



Planning & Code Enforcement

2 York Street
Westbrook, Maine 04092
Phone: 207-854-0638
Fax: 866-559-0642

PLANNING & CODE ENFORCEMENT

WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD

Tuesday, May 5, 2025, 7:00 P.M.
Westbrook High School – Room 114
125 Stroudwater Street

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

This meeting will be offered as a hybrid meeting, accommodating both in-person and remote participation.

Where public comment is permitted, members of the public attending remotely will have the opportunity to provide remote oral testimony. If you wish to speak during a Public Hearing or Public Comment, use the “Raise Hand” function through Zoom (or dial *9 on your phone) when instructed by the Planning Board chair.

Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81700741385>

Dial-in (audio only): 1-646-558-8656

Webinar ID: 817 0074 1385

Roll Call Attendance

Robin Tannenbaum	Present
Nancy Litrocapes	Present
Jason Frazier	Absent
Karen Axelsen	Present
Kevin Price	Absent
Lucas Schrage	Absent
Oriana Farnham	Present
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Present
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Present

Staff: **Rebecca Spitella**; Director of Planning and Code Enforcement, **Irlando Lobo**; Assistant Planner

2. Approval of Minutes – April 7, 2026

Motion by John Turcotte
2nd by Oriana Farnham

Roll Call Vote

Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Nancy Litrocapes	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

WORKSHOP

**Motion by Nancy Litrocapes
2nd by Robin Tannenbaum**

Roll Call Vote

Robin Tannenbaum	Yes
Nancy Litrocapes	Yes
Karen Axelsen	Yes
Oriana Farnham	Yes
Vice Chair – John Turcotte	Yes
Chair – Larry McWilliams	Yes

3. **Irlando read into the record:** 24-001219 – Site Plan, Subdivision – Stroudwater Meadows – J.B. Brown & Sons and Westbrook Development Corporation: The applicant is requesting a +/- 322-unit residential complex to include a mix of housing types located along Stroudwater Street within the vicinity of the Westbrook Middle School. Tax Map: 009 Lot: 003A Zone Gateway Commercial District and Residential Growth Area 2 Use: Dwelling, Single-Family & Dwelling, Multiple-Family

Applicant Presentation

Tuck O’Brien introduced himself as incoming president of JB Brown and outlined his prior experience in municipal planning and redevelopment. He introduced the project team, including representatives from JB Brown, Westbrook Development, and Sebago Technics. The applicant presented the revised Stroudwater Meadows proposal, a phased 322-unit mixed-income residential development consisting of townhomes and three-story apartment buildings. The project is intended to provide a mix of market-rate and affordable housing options consistent with state housing goals and the City’s vision for neighborhood-compatible development. The applicant stated that the proposal had been revised in response to feedback from City staff and neighborhood residents, including reducing the overall scale of the project and reorienting development toward Stroudwater Street. The applicant emphasized the project’s focus on attainable housing, open space, trail connectivity, and neighborhood integration. The applicant also summarized feedback received during an April 29 neighborhood meeting, including concerns related to traffic and pedestrian safety, building scale, neighborhood character, open space, walkability, stormwater management, and overall livability. The applicant stated that the development team is continuing to work collaboratively with staff and neighbors to address these issues throughout the review process. The presentation concluded with the applicant inviting feedback from the Board before turning the presentation over for technical review details.

Kaleb Bourassa, project manager with Sebago Technics, presented the revised Stroudwater Meadows proposal on behalf of the applicant team. He explained that the revised concept significantly reduces the scale of the previously presented 2024 proposal, decreasing the total number of units from approximately 740 to 322 units concentrated primarily on the southern portion of the site near Stroudwater Street. The revised proposal includes townhouses and apartment buildings limited to three stories in height. Bourassa stated the revisions were made in response to prior comments from City staff, the Planning Board, and neighborhood residents regarding project scale, walkability, open space, buffering, and neighborhood compatibility. The applicant emphasized that the new layout focuses development closer to Stroudwater Street to improve pedestrian connectivity and access to nearby amenities, including the middle school. The proposal also increases opportunities for open space, trail connections, and community amenities, including a proposed central community building and gathering space. Bourassa reviewed the conceptual site layout, including roadway circulation, on-street parking opportunities, landscaping, and phased development areas. He noted that affordable housing units proposed by Westbrook Development Corporation are now concentrated closer to Stroudwater Street in response to prior Board feedback. The applicant stated that access design and traffic analysis remain under review with the Maine Department of

Transportation and City staff. A primary entrance is currently proposed from the eastern portion of the site, with additional traffic mitigation measures anticipated. The applicant also outlined the anticipated permitting and review process, including Maine DEP Site Law review, traffic permitting, subdivision review, and phased site plan approvals. The applicant anticipates approximately one year for state and local permitting and stated that additional public meetings and revised submissions will occur as the review process continues. The presentation concluded with the applicant requesting feedback from the Planning Board regarding project layout, walkability, traffic, pedestrian safety, open space, and neighborhood compatibility.

Staff Comment

Rebecca Spitella acknowledged and expressed appreciation for the applicant team's ongoing collaboration throughout the project review process, noting that the proposal has been workshopped with staff for more than two years. Staff stated that the applicant had been responsive to prior feedback from both staff and the Planning Board, including engaging a landscape architect, reducing the overall building footprint and unit count, and revising the layout to better align with surrounding residential density and neighborhood character. Staff explained that the revised proposal was being reintroduced to the Board in conceptual form due to the substantial changes made since the previous workshop in December 2024. Staff emphasized that the project remains at the sketch plan stage and that detailed engineering, traffic analysis, environmental review, and state permitting processes are still forthcoming. Staff advised that some questions raised during the meeting may not yet have definitive answers, as additional design and technical review work remains ongoing. Staff stated that the purpose of the workshop was to gather comments, questions, and feedback from the Board and the public to help inform the next stages of project development and review.

Public Comment

Simon Snyder (528 Stroudwater Street): commented that he appreciated the reduction in the project scale from the previously proposed unit count to 322 units. He expressed concern regarding the concentration of density on a plateau area of the site containing several multi-unit buildings totaling approximately 67 units, noting the potential impact on nearby abutting properties. Mr. Snyder also stated that traffic remains a concern and requested that the density and building concentration in that area receive further consideration as the project moves forward.

Fred Faller (Portland resident, Westbrook Street): expressed concerns regarding increased traffic impacts associated with the proposed development. He stated that traffic volumes on Stroudwater Street have grown significantly in recent years and noted the roadway's function as a major collector route used by emergency services and regional traffic traveling from Gorham and western areas. Mr. Faller expressed concern that the proposed 322-unit development would generate substantial additional vehicle traffic through the neighborhood. He requested that the Planning Board and applicant consider providing greater access to the arterial roadway system in order to reduce traffic impacts on Stroudwater Street and surrounding residential areas. He noted that future residents would likely travel frequently to nearby commercial destinations and suggested that alternative access could help mitigate neighborhood traffic congestion.

Jane Cote (19 Laffin Dr): expressed concerns regarding increased traffic on Stroudwater Street associated with the proposed development. She stated that existing traffic conditions near the middle school and high school already make turning onto Stroudwater Street difficult during peak morning hours and questioned how additional development traffic would be accommodated. Ms. Cote asked why access from the bypass or arterial roadway could not be considered for the project, referencing other residential developments with direct bypass access. She also suggested consideration of a pedestrian overpass connection similar to the Lawrence Street overpass to improve pedestrian access and safety for students traveling to nearby schools. Ms. Cote urged the Planning Board to avoid vehicle access onto Stroudwater Street as part of the project design.

Diane Westcott (18 Laffin Drive): reiterated concerns regarding traffic and roadway safety on Stroudwater Street. She referenced prior traffic studies conducted during the development of Landing Road and noted that traffic conditions have changed since that time. Ms. Westcott stated that the area near Laffin Drive includes limited visibility due to roadway curves and grade changes, creating safety concerns for vehicles entering and exiting nearby roads and driveways, including Landing Road and the cemetery entrance. She also expressed concern regarding vehicle speeds exceeding the posted 35 mph speed limit along the corridor.

Beth Paulsen-Olmstead (245 Methodist Road): raised concerns regarding the cumulative impact of residential development on Westbrook schools and municipal services, noting the absence of impact fees to offset future infrastructure needs. She questioned whether large-scale rental housing developments contribute to long-term community stability and expressed concerns regarding the balance between housing growth and preservation of community character. Ms. Paulsen-Olmstead also spoke on behalf of an abutting property owner and farmer, raising concerns about potential impacts to adjacent agricultural operations. Concerns included tenant trespassing, respect for property boundaries and livestock, potential impacts from stormwater runoff and chemicals, and compatibility between residential development and active farming uses. She requested consideration of permanent fencing and vegetative buffering along the shared property boundary to protect the adjacent farm operation. Additional concerns were raised regarding preservation of open space, agricultural land, traffic congestion and speeding on Stroudwater Street, and the broader impact of development intensity on the surrounding neighborhood and community character.

Elizabeth Crandall (540 Stroudwater Street): expressed concerns regarding the proximity and scale of the proposed development adjacent to her property. She stated that she and her family have lived at the property for approximately 20 years and are concerned about being surrounded by multi-unit buildings and parking areas. Ms. Crandall raised concerns regarding increased noise, vehicle headlights, traffic, and impacts to privacy associated with the proposed development. She questioned the compatibility of large townhouse-style buildings near existing homes and expressed concern regarding the concentration of development along Stroudwater Street. She also referenced past drainage issues experienced following construction of the nearby middle school and expressed concern about potential future stormwater impacts associated with the project. Ms. Crandall requested substantial screening and fencing along her property boundary if the project proceeds.

Woody Howard (28 Roundabout, Portland): stated that he is a member of the neighborhood association and acknowledged that the project revisions represent a significant improvement from earlier iterations, while still expressing concern regarding the overall site plan. Mr. Howard raised concerns about concentrating development access toward Stroudwater Street, citing existing traffic congestion, limited roadway capacity, and safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists. He stated that nearby roadways are already heavily used and referenced perceived limitations in traffic enforcement and infrastructure constraints. He also expressed concern regarding cumulative traffic impacts from existing and approved developments in the area and noted congestion near nearby signalized intersections during peak hours. Mr. Howard questioned whether reliance on Stroudwater Street as the primary access point is appropriate and urged the applicant and the Board to continue exploring potential access alternatives to the arterial roadway system in coordination with the Maine Department of Transportation. Mr. Howard concluded by stating that, in his view, additional review and negotiation with the state regarding access options is necessary to address safety and traffic capacity concerns associated with the proposed development.

Andrew Gattine (529 Stroudwater Street): stated he lives directly across from the proposed development and thanked the Planning Board and applicant for the opportunity to provide input, noting that engagement with the neighborhood and development team has been appreciated. Mr. Gattine referenced prior history of development discussions on the site and in the surrounding area and emphasized the importance of considering both zoning compliance and neighborhood character in evaluating the proposal. He noted that the site was previously subject to zoning restrictions that limited access to Stroudwater Street and directed traffic to the arterial roadway, and encouraged the Board to consider that prior policy context in current deliberations. He expressed agreement with other commenters regarding concerns about traffic on Stroudwater Street and suggested that direct access to the

arterial roadway should be further explored in coordination with the Maine Department of Transportation and City staff to reduce neighborhood traffic impacts. He stated that future residents will likely rely on regional roadways and nearby commercial areas and questioned whether routing all traffic through Stroudwater Street is appropriate given existing school traffic and roadway conditions. Mr. Gattine also encouraged the Board and applicant to consider long-term planning for the remainder of the parcel and future development potential, noting that broader considerations of overall density, circulation, and long-range site planning should inform current decisions.

David Kent (President of the Maine Farm Bureau): spoke on behalf of an abutting farm property owner. He noted that the property is a multi-generation farm with approximately 160 acres producing high-quality beef and emphasized the importance of preserving agricultural land and local food production. Mr. Kent stated that while the property owner has the right to develop the land, the adjacent farm operation also has protections under Maine's Right to Farm laws. He urged the applicant and the Board to consider how residential development and ongoing agricultural use can coexist. He raised concerns regarding potential conflicts between residential tenants and farm operations, including issues such as noise, odors, complaints related to normal agricultural activity, and the potential for vandalism or trespass. He also expressed safety concerns related to livestock, noting that damage to fencing or escaped cattle could create public safety risks. Mr. Kent recommended that the applicant consider measures to protect the farm boundary, including secure fencing and buffering, and encouraged proactive communication with future residents regarding agricultural conditions. He concluded by emphasizing the need for coordination to ensure compatibility between the proposed development and continued agricultural use of the adjacent property.

Deborah Rumery (533 Stroudwater Street): referenced prior written comments submitted to the Board and stated that she appreciated the opportunity for review. She raised additional concerns regarding emergency service access and project drainage impacts. Ms. Brumley stated that she understood that earlier concepts for the project included potential access from the arterial roadway and an emergency access connection near the upper portion of the site. She expressed concern that, without arterial access, emergency vehicles would need to travel through Main Street, William Clark Drive, and school areas to reach the site, potentially increasing response times and congestion, and she encouraged the Board to further consider arterial access options for public safety reasons. She also raised concerns regarding stormwater management and soil conditions, referencing prior studies indicating poorly drained soils in portions of the site and adjacent properties. Ms. Brumley expressed concern about the concentration of impervious surfaces, including parking areas, and potential impacts to nearby properties, including basement flooding and drainage onto abutting farmland. Ms. Brumley concluded by reiterating her primary concern regarding the need for arterial access and stated that further evaluation of drainage and emergency access impacts should be part of the review process.

Guy Cote (19 Laffin Drive): reiterated concerns regarding traffic and access, emphasizing support for consideration of direct access to the arterial roadway. He suggested that a roundabout configuration at the arterial intersection could help improve traffic flow and accommodate increased demand from the proposed development as well as nearby developments such as Rock Row. Mr. Cote also noted that the applicant has been working collaboratively with City staff over the past two years and stated that many of the project revisions appear to reflect guidance provided through the City review process. He further commented on concerns raised regarding the adjacent farm operation and fencing, stating that livestock have previously been observed off-property and suggesting that while stronger fencing may be beneficial, an "impenetrable" barrier may not be fully practical. He concluded that continued coordination between the development and adjacent agricultural operations would be important moving forward.

Mike Archibald (Portland resident, Stroudwater neighborhood): expressed concern that the project is proceeding without adequate resolution of arterial access and pedestrian connectivity. He stated that direct access to the arterial roadway should be provided and suggested that pedestrian safety could be improved through the construction of a footbridge at the arterial crossing. Mr. Archibald also referenced the broader development

context, including nearby Rock Row, and suggested that coordinated infrastructure improvements should be considered to support increased traffic and pedestrian movement in the area. He further asked whether planned sidewalk infrastructure would extend to the existing overpass to ensure continuous pedestrian and bicycle connectivity toward Portland, noting concern that sidewalk discontinuity could create unsafe or impractical conditions for pedestrians and cyclists.

Mark Randall (540 Stroudwater Street): expressed concerns regarding stormwater impacts and roadway safety related to the proposed development. He stated that following construction of the nearby middle school, he experienced significant basement flooding and ongoing water intrusion, requiring continuous pumping during certain periods, and raised concern that additional development could worsen drainage conditions in the area. Mr. Randall also described concerns regarding traffic safety on Stroudwater Street, including speeding, unsafe passing, and near-miss incidents near his property. He stated that vehicle speeds frequently exceed posted limits and that passing behavior creates safety risks for residents along the corridor. He further expressed concern that the proposed development would rely heavily on a single access point to the arterial roadway, which he characterized as insufficient for traffic demand and emergency access needs. Mr. Randall stated that increased traffic volume from the development could exacerbate existing safety concerns. He concluded by noting concerns regarding potential future development pressure on his property.

Rebecca Spitella (Staff Response): provided comments in response to public concerns. She stated that while some issues raised may not yet have definitive answers, staff and the applicant team will continue to evaluate them through the ongoing review process. Regarding arterial access, staff explained that the Westbrook Arterial is classified as a high-speed facility where at-grade pedestrian crossings are not permitted under MaineDOT standards. Staff noted that any pedestrian or bicycle connection across the arterial would require a grade-separated crossing, which was determined to be cost-prohibitive and, in staff's view, would likely not be practical or safe for intended use. Staff further stated that, in prior iterations of the project, fencing would have been required along the arterial frontage to discourage pedestrian access due to safety concerns. Staff emphasized that both the City and MaineDOT share concerns about introducing pedestrian crossings in this corridor given roadway speeds and intended function. Staff explained that traffic impacts are being evaluated through the MaineDOT Traffic Movement Permit process and City engineering review, which will assess broader roadway network impacts beyond the immediate site. This includes analysis of intersections near the middle school and along Stroudwater Street, with consideration of required mitigation measures. Staff noted that the proposal is permitted within the existing zoning district and does not require a zoning change, though it will be subject to site plan review standards and regulatory approvals related to traffic, stormwater, and infrastructure capacity. Staff also acknowledged concerns regarding compatibility with the adjacent farm operation and stated that continued coordination with abutters will be important as the design progresses. Staff noted that existing agricultural uses are legally protected and are not intended to be impacted by the proposed residential development. Staff concluded by noting that Westbrook includes a mix of residential densities and housing types and stated that while the proposal represents a change for this specific area, it is consistent with broader development patterns in the city and statewide housing policy goals. Staff invited continued feedback as the review process continues.

Kaleb Bourassa (Applicant Response): reiterated that key issues raised during the meeting, including traffic, pedestrian safety, and site access, are ongoing areas of refinement in the project design. He stated that the applicant team remains open to continued coordination with neighbors and stakeholders as the plan advances. Mr. Bourassa noted that the applicant exceeded standard neighborhood meeting notification requirements by expanding outreach beyond the required 500-foot abutter radius to approximately 1,000 feet, including additional neighborhoods and participants from surrounding areas. He also summarized stormwater and site constraints, noting the presence of poorly drained soils, wetlands, and natural drainage features across portions of the site. He explained that these conditions require on-site stormwater management and detention measures, including treatment at the source and phased stormwater infrastructure such as filtration basins and proprietary systems, to meet Maine DEP Chapter 500 and local standards. Mr. Bourassa stated that the northern portion of the parcel is not currently included in the proposed development plan but is not designated for conservation and could be

considered for future development. He concluded by noting that the project is designed to comply with applicable stormwater and regulatory requirements while continuing to evolve through ongoing review.

Board Comment

John Turcotte: noted that Stroudwater Street experiences heavy traffic patterns, including morning, afternoon, and mid-day school-related peaks, and stated that the project will require a comprehensive traffic study through the MaineDOT review process. He raised concerns regarding school transportation and pedestrian safety, noting potential bus routing impacts and the need for safe pedestrian crossings near the site, particularly in proximity to the middle school. He indicated that crosswalk design, signalization, and sidewalk connectivity will be important considerations in future review stages. John also commented on the site layout, noting that a significant portion of proposed development appears concentrated near existing residential properties, including abutting homes. He requested that the applicant further evaluate building placement, particularly the location of larger structures near adjacent residences, and provide enhanced buffering and screening measures for nearby neighbors. He observed that the conceptual plan appears to divide the site into distinct development areas and asked for clarification regarding internal connectivity and overall site cohesion. He also requested that neighborhood meeting documentation be included in future submission packets and asked for additional information regarding the project layout and phasing approach. Finally, he noted that landscaping and buffering will be important due to existing open field conditions and potential visibility of the development from surrounding properties, while also acknowledging that site topography may limit certain sightlines.

Karen Axelsen: asked whether the reduction in the project from over 700 units to approximately 322 units changes prior requirements related to a school impact study. She requested that a school impact study be considered or updated as part of the review process given the revised project scope.

Robin Tannenbaum: thanked the applicant team and members of the public for their comments and noted that the revised layout represented a significant improvement from earlier versions. She stated that traffic impacts remain a primary concern and requested continued analysis and follow-up from the applicant regarding roadway capacity and safety. Regarding site layout, she observed that the largest proposed building appears to be located adjacent to Stroudwater Street and near abutting residential properties. She referenced other development examples for comparison and expressed concern that placing larger-scale buildings closest to existing homes may not be the most context-sensitive approach. She requested that the applicant reconsider building massing and placement, particularly along Stroudwater Street, and evaluate whether smaller-scale or more residentially compatible building types could better transition to the surrounding neighborhood. Robin also stated that architectural design and building character will be important considerations and encouraged the applicant to incorporate more neighborhood-compatible design elements, such as pitched roof forms and contextual massing, referencing prior successful projects as examples. In response to discussion regarding school impacts, she referenced prior school impact studies and noted that while such studies often provide projections, their practical implications for school capacity and enrollment are less clear. She asked how school impact study findings are intended to be used in decision-making, particularly in light of varying enrollment trends and the limited ability to immediately expand school facilities.

Oriana Farnham: raised questions regarding pedestrian infrastructure, site amenities, housing mix, and unit distribution within the proposed development. She expressed support for the proposed looped circulation concept and suggested enhancing pedestrian connectivity through sidewalks or bike paths along Stroudwater Street to improve access to open space and encourage recreational use. She also recommended consideration of additional amenities such as a playground and community gardens to better serve residents and reduce pedestrian traffic to nearby schools during non-school hours. Oriana inquired about environmental constraints on the site, including wetlands, and asked whether such constraints are influencing the placement of buildings closer to Stroudwater Street and adjacent properties. She requested clarification on whether site layout decisions are driven by environmental limitations, financial considerations, or design intent, and whether additional building setbacks

could be feasible to increase buffering and preserve open space. She also asked whether the proposed housing includes ownership opportunities in addition to rental units. Regarding affordable housing, she expressed concern that concentrating all affordable units within a single portion of the site may result in unintended segregation and reduce opportunities for income integration. She encouraged a more integrated distribution of affordable units throughout the development and emphasized the importance of equal access to site amenities, including open space, recreational areas, and community facilities. Finally, she noted the need for increased affordable townhouse-style housing, particularly for families, and shared personal reflections on the importance of rental housing and pathways to homeownership. She emphasized the value of diverse housing types, including townhomes, to support households with children and varying household needs.

Rebecca Spitella: responded that the current placement of the affordable housing units reflects prior staff recommendations. She explained that in earlier conceptual plans, the affordable units were located toward the rear of the site, resulting in a longer walking distance to nearby schools and amenities. She stated that staff recommended relocating the affordable units closer to Stroudwater Street to improve walkability and accessibility, particularly for residents with school-age children. She noted that this change was made in response to staff feedback during earlier review stages. She added that prior sketch plans showing the previous configuration are available for comparison if helpful for the Board or public.

Tyler Nord (President of Westbrook Development Corporation): responded to questions regarding unit mix, site constraints, affordability, and design intent. He stated that the proposed development includes a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom units distributed across the residential buildings. He explained that building placement is influenced by several site constraints, including wetlands, a Portland Water District easement for a major pipeline, and existing topography, which together limit areas suitable for building footprints, parking, and roadway layout. He noted that these constraints contribute to the current clustered arrangement of development areas. Mr. Nord stated that the development team is exploring opportunities to integrate open space and recreational amenities, including coordination with Portland Trails, and potential on-site amenities such as playgrounds and publicly accessible open space. He indicated that amenity placement is being considered to improve internal connectivity and encourage pedestrian movement throughout the site. He also discussed the distribution of affordable housing units and noted that coordination with MaineHousing financing requirements and project timing influences building configuration and ownership structure, including the efficiency of organizing development under a unified condominium structure. Regarding housing needs, Mr. Nord stated that the project prioritizes larger-bedroom units in response to regional demand for family housing at affordable income levels. He cited increased housing insecurity among families within the local school system, noting a significant rise in households experiencing housing instability in recent years compared to pre-pandemic levels. He concluded by emphasizing that the project seeks to address a shortage of attainable family-sized housing while balancing site constraints, regulatory requirements, and financing considerations.

Larry McWilliams: commented on the proposed unit mix and site layout, noting uncertainty regarding the project's target demographic and how that relates to design decisions. He questioned whether the development is intended primarily for 55+ residents and stated that, if so, this may influence assumptions about pedestrian activity, parking needs, and use of outdoor spaces. Larry expressed concern regarding building placement and suggested reconsidering the arrangement of housing types. He stated that, in his view, larger buildings should be located toward the interior or rear of the site, with townhomes positioned closer to Stroudwater Street to better reflect neighborhood character and improve accessibility for families and children traveling to nearby schools. He also referenced prior site design iterations and expressed concern about tree removal and site impacts. He concluded by recommending that the applicant reconsider the layout and "flip" the arrangement of building types to better align with perceived neighborhood context and circulation patterns.

Nancy Litrocapis: stated that many of her comments had been previously addressed by others and focused her remarks on a few additional topics. She expressed support for locating larger buildings toward the rear of the site to better preserve the existing neighborhood and rural/farm character of the area. She stated that this arrangement

would help reduce the visual impact of larger structures on nearby residential properties. Nancy also suggested incorporating agricultural-themed community amenities, such as community garden plots or farming-related spaces, to strengthen connections between the development and the surrounding agricultural landscape. She encouraged consideration of homeownership opportunities in addition to rental housing, stating that ownership options may promote long-term community investment and stability. In addition, she raised traffic calming concerns and suggested that roundabouts could be considered as a potential tool to reduce vehicle speeds on Stroudwater Street and improve pedestrian safety. She noted that such infrastructure would require coordination with appropriate transportation authorities and could contribute to safer crossing conditions for pedestrians, particularly children.

Larry McWilliams: reiterated his preference for revising the site layout to better distribute development across the parcel. He suggested relocating larger buildings toward the interior or rear of the site and positioning lower-scale housing, such as townhomes, closer to Stroudwater Street. He also expressed support for incorporating homeownership opportunities, referencing public comments received on the topic. Larry stated that, given the size of the parcel and the proposed 322-unit total, the development should be more widely dispersed rather than concentrated into two primary clusters. He suggested that a more distributed layout could improve visual character along Stroudwater Street by setting buildings farther back and reducing their immediate prominence from the roadway. He further noted that additional evaluation of traffic studies and other technical analyses will be important before finalizing the design and stated that, at present, he is not supportive of the current site configuration and would prefer a redesigned layout.

Robin Tannenbaum: stated that there are differing perspectives on appropriate density distribution within the site. She acknowledged interest among some Board members and the public in locating lower-density development closer to Stroudwater Street, while also recognizing that clustering development can preserve open space and reflect economic efficiency in site design. She stated that she did not provide a specific directive regarding layout but noted that consideration of density placement within the site appears to be an important point of discussion for the Board moving forward.

Oriana Farnham: stated that while she respects comments expressing a preference for single-family homes in the neighborhood, she does not agree that single-family development is the appropriate approach to addressing Westbrook's housing needs. She emphasized that lower-density single-family development is less efficient in meeting housing demand and expressed support for the proposed density and variety of housing types included in the project. She stated that she does not support shifting the proposal toward single-family housing. Oriana concluded by stating that she is generally supportive of the project and expressed enthusiasm for the proposal as presented.

4. **Irlando read into the record:** 26-000123 – Site Plan, Subdivision, Conditional Use – Bridgton Rd - Wormell Farms, LLC: The applicant is proposing a 109-unit multi-family residential complex to be located between 197 and 299 Bridgton Road. Tax Map: 016 Lot 002 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2 Use: Dwelling, Multiple-Family

Applicant Presentation

Matthew Pelletier of Teradyne Consultants presented a proposed 109-unit apartment development on behalf of Wormell Farms LLC for property located between 197 and 299 Bridgton Road (Route 302), identified as Tax Map 16, Lot 2, within the Residential Growth 2 zoning district. Mr. Pelletier explained that the approximately 60-acre site contains significant environmental constraints, including wetlands, floodplain areas associated with Minot Brook, steep slopes, and utility easements, which limit development primarily to upland areas near Route 302 and portions of the central site. Wetlands were delineated and recertified in October 2025, and coordination has occurred with multiple state agencies, including Maine IF&W, Maine Natural Areas Program, and MHPC. A Phase I archaeological review has also been completed, with results pending. The proposal includes 11 two-and-a-

half-story multifamily buildings containing approximately 109 rental units, anticipated to consist primarily of one- and two-bedroom apartments. Approximately 8.24 acres of the site would be developed, including roughly four acres of impervious surface, while the remaining acreage would remain open space, including wetlands and natural areas. Access to the development is proposed via a single internal roadway connecting to Route 302 opposite an existing commercial driveway. Estimated traffic generation is approximately 53 AM peak-hour trips, 68 PM peak-hour trips, and 677 daily trips. The applicant stated that a traffic safety analysis will be conducted to evaluate turning movements, pedestrian safety, and potential improvements at the Route 302 access point, including consideration of pedestrian crossing enhancements such as a flashing beacon. Mr. Pelletier stated that the development will utilize public water, sewer, electric, and gas utilities, including a proposed sewer pump station. Stormwater management will be handled through on-site best management practices designed to meet Maine DEP Chapter 500 and City standards, with runoff collected, treated, and discharged to Minot Brook. No direct wetland impacts are proposed, though permitting related to protected natural resource setbacks will be required. The applicant also noted that the site design is influenced by an existing CMP easement and utility infrastructure, which limits building placement in portions of the property. Proposed amenities include sidewalks, pedestrian connections, landscaping, and potential trail connections coordinated with local recreation and trail networks. Mr. Pelletier stated that a neighborhood meeting was held the previous week, during which traffic, buffering, lighting, and future development concerns were discussed with nearby residents. He concluded by noting that the project remains in the conceptual design phase and that additional engineering, architectural, traffic, and permitting details will be provided in future submissions.

Staff Comment

Rebecca Spitella noted appreciation for the applicant team's collaboration with City staff in revising the project layout following concerns raised during an earlier Planning Board review. Staff stated the revised proposal addressed prior issues and reflected a productive review process. Staff provided background on the project, explaining the parcel was originally part of a larger farm property divided into three parcels. The first two parcels, accessed from Brook Street, have already been developed, including an 18-unit duplex development and the adjacent Brooks Edge Farm project consisting of 118 phased duplex units. This application represents the third phase of the overall Wormell Farm development. Staff stated that while the project does not meet the threshold requiring a traffic movement permit, traffic and pedestrian safety remain priorities. Staff requested a safety analysis and potential pedestrian improvements related to crossings along Route 302 to support resident access to recreation and trail networks. Staff also highlighted coordination with the Presumpscot Regional Land Trust (PRLT) regarding trail connectivity along the river frontage, with the goal of extending the public trail network for both residents and the broader community.

Public Comment

Sandra Good (197 Bridgton Road): expressed concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed development to her property, stating that one of the proposed buildings would be located approximately 15 feet from her property line. She requested consideration of relocating the building farther from neighboring homes. Ms. Good also raised concerns about potential light pollution, noting existing impacts from nearby commercial signage and requesting lighting that minimizes impacts on adjacent residences. Additional concerns included the cumulative impact of ongoing developments on local schools and property taxes. Ms. Good stated that residents are concerned about increasing tax burdens associated with growth and questioned whether school impacts are being evaluated comprehensively across multiple projects. Ms. Good also referenced existing drainage concerns affecting her property and indicated that her husband would provide additional comments related to flooding and stormwater management.

Crystal MacRitchie (7 Brooks Edge Farm Road): expressed support for development that provides homeownership opportunities and affordable housing options for residents. She stated a preference for owner-occupied housing over additional rental units, citing concerns about long-term property maintenance and

community investment. Ms. McRitchie also raised concerns regarding increased traffic along Route 302, particularly during peak tourist seasons, noting the corridor already experiences significant congestion. Additional concerns included stormwater and drainage impacts. Ms. McRitchie stated that some residents within the Brooks Edge Farm development have experienced water intrusion issues in lower-lying areas and requested careful consideration of drainage impacts as part of the proposed project. Ms. McRitchie emphasized the importance of maintaining the character and quality of the Westbrook community while accommodating future growth.

Joanna Levesque (299 Bridgton Road): stated that many project details remain unresolved, making it difficult for residents' questions to be fully addressed at this stage. She noted that concerns raised during prior subdivision reviews, including buffering and neighborhood impacts, remain relevant to the current proposal. Ms. Levesque expressed concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed parking area and apartment buildings to her property and to an existing gas line running through the site. Additional concerns included sewer and water system capacity, particularly the potential impact on older water infrastructure along Route 302, as well as the location and management of stormwater runoff facilities. Ms. Levesque also raised concerns about cumulative traffic impacts along Route 302, noting ongoing condominium development adjacent to the property and uncertainty regarding future traffic volumes from multiple nearby projects. She emphasized the importance of ensuring roadway safety for residents and travelers as development continues in the area.

Paul Goode (197 Bridgton Road): raised concerns regarding existing stormwater runoff conditions along Route 302 and the potential for additional impacts from the proposed development. Mr. Goode stated that state roadway improvements completed in 2006, including regrading, paving, and curbing along Route 302, altered drainage patterns and redirected runoff onto his property. He explained that runoff currently flows downhill to the point where curbing ends near the Wormall Farm property and then crosses onto adjacent properties, resulting in pooling and flooding concerns. Mr. Goode stated that, with permission from the previous property owner, he installed a drainage ditch along the property line to help redirect water and reduce flooding impacts. He expressed concern that future development, including additional curbing and driveway construction, could further alter drainage patterns and worsen flooding conditions on his property. Mr. Goode requested that stormwater management and roadway runoff impacts be carefully evaluated prior to development, including consideration of potential drainage infrastructure improvements such as additional storm drains or catch basins. Mr. Goode also requested protection of an existing stand of lilac bushes located along the shared property boundary and suggested additional buffering plantings along the property line.

Lawrence Levesque (299 Bridgton Road): expressed concerns regarding existing stormwater runoff from Route 302, stating that roadway curbing directs water downhill toward adjacent residential properties during heavy rain events. Mr. Levesque stated that runoff has affected both his property and neighboring properties and noted prior discussions with Public Works and the Maine Department of Transportation regarding the issue. Mr. Levesque also raised concerns about the proximity of the proposed parking and driveway areas to neighboring property lines. He requested clarification regarding setback distances and expressed concern about potential snow storage and plowing impacts affecting his property during winter maintenance operations.

Steve Bradstreet (60 Grandview Drive): raised questions regarding transportation, pedestrian access, emergency access, and utility easements related to the proposed development. Mr. Bradstreet inquired whether the project, in combination with a nearby condominium development under construction, would trigger a requirement for a traffic movement permit, noting concerns about cumulative traffic impacts in the area. He also raised concerns regarding pedestrian connectivity along Route 302, noting existing and proposed crosswalk locations and questioning whether a continuous sidewalk connection could be provided to reduce multiple crossings of Route 302. He stated that additional mid-block crossings may be undesirable given existing nearby pedestrian infrastructure. Mr. Bradstreet further inquired about emergency access, referencing past discussions about potential roadway connections through the larger development area. He suggested that future connectivity between developments and potential fire access routes be considered, noting existing informal vehicle access through portions of the site. Finally, Mr. Bradstreet requested clarification regarding the Central Maine Power

(CMP) utility corridor crossing the property, including whether it is an easement or fee-owned land, and whether relocation of the corridor would be feasible if it conflicts with development plans.

Rebecca Spitella: responded to public comments regarding lighting, traffic, utilities, drainage, and site access. Staff stated that lighting will be required to comply with ordinance standards for full cutoff, downward-directed fixtures. A photometric plan will be provided with the final application to demonstrate that lighting will not trespass onto adjacent properties, though some visible light may still be present. Regarding broader community impacts, staff noted that the proposed development consists primarily of one- to two-bedroom units and explained that residential development impacts should be evaluated over longer-term trends rather than isolated projects. Staff further noted that development activity in Westbrook has remained relatively consistent over a multi-year period despite fluctuations in annual review volume. Staff confirmed that a traffic safety analysis has been requested due to the corridor's existing traffic conditions, and that recommendations from the traffic engineer will be incorporated into the review. Staff also stated that buffering and site edge protections will be addressed as the application progresses. Staff requested that additional written comments from residents be submitted to the Planning Office for inclusion in the record and distribution to the Board. Regarding sewer and water capacity, staff explained that the City's wastewater engineer reviews proposed connections and issues an "ability-to-serve" determination to ensure adequate system and pipe capacity without adverse impacts to surrounding properties. Staff noted that concerns regarding existing Route 302 runoff conditions will require further investigation and coordination with relevant staff due to the need for additional historical review. Staff clarified that a Traffic Movement Permit (TMP) is evaluated based on the individual project's traffic generation and thresholds established by the Maine Department of Transportation. Neighboring developments are not included in the initial threshold determination, though they may be considered if a TMP is triggered. Staff further stated that a direct fire access connection between the subject site and adjacent development is not feasible due to site constraints, including a ravine, and because the parcels are separate projects with separate ownership, limiting the ability to require interconnection.

Matthew Pelletier: responded to comments regarding lighting, buffering, traffic, utility easements, site layout, and open space. Mr. Pelletier stated that lighting design will comply with required photometric standards and will include full cutoff, downward-directed fixtures to minimize off-site light impacts. He noted that buffering will be further evaluated as the design advances and will also be required through the City review process. Regarding traffic, Mr. Pelletier explained that a Traffic Movement Permit is generally required when a development exceeds 100 peak-hour trips. He stated the proposed project generates approximately 68 peak-hour trips and therefore does not meet the threshold. He further clarified that the project is not part of a common scheme of development with nearby projects due to the lack of physical connection, and therefore traffic impacts are evaluated separately. Mr. Pelletier stated that the Central Maine Power (CMP) corridor is an existing utility pole easement and is not proposed for relocation. He explained that parking, drive aisles, and open space are designed around the easement, and that structures are not permitted within it. He noted the easement also provides usable open space and limits development in the rear portion of the site. He further stated that the site design is constrained by environmental features including wetlands, floodplain areas, Minnow Brook, and wetlands of special significance. He noted that the current plan is conceptual and will continue to be refined through engineering review, including potential adjustments to parking layout, stormwater design, and snow storage considerations. Mr. Pelletier also stated that a significant portion of the parcel will remain as open space and confirmed that the project is designed to comply with the maximum allowable density for the site.

Board Comment

Oriana Farnham: expressed concern regarding light impacts on neighboring properties, including both site lighting and vehicle headlights affecting nearby homes and windows. She noted understanding of the site constraints, including easements and environmental features. Oriana also commented on the proposed parking supply, stating that the project appears to provide approximately 2.15 spaces per unit, compared to the typical requirement of 1.5 spaces for one- to two-bedroom units. She acknowledged the need for some additional parking

for visitor use but suggested that the applicant consider reducing or reconfiguring parking areas to lessen proximity impacts and minimize light intrusion onto adjacent properties.

John Turcotte: John expressed general support for the overall site layout, noting that the design responds to the parcel's irregular shape and environmental constraints, including wetlands. He stated that the layout avoids a uniform "row house" configuration and provides internal pedestrian connectivity, which he viewed positively. He also noted that approximately half of the development would be screened from Route 302. John echoed concerns regarding parking orientation toward abutting properties and emphasized the importance of buffering to reduce headlight glare impacts on neighboring properties, including adjacent residences and condominium developments. He raised a question regarding the apparent lack of side setback in the area where the driveway curves near an abutting property line and requested clarification from staff regarding compliance with setback requirements. John also commented on traffic conditions along Route 302, noting the roadway's existing congestion. He stated that trip generation estimates and traffic study results should be reviewed by engineering professionals to determine whether a Traffic Movement Permit is triggered and to evaluate potential impacts.

Nancy Litrocapes: expressed support for incorporating lighting design into the site's landscape plan, noting that the current submission does not yet include a detailed landscape design. She requested that future submissions demonstrate how landscaping will be used to soften parking areas and reduce the visual impact of the development. She supported the use of lower-level lighting where feasible, stating it could maintain safety while reducing off-site light impacts compared to pole-mounted fixtures. Nancy also noted the complexity of the site due to multiple environmental and cultural constraints, including vernal pools, bat habitat considerations, and archaeological resources. She commended the applicant for addressing these constraints in the proposal. She suggested consideration of habitat mitigation measures, including potential tree replacement and installation of bat houses, and expressed support for ongoing acoustic studies related to bat habitat. Regarding archaeological resources, she inquired whether findings from required studies could influence or modify the final site layout. Nancy also commented on the presence of wetlands along the river corridor and supported exploring opportunities for trail connections in coordination with organizations such as the Presumpscot Regional Land Trust to enhance public access where appropriate.

Matt Pelletier: responded to comments regarding landscaping, habitat considerations, and archaeological review. Mr. Pelletier stated that the majority of the development area is currently open field, with limited existing tree cover, primarily concentrated in clusters toward the rear of the site. He noted that tree preservation and environmental coordination will be considered during permitting processes, including coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He further stated that prior investigations identified a historic dump site in the rear portion of the property, and that archaeological testing has been focused closer to the river corridor where resources are more likely to be found. He explained that additional review may be required depending on the findings of ongoing studies. Mr. Pelletier stated that while further archaeological review could influence the project, significant changes to the current building layout are not anticipated based on available information, though final outcomes remain uncertain pending agency review.

Larry McWilliams: suggested relocating Building 1 farther back on the site, closer to the alignment of Building 4, in order to redistribute parking areas on both sides of the structure and improve buffering along the shared property line. He stated that this adjustment could reduce direct visual impacts, including views into neighboring properties and potential second-story overlook concerns, even with proposed screening measures. Mr. McWilliams also expressed concerns regarding pedestrian infrastructure, specifically the placement of a proposed sidewalk and crosswalk near adjacent residential properties. He questioned whether additional crossings of Route 302 would be permitted given existing nearby crosswalks and potential Maine Department of Transportation standards regarding spacing and safety. He further commented on the potential costs and feasibility of relocating existing crosswalk infrastructure, citing discussions suggesting significant expense associated with such changes, and questioned how pedestrian access planning would be coordinated with existing crossings.

Rebecca Spitella: responded to comments regarding pedestrian crossings and sidewalk connectivity. She stated she was not familiar with the cost or specifics of relocating existing crosswalk infrastructure and noted that such decisions may depend on site-specific conditions at individual intersections. Staff reiterated that mid-block pedestrian crossings are generally not preferred due to safety considerations. However, she explained that a pedestrian connection is being considered to allow residents of the proposed development to access the existing sidewalk network, and that this concept will be evaluated further through the requested traffic safety analysis. She stated that prior discussions have focused primarily on conditions at the immediate intersection rather than relocating or coordinating with other existing crosswalk locations. Staff indicated that comments regarding crosswalk spacing and coordination would be taken back for further review with the project team and relevant agencies.

Matt Pelletier: responded to comments regarding potential relocation and reorientation of Building 1. He stated that the applicant will review the building layout in light of prior feedback, including parking configuration and buffering considerations. Mr. Pelletier explained that the current placement of Building 1 is influenced by existing utility constraints, including a force main easement and an oil pipeline easement located in the vicinity. He stated that structures cannot be located directly over these utilities, which has informed the proposed building orientation. He noted that while these constraints limit flexibility, the applicant will re-evaluate the layout to explore opportunities to reduce lighting impacts and improve buffering for adjacent properties while remaining consistent with utility restrictions.

5. **Irlando read into the record:** 26-000275 – Site Plan, Subdivision, Conditional Use – 547 Saco St – MTR Development, LLC: The applicant is proposing to subdivide 547 Saco Street into two lots and construct an 800-foot private driveway providing access for the development of six 12-unit multifamily buildings, totaling 72 units. The existing single-family residence to remain on a separate lot. Tax Map: 004 Lot: 013 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2 Use: Dwelling, Multiple-Family

Applicant Presentation

Dustin Roma (DM Roma Consulting Engineers) presented the proposed multifamily residential development on behalf of MTR Development. The property was previously discussed at the sketch plan level under prior ownership. The new owner has acquired the property and is advancing a revised proposal. The existing farmhouse will be subdivided into a separate lot with its own driveway access from Saco Street. The development application will focus on the remaining parcel, which contains one existing barn to remain for storage purposes; a smaller outbuilding will be removed. The conceptual plan proposes approximately 72 dwelling units in multiple 12-unit buildings, subject to refinement following completion of wetland delineations and a boundary survey. Buildings are set back from Saco Street and arranged around a central parking area to minimize visual impacts and concentrate activity away from neighboring properties. Parking, driveways, and other active uses are located centrally, with buildings serving as a buffer along the perimeter. Preliminary environmental and site analysis is ongoing, including updated wetland delineations, stormwater management planning, utility coordination, and density calculations. The project is located in the RGA-2 zoning district. The applicant has been coordinating with City staff and utility providers regarding water, sewer, and infrastructure improvements. A sidewalk connection along Saco Street to the existing sidewalk network near Elm/Maple Streets is proposed, along with internal sidewalks throughout the development. The project is expected to be constructed in phases, with approximately two buildings constructed annually. A detailed phasing plan, including access, parking, and turnaround provisions, will be submitted with the formal application. State stormwater permitting through DEP will be required. Open space opportunities, including potential walking trails within preserved areas of the property, are being evaluated in consultation with the Recreation and Conservation Committee. A neighborhood meeting was held with four abutting property owners. Concerns raised included traffic, project scale, drainage, building proximity to property lines, and impacts to a neighboring backyard and pool area. The applicant stated that building orientation, landscaping, buffering, and screening measures will be further evaluated to address these

concerns. The development is proposed primarily within existing field areas, limiting tree clearing and preserving much of the wooded portions of the property. An existing farm pond is also planned to remain. Preliminary building elevations depict three-story, pitched-roof structures with dormers. Units are proposed as two-bedroom apartments on the first and second floors and one-bedroom apartments on the third floor. Buildings are intended to be slab-on-grade construction to minimize site disturbance. Detailed landscaping, buffering, and architectural plans will be provided during formal site plan review.

Staff Comment

Rebecca Spitella highlighted the project's proposed off-site sidewalk improvements along Saco Street. Staff noted that a previous subdivision at Elm Maple was required to construct a sidewalk connection from Elm Maple to the Public Services facility, extending the existing sidewalk network. The current proposal would continue that sidewalk extension further along Saco Street, improving pedestrian connectivity and expanding the City's sidewalk system for residents and the public. Staff expressed appreciation for the applicant's willingness to incorporate these public infrastructure improvements and noted that staff comments have been provided to the applicant. Staff will continue to work with the applicant as the project design and engineering advance.

Public Comment

Cathy Gorham (521 Saco Street): an abutting property owner, expressed concerns about the scale and character of the proposed multifamily development compared to the existing single-family neighborhood. She noted concerns regarding the proximity and height of the two buildings nearest her property, citing potential privacy impacts, and requested consideration of additional setbacks, reduced building height, or other buffering measures. Ms. Gorham also questioned how planned Saco Street paving improvements may affect the project's timeline and infrastructure work and urged the Board to carefully consider neighborhood concerns as the application moves forward.

Amanda Davies (120 Victoria Drive): Ms. Davies, an abutting property owner and member of the neighboring HOA, expressed support for additional housing but urged careful review of the proposal. She noted that wetland delineations, boundary surveys, and density calculations remain incomplete and stated that the project's final unit count may be affected by those findings. Ms. Davies raised concerns regarding stormwater management, citing existing drainage and flooding issues within the Victoria Drive neighborhood. She emphasized the importance of detailed stormwater and downstream impact analyses before the project advances. Additional concerns included the project's density, building height, parking layout, lack of identified visitor parking and common amenities, construction phasing, traffic impacts, and the potential duration of construction activity. She also referenced concerns raised during a previous development proposal for the property, including traffic and wetland issues. Ms. Davies encouraged the Board to ensure the project is designed to support long-term neighborhood compatibility and community needs before moving forward.

Karen Dowling Ingraham (520 Saco Street): Ms. Ingraham expressed concerns regarding traffic safety on Saco Street, noting the existing 45 mph speed limit, school bus traffic, and pedestrian crossings. She suggested that speed limits and traffic conditions be reviewed if additional residential development is approved. Ms. Ingraham also supported requests for increased setbacks and buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties, citing the importance of neighborhood compatibility and respect for existing residents. She encouraged consideration of reducing the height of the proposed buildings and noted that the current architectural design is an improvement over a previous proposal for the site.

Rebecca Spitella: noted that Saco Street is scheduled for paving this year, requiring any right-of-way work, including sidewalk construction and utility connections, to occur before the paving moratorium takes effect. Staff indicated that a potential approval condition could require state stormwater permitting prior to on-site development while allowing public infrastructure improvements, such as sidewalks and utility work, to proceed. Staff emphasized

that the proposal is currently at the sketch plan stage, where only a conceptual layout and proof of site control are required. Detailed materials, including surveys, wetland delineations, stormwater analyses, and engineering plans, will be submitted as part of the final application review. Staff also explained that phased construction is common for large developments and noted that the applicant will be required to submit a detailed phasing plan and provide a performance guarantee to ensure completion of site improvements and stabilization if construction is not completed.

Dustin Roma: stated that discussions with staff regarding the Saco Street paving schedule began early in the process and emphasized that no effort is being made to expedite approvals. The applicant indicated a willingness to coordinate construction timing and, if necessary, complete certain right-of-way improvements in advance to accommodate the paving schedule. In response to neighborhood concerns, the applicant stated that revisions to the site layout will be explored, particularly regarding the proximity of buildings to adjacent properties. The applicant noted that any changes must be balanced with the goal of limiting impacts to wooded areas, wetlands, and additional roadway construction, while remaining sensitive to neighboring residences.

Board Comment

John Turcotte: expressed support for the proposed curvilinear site layout, noting that it responds to site constraints, including wetlands. He observed that increasing setbacks from neighboring properties may require extending development further into the site, resulting in additional roadway and impervious surface area. He emphasized the importance of buffering and screening for adjacent properties, particularly those to the north and along Victoria Drive. He also noted that the development would have limited visibility from Saco Street due to the site's layout and the presence of existing structures, with the primary concerns being impacts on abutting properties.

Oriana Farnham: thanked members of the public for their participation and acknowledged concerns raised regarding housing type and neighborhood change. She noted that the Planning Board's role is to apply the zoning ordinance as written, and that the proposed multifamily development is permitted within the allowable density and height standards of the district. She further stated that broader policy questions regarding housing types and distribution are matters for the City Council. Oriana also emphasized the need for additional housing options in Westbrook to support long-term housing availability for current and future residents.

Nancy Litrocapes: commented on the site design and questioned the curvilinear layout, noting that a straighter configuration could potentially increase the distance between proposed buildings and the adjacent property with a swimming pool. The applicant responded that the current layout was initially designed to accommodate site constraints and that, following the neighborhood meeting, there appears to be opportunity to shift the buildings farther from the property line.

Robin Tannenbaum: thanked the applicant for willingness to revisit layout considerations and commented favorably on the architectural design. She stated the proposed buildings are more context-sensitive than typical mid-size multifamily designs, noting the pitched roof and dormers as helping to reduce massing impacts. She also remarked that, despite the building scale, the design appears comparatively softer and more compatible with a single-family residential context.

Larry McWilliams: expressed support for the preliminary architectural design, noting appreciation for the proposed non-box-like building form. He acknowledged the applicant's prior experience with the Board and stated that the project is still in an early review stage. He indicated that additional work is needed on the layout, particularly regarding buffering and setbacks, and requested that revised options be presented for further consideration at a future meeting.

Karen Axelson: provided remarks recalling long-term familiarity with the property and surrounding area, noting past agricultural use and prior development proposals. She referenced concerns previously raised by neighbors

regarding tree clearing under earlier plans and questioned whether tree removal had already occurred on the site. She noted that earlier proposals were more spread out, while the current design appears more consolidated. Karen stated that she is pleased the existing farmhouse will remain and reflected on its historical presence in the neighborhood.

Dustin Roma: stated that no recent tree clearing or stumps were observed on the property, indicating that any prior tree removal likely occurred in the past. He noted that previous development proposals for the site included more extensive roadway, parking, and building areas extending further into the property, including structures located closer to the road.

Note: Due to the 10:00 pm adjournment deadline, the Planning Board was unable to complete all items on the agenda. Item #7 (26-000274 – Site Plan/Subdivision: Rock Row South Campus Building SG & SR – Dirigo Center Developers, LLC), which proposes the construction of a mixed-use building within the Rock Row South Campus on Lot 8, will be carried forward to the next available Planning Board meeting scheduled for May 19th. The proposal includes a seven-story structure with ground-floor retail, a parking garage, and residential units above (Tax Map 042B, Lot 14I; Zone: Contract Zone 12 – Rock Row; permitted use: mixed-use retail). A quorum was confirmed, and the Board agreed to reconvene on May 19th to continue the agenda.

Meeting Adjourned.

MINUTES MAY NOT BE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. SECTIONS MAY BE PARAPHRASED FOR CLARITY.

A COMPLETE RECORDING MAY BE OBTAINED BY CONTACTING PLANNING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT at 207-854-0638 and ilobo@westbrook.me.us