

Planning Board Meeting
8/18/92

L. Bell, C. Wallace, B. Ricker, K. Leavitt, J. Matheson, CEO Smith, Selectmen D. Jack and V. Pendexter were present.

Motion by CW to approve minutes, seconded by LB, carried unanimously.

1. Gleichman & Co. - Cornish Commons and Chasalco

Q. K.L. - If this application not approved would company proceed with option on land?

A. Shapiro - No.

Q. K. L. - Likely to be withdrawn?

A. Shapiro - Yes.

KL told Board that he had received a letter from David Brown, Superintendent of SAD #55 stating that there was a great deal of concern about subdivision's impact on school district that was already overcrowded. Also received a partition on Aug. 5, 1992 signed by 101 residents of Cornish opposing subdivision.

K. L. spoke about 12 August letter from Aaron Shapiro stating Gleichman & Co. believes proposal conforms to Cornish Comprehensive Plan. Seventeen criteria set by state for major subdivision need to be clearly looked at. Board can approve as presented, approve w/changes, disapprove or table for additional info.

Shapiro stated property fully tax paying property.

KL - Pumpkinville originally believed to be but later determined to be tax exempt.

Shapiro - Pumpkinville is not-for-profit, Gleichman remains owner of their properties.

KL - But Gleichman could sell properties at a later date?

Shapiro - Could, but years down the road, 20 years probably, history shows they maintain ownership. On issue of schools, combined with Cornish Station, taxes would be up to \$40,000. Child in school costs \$1500 each.

JM - Not problem of cost as much as space.

Shapiro - Up to 5 new students spread out over 13 grades.

JM, KL - Unrealistic to assume apartments moved out of would not be refilled.

LB - According to # of people allowed in apartments, could be much more than 29 children.

Shapiro - Not realistic that this would happen.

BR - How is breakdown of units in Bucksport, Dixfield, etc. per bedroom?

Shapiro - More 3 bedroom units in some because that was felt needed.

JM - Doesn't every town have % of low income units for certain # of years? We felt Cornish Station met this requirement.

KL - Comp. Plan was for gradual accomplishment.

JM - All requirements don't need to be one right after the other. Low income housing doesn't have to be complexes.

KL - Housing needs provided thru apartments in village, mobile home parks, etc. We can address this over 10 yr. period that Plan covers. Population growing older. Growth should address that population. Assumed growth of 7.5 households/year. Actual growth in 1990 was 36 building permits, including Cornish Station. In 1991 it was 5 households (4 trailers, 1 house). 31 of these were low income housing, already 75% of Plan requirements. Maybe we should take a breather and build regular housing, don't want to become known as low-income town,

w/devaluation of property, lower taxes, etc.

Shapiro - Plan has no quotas, housing choice was concern of citizens, that what he looked for.

KL - Certainly gives guidelines as to % of new houses to be affordable.

JM - Pg. 41 of Plan - survey of what people in town wanted. All neighborhoods living together, no Cape Elizabeth here, all get along together, not against low income housing, we live it daily.
CEO Smith - Base of town is mostly affordable housing anyway, not rich, some apartments not very good.

JM - Can they be closed down? Condemned?

Smith - If vacant over 3 months may not be able to refill.

JM - Town is fully volunteer. All these facilities could overload town.

KL - Considerable discussion needed. Another applicant here should be handled and then come back to Gleichman.

2. Lauren & Paul Gurney - Barbara Conover inquiring what needed to allow what used to be Soaring Eagle to be retail discount food store. Now residential.

Paul and Lauren Gurney stated that this was not a convenience store, no liquor, cigs, beer or wine. To be alternative shopping, health and retail licensed. Discount food items, cereals, pasta, spices, cheeses, no frills store w/low overhead, lower prices. Has store presently at Windsong Campgrounds. Would keep same format essentially but feel hampered by distance to that store. Not a health food or bulk food store, some cans dented, boxes damaged but salvageable. Bought by the pallet, units not fit for shelves are destroyed. Have food and salvage license from state. Expect parking lot ample for expected parking needs. Have 2 small shopping carts now, people given boxes, encouraged to bring own shopping bags. Rt. 25 would be back of store, only to be used as emergency exit. Entrance would be from Rt. 5. Expect 20-40 people/day with average sale of \$20. Hours would be from 9 - 5 or 6, closed Sunday, probably one other day. Food not delivered, they pick up. Busiest day would be when food stamps come out. Worked at Jamie's Place. B. Conover stated that Jamie (Gleason) stated Lauren very well organized and hard worker. P. & L. G. stated facilities were upstairs, storage of non-perishables in basement. B. Conover would put in couple SS sink if approved.

CEO Smith discussed requirements for septic, etc.

KL - Public hearing needs to be held, then special town meeting.

CW moved PB initiate zoning change to business commercial, JM seconded. BR requested to abstain from voting as her office is presently there and could be conflict of interest.

KL - On what basis was Soaring Eagle allowed to operate?

B. Conover - Conditional use permit for store, came before PB in '86. Was told that area was going to be changed to commercial but that she should live there so she did as home industry. Motion carried 4-0.

KL - Public hearing would be set for 9/15 @ 7:15.

VP stated that no town meeting was scheduled at this time. Could be done w/in 10 days of PB action.

Back to Gleichman.

KL stated that to review Cornish Commons we would have to review state subdivision law.

13 criteria from state:

1. Will not result in undue water or air pollution
2. Will have sufficient water available
3. Will not cause unreasonable burden on the existing water supply
4. Will/Will not cause unreasonable soil erosion? Still has not been determined. There is a site location law under common scheme of development, may fall under site location law w/Cornish Station. Approved by York County for town consideration purposes only.

5. Will/Will not cause unreasonable traffic congestion? Some ? about DOT requirements, approval would be conditional on DOT approval.

6. Will provide adequate sewage waste disposal

7. Municipal solid waste? Cornish Commons contracts hauler for dumpster - town charged for tipping fees. 24 apartments may add considerable cost to town. No evidence to say it would cause unreasonable burden.

8. Will not have an adverse affect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area.

9. Will/will not conform to local regs, ord., dev. plan or comp. plan? KL stated that approval of 24 new units may change unfavorably the income level of town. CEO Smith asked what mix we wanted, is he not able to approve permits for affordable houses. CW stated Comp Plan is goal, not set in stone. Can't put too much emphasis on fact this would be more than Comp Plan calls for. KL asked at what point do we say we have too much? CEO Smith said town should be careful about saying we shouldn't have anymore. Discussion about approval or disapproval because its low income only. JM stated it would be better if phased in over 5 yr. period, not all at once. KL said goals could be met without concentration in one area of affordable housing. CW said we don't need project to meet Plan, but should not disapprove because of that. Could be open to lawsuit if board considers it only as low-income.

Facts: a. Town has Comp. Plan.

b. Anticipated rate of growth based on history of town and Comp Plan addresses affordable housing.

c. Application is for affordable housing so plan has some significance.

d. Pg. 72 of plan gives 6 specific programs that deal with accomplishing objectives of affordable housing.

e. Plan relies basically on private market to provide.

KL stated that we would have to work through facts more.

10. Will not adversely affect quality of shorelines, ponds, rivers.

11. Will not adversely affect ground water quality.

12. Has demonstrated adequate technical and financial capacity.

13. Will have all buildings one foot above base flood elevation.

KL stated not ready for vote. Maybe we should have Maine Municipal look it over as unbiased. BR moved and CW seconded that we take info and be in touch with Maine Municipal and/or town's attorney to determine how and if we can interpret Comp. Plan.
Motion carried 5-0.

Mtg. adjourned.

At 8/19/92 meeting of Planning Board KL moved that we initiate a change that no more zoning changes will be considered until unified plan has been acted upon. Seconded by all and approved unanimously. (BR, LB, CW, KL, JM present).

Notes by L. Bell