a site. Let them use parking spaces of the site.

3. §8.1.9, Snow Removal, describes the requirement that a plan for snow removal from all sites be provided.

4. §7.17 and §7.25, as well as several sub-sections concerning Landscaping, Buffering, and Building Design. Steve Burns said that these regulations would require that when mandatory landscape plantings die, they must be replaced. Site plan standards will be tied to the building design (nice buildings are nice to look at, and buildings that are not as nice to look at will need to be screened). He described the Visual Preferences Survey, a technique for establishing standards and making evaluations using pictures. He noted that there is no generic standard for making things look good. There should be a reference point from which the Planning Board can use its judgment. The group also discussed parking standards and the buffering requirements around park-

ing lots with four or more cars. The desirability of hardwood trees, their trimming for utility lines, and the specific screening of the lower parts of cars were also brought up. Michelle Moody described how some trees that have been required as part of a plan have grown too tall and sometimes have to be replaced with similar trees within about 10 or 15 years after initial planting. Steve Burns suggested that the replacement of overgrown plantings should be allowable through regulation language that allows people to replace them without going before the Planning Board. Dan Remick suggested that a stonewall could be allowed where buffering hedge planting is requested, to which others agreed.

5. And 6. §7.23 ADA Compliance and §7.12, Solid Waste Disposal. The language surrounding these issues was quickly agreed to, as written.

7. §7.24, Outdoor Storage and Display. Steve Burns paraphrased the regulation. There are deadlines for elimination of certain outdoor displays. On the Beach, there is no room for outdoor display. Outdoor display has to be under a roof overhang and limited to 300 sq. ft. Outdoor display is subject to Code Enforcement. Mike Estes recommended taking antique stores off the list of stores with allowable outdoor displays. Steve Burns answered that antique stores are grandfathered to that right. There was discussion of specific outdoor displays that look good and one about the inverse. Steve Burns asked the board if the displays should be limited to under a roof. Dave Marshall reiterated that antique stores should not have outdoor displays, "unless it is adequately buffered, if visible from the road."

§7.24.5, Special Events. Steve Burns said that currently there is no policy about permits for special events that is reviewed by the Selectmen. Tent sales are allowed in parking lots, provided the parking is someplace else. Dan Remick thought an exception to the 15-day permits should be made for the Lions Club, during Christmas trees sale season. They need a longer selling season, plus they are non-profit and should get a larger opportunity to make their money. Mike Estes thought the rule should be kept the way it is. Dave Marshall agreed that Christmas tree sales should go for 30 days.

8. §7.22, Hazardous Materials. Propane cylinders weighing two hundred pounds, and their placement next to buildings were subject to State rules, said Mike Estes. Chemical and fuel storage are also regulated by existing codes. Fuel storage tanks can be bigger than 275 gallons. Tanks need to be buffered, said Dave Marshall.

9. §7.19 Impact Mitigation. The group agreed on this language.

10. §9.5.8 Number of Lots on a Street. The maximum cul-de-sac length was discussed, as was the inconvenience for delivery trucks on such streets. Brett Horr referred to *Residential Streets*, from the American Society of Civil Engi-

neers, which recommends keeping traffic volumes low for obvious reasons. Barrie Munro argued that the book is academic and the numbers, subjective, and then described his own experience in his cul-de-sac neighborhood. Al Bibb said that more should be examined than the length of the road and the number of the houses. Those figures should be tied to safety, instead of getting away with a fixed number. Dave Marshall said that a number is needed as a guideline. Steve Burns suggested putting “15 houses” in the document, and then leave the burden of proof for the applicant, if they want more than that. Brett Horr suggested the language, “Unless the applicant can prove otherwise, 15 lots . . .”

#12. §6.3.14 Historic Resources. The board found this language complete.

#13 §4.3 Delegation of Minor Site Plans to CEOs. The proposed regulation suggests those projects a) of 1,000 sq. ft., or less, or b) those with modifications of 1,000 sq. ft or less can be exempt from required site plan review by the Planning Board. Dave Marshall suggested leaving Part b) out, because it might “backfire.” Steve Burns agreed and said he would leave that suggestion out.

14. Comp Plan Policy 6.2.6. Wildlife Habitat. Mike Estes described 180 acres at Whippoorwill loaded with wildlife, which gives good reason for having cluster subdivision, he said. Steve Burns said he wanted to analyze the land with the GIS, so that the specific information would be available and will pop up automatically when reviewed. That ended the input discussion for the Proposed Amendments to Site Plan & Subdivision Regulations.

Road Classifications. Follow-up discussion about road classifications.

Brett went through a quick definition of an urban area and handed out information about how roads are classified.

Other Business/Adjourn

Vice-Chairman Marshall adjourned the meeting. It was 9:45.