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

PLANNING & CODE ENFORCEMENT

**WESTBROOK PLANNING BOARD**

**Tuesday, June 2, 2026, 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** | **Present** |
| **Karen Axelsen** | **Present** |
| **Kevin Price** | **Present** |
| **Lucas Schrage** | **Present** |
| **Oriana Farnham** | **Absent** |
| **Vice Chair – John Turcotte** | **Present** |
| **Chair – Larry McWilliams** | **Present** |

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

## REGULAR BUSINESS

2. **Irlando read into the record:** 25-000624 - Site Plan, Subdivision, Village Review - 688-712 Main St – Ryan Le: The applicant is proposing two new multifamily structures to comprise of a total of 20 new residential units located at 688 and 712 Main Street with a new commercial use adjacent to Main Street. Tax Map: 033 Lots: 033 & 038 Zone: City Center District; Village Review Overlay Zone – Downtown District Use: Dwelling, Multiple-Family

Robin Tannenbaum recused.

## Applicant Presentation

**Andy Morrill (BH2M)** presented the application on behalf of the applicant, with Ryan Lee also in attendance. Mr. Morrill provided an update on revisions made since the Board's review in November, focusing on three previously identified issues: sewer service, retaining wall construction and maintenance, and stormwater

management. Regarding sewer service, the proposed system was redesigned so that all sewer infrastructure is routed through the 712 Main Street parcel. Wastewater from the two proposed buildings will flow by gravity to a grinder pump and be conveyed via a force main to Main Street. The grinder pump is designed to meet City pretreatment standards. To accommodate the revised sewer layout, the underground stormwater retention tank system was narrowed and extended further into the parking area. Mr. Morrill reported that concerns related to the retaining wall had been addressed by reducing the depth of Building A along William Clark Drive, creating a 12.5-foot setback between the building and the retaining wall. This revision provides adequate space for both construction and long-term maintenance of the wall. Updated plans reflecting this change have been submitted, and the design has been reviewed with City staff and the Fire Chief. Stormwater management was also revised. The underground retention system was redesigned to manage the required storm events, and a bypass system was added to address runoff from the upstream watershed. Runoff will be collected and directed to Main Street. An analysis of the existing storm drain system confirmed that it can accommodate the additional flow. Mr. Morrill stated that City staff have reviewed and are satisfied with the proposed solution. Additional plan revisions include the addition of a fire apparatus turnaround behind Building B, relocation of the dumpster enclosure, removal of several parking spaces adjacent to Building A to improve fire access, and installation of guardrails along the western edge of the parking lot and the top of the retaining wall. Mr. Morrill stated that the major outstanding issues have been addressed and indicated that the applicant is agreeable to the conditions of approval outlined in the staff memorandum. He concluded his presentation and offered to answer questions from the Board.

## Staff Comment

**Rebecca Spitella:** acknowledged the applicant's efforts and coordination with staff to address outstanding issues. The final three issues related to sewer service, stormwater management, and retaining wall maintenance have been resolved. Staff noted that several final plan revisions and coordination meetings will still be required during post-approval, pre-construction, and construction phases. These requirements have been incorporated into the draft's conditions of approval. Staff indicated that a draft motion is provided on page four of the memo for the Board's consideration.

## Public Comment

**Gary Manoogian (702 Main Street):** expressed opposition to the project. He stated that he had previously discussed the proposal with the applicant and raised concerns about impacts to the privacy of his backyard, increased traffic and noise, and the overall density of the development. He noted that he had not seen the revised plans and had declined a previous request for an easement related to retaining wall construction. Mr. Manoogian indicated that he had suggested alternative site layouts that would better preserve privacy but does not support the project as proposed.

**Andy Morrill:** explained that the original proposal contemplated a potential easement from the abutting property owner to allow access for future construction and maintenance of the retaining wall. When the easement was not granted, the project was redesigned by reducing the depth of the building and increasing the setback from the retaining wall. This modification provides sufficient space to construct and maintain the retaining wall entirely from the project site, eliminating the need for an easement on the abutting property.

**Rebecca Spitella:** clarified that an easement had been considered in an earlier version of the project because the building was located approximately five feet from the property line, raising concerns about long-term access for retaining wall maintenance. Following revisions to reduce the building footprint, the setback was increased to approximately 12.5 feet, providing adequate space for construction and future maintenance from within the project site and eliminating the need for an easement or access to the abutting property. Rebecca also addressed concerns regarding parking and density, noting that the project is located within the City Center District, where the ordinance requires one parking space per residential unit and recognizes the availability of alternative parking options in the

area. Rebecca stated that the proposed parking meets applicable ordinance requirements for the district and that multifamily residential development is a permitted use in the City Center District.

## Board Comment

**John Turcotte:** asked for more information regarding the buffering for the project and the abutters

**Andy Morrill:** answered that they're proposing to install a retaining wall with wooden guardrail on the back. He also mentioned that there is a 40-foot difference with the grading from the backyards of the abutting properties and the proposed building.

**Rebecca Spitella**: asked what the height of the proposed wall would be.

**Andy Morrill:** answered at its highest point the wall would be 9ft, acting as a sort of fence.

**Larry McWilliams:** commended the applicant for the work done with the project thus far and clarified the buffering in relation to the abutters.

**Motion by John Turcotte**
**2nd by Kevin Price**

**Roll Call Vote**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Robin Tannenbaum** | **Yes** |
| **Nancy Litrocapes** | **Yes** |
| **Jason Frazier** | **Yes** |
| **Karen Axelsen** | **Yes** |
| **Kevin Price** | **Yes** |
| **Lucas Schrage** | **Yes** |
| **Vice Chair – John Turcotte** | **Yes** |
| **Chair – Larry McWilliams** | **Yes** |

## NEW BUSINESS

3. **Irlando read into the record:** 25-001113 - Site Plan – 405 Bridgton Rd – Vaughn Dibiase: The applicant is proposing a new 7,500sf multitenant commercial structure and associated site improvements located at 405 Bridgton Road. Tax Map: 057 Lot: 022A Zone: Highway Services

## Applicant Presentation

**Dustin Roma (DM Roma Consulting Engineers):** presented the proposed development at 405 Bridgton Road on behalf of property owner and developer Vaughn Tobias. He noted that the project had undergone several design revisions since the preliminary workshop to address wastewater disposal, traffic generation, stormwater management, and site constraints. Mr. Roma stated that drainage design was developed with consideration of concerns raised by neighboring property owners regarding historical drainage issues. A traffic engineer was retained to evaluate access and circulation alternatives. Based on the traffic analysis and staff review, the proposal was revised to include a single access point that allows vehicles to enter from either direction but restricts exiting traffic to right turns only, reducing potential conflicts on Bridgton Road. The proposal includes a 7,500-square-foot multi-tenant commercial building with five bays. The site design provides circulation around the building for tenant access and deliveries, while prohibiting outdoor storage. Additional project features include a screened

dumpster enclosure, tenant signage subject to future permitting, designated snow storage areas, landscaping, and building-mounted downcast lighting. Mr. Roma explained that stormwater runoff will be collected and treated through an underground detention system before being released at existing discharge locations. The dumpster location was relocated in response to abutter concerns, and the existing curb cut serving the former building will be removed and revegetated. The applicant indicated agreement with the remaining staff comments and conditions, including compliance with sprinkler system requirements during the building permit review process.

**Rebecca Spitella:** noted that the parcel presents unique challenges related to its size, physical constraints, location, and traffic conditions. Rebecca stated that higher-traffic-generating uses previously considered for the site could not be safely accommodated and expressed support for the proposed service business use as an appropriate fit for the property. Rebecca clarified that the approval is limited to service business uses. Future tenants will be required to submit a letter of intent to the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with the approved use. Rebecca noted that any proposed use outside of the approved category may require additional Planning Board review to evaluate impacts such as parking and traffic. Staff also requested confirmation from the applicant that a sprinkler system would be incorporated into the project as required.

**Dustin Roma:** stated that the project is currently being designed as a 7,500-square-foot building, which he understands would require a sprinkler system. He noted that the applicant is still evaluating project costs and did not want questions regarding sprinkler requirements to delay the approval process. Mr. Roma asked whether additional Planning Board review would be required if, during the building permit review process, it is determined that a sprinkler system is not required under applicable codes.

**Rebecca Spitella:** explained that sprinkler system requirements are relevant not only to building code review but also to the approved use of the building, as they may affect the types of tenants and uses permitted on the site. She stated that the final plan set submitted for signature should clearly indicate whether a sprinkler system will be provided. Rebecca further noted that if project details change in the future, the applicant may return to the Planning Board to request an amendment if necessary.

## Public Comment

**Pauline and Paul Barrows (409 Bridgton Road):** Inquired about the entrance/exit to the site for access, hours of operations, the amount of bays and the number of parking spaces. They thanked the applicant for moving the location of the proposed dumpster. They also raised concerns about the proposed location for the sign and the drainage on their property, the site for the project and the abutting properties.

**Dustin Roma:** stated that the proposed sign location has been positioned to avoid impacts on driveway visibility and sight lines. Final sign placement and design will be subject to City review and compliance with applicable standards. Regarding drainage concerns, the applicant explained that the stormwater design includes a culvert at the location where runoff currently enters the property, allowing existing drainage patterns to continue while directing water through the site's stormwater management system. The system is designed to detain, infiltrate, and gradually release runoff without impeding existing drainage flows or causing upstream ponding. The applicant also addressed concerns about hours of operation, noting that the building is intended for service-business tenants with limited customer traffic. The applicant stated that the anticipated uses are not expected to generate activity during unusual hours or create nuisance conditions for neighboring properties. Future tenant uses will be regulated through zoning requirements and City review to ensure consistency with the approved use of the site.

**Rebecca Spitella:** concurred with the applicant's explanation regarding the proposed sign, noting that all signs are subject to permit review to ensure they do not interfere with driveway sight distance requirements. Staff explained that the unique right-of-way configuration along the property provides additional setback from the roadway, and the proposed sign location is situated behind the frontage of the abutter's driveway. Regarding drainage concerns, staff noted that the abutting property has the right to continue discharging existing stormwater flows and the

responsibility to accept historic drainage patterns. Staff stated that the approved drainage plan includes a pipe system designed to collect runoff from the existing low point, convey it through the site's stormwater management system, and discharge it downstream while maintaining existing drainage patterns. Staff offered to provide the drainage plans to the abutter for further review and clarification.

## Board Comment

**Larry McWilliams:** asked if fire rated walls would be installed between the bays if a sprinkler system is not installed.

**Rebecca Spitella:** responded that the standard for commercial is based on square footage and use. She stated the applicant would have the greatest level of flexibility to have the building sprinkled.

**John Turcote:** asked City Staff if the applicant would have to return in front of the board if the sprinkler system is not required.

**Rebecca Spitella:** explained that the square footage of the proposed building would require a sprinkler system installed. The applicant was considering reducing the square footage of the building, however that would also further restrict the use for the building.

**Karen Axelsen:** asked for examples of what types of businesses would operate at this site

**Dustin Roma:** answered that it is difficult to pre-determine what type of business may occupy the space but that they have focused on creating clear uses and boundaries so that it would be marketed to the appropriate tenants.

**Motion by Kevin Price**
**2nd by Nancy Litrocapes**

4. **Irlando read into the record:** 26-000404 – Subdivision Amendment – Rock Row South Campus – Dirigo Center Developers, LLC: The applicant is requesting a third amendment to the Rock Row South Campus which includes the reconfiguration of several lots within the South Campus subdivision. Tax Map: 042B Lot: 14I Zone: Contract Zone 12 – Rock Row Contract Zone Use: Mixed, Retail

**Roll Call Vote**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Robin Tannenbaum** | **Yes** |
| **Nancy Litrocapes** | **Yes** |
| **Jason Frazier** | **Yes** |
| **Karen Axelsen** | **Yes** |
| **Kevin Price** | **Yes** |
| **Lucas Schrage** | **Yes** |
| **Vice Chair – John Turcotte** | **Yes** |
| **Chair – Larry McWilliams** | **Yes** |

## Applicant Presentation

**Ian McKinnon (Jones Beach Engineering)** presented a proposed amendment to the approved Rock Row Phase III subdivision. He explained that, since the Phase III master plan was approved several years ago, project design has advanced and additional lot line adjustments are needed to reflect current development plans. The amendment primarily consists of minor lot line adjustments and the creation of several new lots to accommodate individual

building ownership and development. One example is the separation of the proposed Building S residential building and parking garage onto separate parcels, as they will be developed and owned by different entities. Mr. McKinnon noted that although separate lots are being created, the development will continue to function as an integrated site through reciprocal easement agreements and a master condominium/REA governing shared access, parking, and maintenance responsibilities. He stated that future site plan applications will continue to be reviewed on a project-specific basis, even where multiple lots function as a single development. Mr. McKinnon also explained that the amended subdivision will be submitted to the City of Portland following Westbrook Planning Board approval. Because the amendment involves parcels crossing the municipal boundary without changing Portland lot lines, it is expected to be processed administratively by Portland. He requested approval of previously identified waivers, including the joint Westbrook-Portland meeting requirement and an extension of the subdivision recording deadline to allow additional time for Portland's review. He concluded that the amendment is primarily administrative in nature and intended to align the subdivision with the current Phase III development plan.

## Staff Comment

**Rebecca Spitella:** explained that the amendment is based on the currently approved Phase III subdivision from November 2024. A subsequent subdivision amendment approved in November 2025 was never finalized or recorded following review by the City of Portland and is therefore void, making the 2024 approved plan the governing subdivision. Staff noted that the current application reflects the lot line adjustments described by the applicant. Each resulting lot will require separate site plan review, where the board will conduct its detailed evaluation of the proposed development. Staff also clarified that the previously approved waiver of the joint Westbrook-Portland meeting requirement remains in effect and does not require further board action. The only waiver requested with this application is an extension of up to 150 days to record the subdivision plan, which staff recommended for approval.

## No Public Comment

## No Board Comment

**Motion by Nancy Litrocapes**
**2nd by Lucas Schrage**

**Roll Call Vote**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Robin Tannenbaum** | **Yes** |
| **Nancy Litrocapes** | **Yes** |
| **Jason Frazier** | **Yes** |
| **Karen Axelsen** | **Yes** |
| **Kevin Price** | **Yes** |
| **Lucas Schrage** | **Yes** |
| **Vice Chair – John Turcotte** | **Yes** |
| **Chair – Larry McWilliams** | **Yes** |

## WORKSHOP

**Motion by John Turcotte**
**2nd by Kevin Price**

**Roll Call Vote**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Robin Tannenbaum** | **Yes** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Nancy Litrocapes** | **Yes** |
| **Jason Frazier** | **Yes** |
| **Karen Axelsen** | **Yes** |
| **Kevin Price** | **Yes** |
| **Lucas Schrage** | **Yes** |
| **Vice Chair – John Turcotte** | **Yes** |
| **Chair – Larry McWilliams** | **Yes** |

5. **Irlando read into the record:** 26-000402 – Site Plan – Rock Row Phase 3 Building V – Dirigo Center Developers, LLC: The applicant is proposing the construction of a 5-story building on Lot 10 within the South Campus, consisting of restaurant and retail space on the ground floor and a 119-room hotel above. Tax Map: 042B Lot: 14K Zone: Contract Zone 12 – Rock Row Contract Zone Use: Mixed, Retail

## Applicant Presentation

**Ian McKinnon (Jones Beach Engineering)** presented the sketch plan for Building V, a proposed five-story mixed-use building in Rock Row Phase III. The project includes an Element by Marriott extended-stay hotel above ground-floor restaurant and retail space. Waterstone Properties is the developer, with Dever Architects serving as the hotel architect. The site plan includes a one-way hotel drop-off from Quarry Drive, pedestrian connections through a central paseo and surrounding sidewalks, outdoor dining and courtyard space, service/loading areas at the rear of the building, and connections to the Nason's Brook trail sytem. Hotel parking is proposed in the adjacent parking garage and will be addressed through future approvals and shared parking agreements. McKinnon stated that the landscape design continues the Phase III streetscape theme with native plantings, natural stone features, and enhanced pedestrian amenities.

**Thomas Dever and Greg Del Nero (Dever Architects)** presented the architectural design. They stated that the project is proposed as an Element by Marriott, an extended-stay hotel emphasizing sustainability. Approximately 70 percent of guest rooms will include full kitchens, with the remainder providing kitchenettes. Architectural materials include brick at the ground level with aluminum composite panel cladding above in gray, white, and wood-tone finishes. Canopies are proposed over tenant entrances, with extensive glazing, outdoor seating, and landscaping intended to create an active pedestrian environment. Renderings illustrated the building's relationship to Quarry Drive, the adjacent parking garage, and surrounding Phase III development.

## Staff Comment

**Rebecca Spitella:** Noted that the proposed Element Hotel is located across Quarry Drive from the previously reviewed residential building and parking garage within Rock Row Phase III, with another future building planned nearby. Staff stated that the comments included in the staff memorandum are preliminary and intended to identify issues for future consideration. A full building and fire code review will occur after complete building plans are submitted to the Code Enforcement Office and Fire Department, rather than during the Planning Board's site plan review. Staff also noted that final architectural building elevations will be required as part of the final site plan submission.

## No Public Comment

## Board Comment

**Jason Fraizer:** Commented that he liked the building's exterior design, overall layout, and appearance. He asked the applicant to explain the purpose of the raised landscaped planter strip with trees shown on the site plan.

**Ian McKinnon:** Explained that the raised landscaped planter is intended to add visual interest and subtle elevation changes along the streetscape while maintaining ADA-compliant sidewalks and accessibility. The landscaped area will feature a gentle two- to three-foot mound over approximately 20 feet, creating a more natural appearance without obstructing views into the site. The planter will also help define and protect the planting area while maintaining visibility between Quarry Drive and the hotel entrance.

**Jason Fraizer:** Asked for additional detail on the proposed landscaped berm, including the planting materials and ground cover. He requested that the applicant provide more detailed landscape plans or example images with the final application to better illustrate the appearance of the feature.

**Ian McKinnon:** Stated that the landscaped areas are expected to include a combination of mulch beds, plantings, and stone, with stone used in some locations to reduce maintenance. More detailed landscape plans and renderings will be provided as part of the final site plan submission.

**Robin Tannenbaum:** **R**equested for submitted plans to include a North arrow.

**Karen Axelsen:** Asked if the Hotel will include a conference center, banquet or ballroom

**Greg Del Nero:** Responded that there are no proposed centers, banquets or ballrooms.

**Larry McWilliams:** Asked if the Hotel will be offering Timeshare options

**Thomas Dever:** Answered that it is a straightforward hotel that will be owned by a hotel management company.

**Nancy Litrocapes:** Expressed the need for a hotel in the City of Westbrook and support for the project.

**Larry McWilliams:** Asked if the design of the Hotel is standard with other Marriot Element hotels.

**Greg Del Nero:** Answered that the hotel is custom designed

6. **Irlando read into the record:** 26-000401 – Site Plan, Subdivision, Conditional Use – 300 East Bridge St. Millbrook Estates – Westbrook Development Corporation: The applicant is proposing to construct two 36-unit affordable housing multifamily dwellings within the Millbrook Estates development. Tax Map: 012 Lot: 010 Zone: Residential Growth Area 2 and Contract Zone 1 - Millbrook Use: Dwelling, Multiple Family

Karen Axelsen and Robin Tannenbaum both recused.

## Applicant Presentation

**Tyler Nord (Westbrook Development Corporation)** presented the proposed development at 300 East Bridge Street. The project was previously reviewed by the Planning Board and City Council in 2024 and received a contract zone amendment and sketch plan approval. The project was subsequently delayed due to state approvals and funding changes and is now moving forward with funding anticipated through MaineHousing. The proposal consists of two three-story, one-bedroom apartment buildings (Phases 3 and 4) on two currently undeveloped areas of the Mill Brook Estates property. The project is intended to provide affordable housing, including housing for seniors and moderate-income households. The first phase would include 36 units.

**Kaleb Bourassa (Gorrill Palmer/LJB Engineering)** reviewed the site plan. The applicant is requesting concurrent site plan and subdivision review to create two lots. Access will remain from the existing East Bridge Street driveway, with no new curb cuts. Approximately 26–28 parking spaces are proposed for each building,

supplemented by existing on-site parking. Updates since the 2024 review include a landscape plan, additional stormwater improvements, and continued utility coordination. The project will include screening, pedestrian connections, outdoor gathering areas, and improvements to the existing stormwater treatment system.

**Jesse Thompson (Kaplan Thompson Architects)** reviewed the building design, which remains substantially consistent with the 2024 proposal. The L-shaped buildings are designed to reduce the perceived scale along East Bridge Street. The design preserves mature street trees where feasible and includes post-and-rail fencing, gable roofs, wraparound porches, elevators, accessible units, and pedestrian connections to the existing trail system. Jesse stated that the project design has remained substantially unchanged since the 2024 review and that the primary purpose of returning to the Board is to proceed with the project following the funding delay.

## Staff Comment

**Rebecca Spitella:** expressed support for the project, noting that the contract zone process allows the existing affordable housing development to be expanded in a manner that complements the surrounding neighborhood. Staff highlighted the project's consistent design, landscaping, and streetscape elements. Staff noted that the project previously underwent sketch plan review in 2024 and that many of the comments from that review have been addressed. A few informational and outstanding items remain and will continue to be addressed as the project moves toward a final application anticipated in the coming months.

## Public Comment

**Beth Paulsen-Olmstead:** expressed concerns regarding the proposed development, including whether the units would primarily serve Westbrook residents and seniors, given the anticipated use of state and federal funding. The speaker questioned the number of Housing Authority units in Westbrook relative to other communities and whether additional affordable housing is needed in the area. She also raised concerns regarding the project's scale, height, and proximity to East Bridge Street, stating that the development could alter the existing residential character of the neighborhood. They referenced the original development and the previous commitment to maintaining setbacks, green space, and reduced neighborhood impacts, and asked whether the Board had reviewed the original agreements and minutes associated with that development. She questioned whether additional Housing Authority development is appropriate given the amount of existing and proposed development in Westbrook and expressed concern about the cumulative impact on the neighborhood and the community's traditional character.

**Rebecca Spitella:** stated that approximately 25% of projects approved by the Planning Board over the past 5–10 years have involved affordable housing. Staff noted the importance of maintaining a diverse housing stock that includes both affordable and market-rate housing. She also noted that other Westbrook Development Corporation projects have been completed in the City in accordance with their approved site plans. Staff clarified that the current proposal does not require a zoning change and that the proposed development is permitted within the applicable zoning district.

## Board Comment

**Lucas Shrage:** expressed strong support for the project, citing the need for affordable housing and the successful community character of the existing Mill Brook Estates development. He noted that the proposed design complements the existing development, preserves adjacent green space, and provides opportunities for residents to interact through porches, pedestrian connections, and shared outdoor areas. He also expressed support for the L-shaped building configuration and overall design. Lucas suggested providing bike racks on both sides of the development and considering an additional amenity on the opposite side to maintain symmetry and better serve the anticipated senior population. Lucas also asked whether the proposed units would be exclusively Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) units.

**Tyler Noord:** stated that the anticipated funding source is Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), using either the 4% or 9% program. The proposed income mix is primarily households at 50% and 60% of Area Median Income (AMI). He noted that the final income mix could vary depending on supplemental funding sources, but the project is expected to remain predominantly at the 50% and 60% AMI levels.

**John Turcotte:** Asked if Staff could provide the original approval for the project for reference and asked if the applicant can consider buffering options for the easterly parking area.

**Rebecca Spitella:** Noted to provide the original approval with members of the Board

**Larry McWilliams:** Expressed that the feels the proposed building is placed too close to the road in comparison with the height of the building and surrounding neighborhood.

**Nancy Litrocapes:** Asked if any design elements can be considered to reduce the height of the building

**Tyler Noord:** explained that the project's design was developed through the three concepts previously presented to the Board, with the intent of balancing the surrounding mix of multifamily and single-family development while maintaining a residential scale. He noted that the L-shaped configuration, wraparound porches, gable roofs, building setbacks, and post-and-rail fencing were intentional design elements to reduce the building's perceived scale and complement the neighborhood. The applicant also worked with an arborist to maximize setbacks from existing mature trees along East Bridge Street. Nord explained that the project must remain financially feasible under LIHTC and other affordable housing funding requirements, which limit the ability to make significant changes to the building configuration. He noted that the proposed architectural features add cost but were retained to improve the building's appearance and relationship to the surrounding neighborhood.

**Kevin Price:** expressed appreciation for the work undertaken to refine the project and noted that the current proposal is a significant improvement over the alternatives previously presented. He noted that developable land in Westbrook is increasingly constrained and that the site benefits from existing water, sewer, and transit access. Kevin acknowledged the project's visual impact along East Bridge Street but stated that Westbrook is a changing community and that the proposal provides an opportunity to accommodate additional residents. Kevin expressed support for moving the project forward and encouraged an efficient review process to avoid delays that could affect funding opportunities.

7. **Irlando read into the record: 26-000403 – Site Plan, Subdivision – 955 Bridgton Rd. – Robie Holdings, LLC: The applicant is proposing a residential condo development consisting of approximately 10 duplex buildings, totaling approximately 20 dwelling units, to be accessed via a new private driveway. Tax Map: 021 Lot: 027 Zone: Highway Commercial 1 Use: Dwelling, Multifamily**

## Applicant Presentation

**Dustin Roma (DM Roma Consulting)** representing Robie Holdings, presented a preliminary proposal for a 10-acre parcel at 955 Bridgeton Road. The property currently contains a single-family dwelling, detached barn, and shed and is an existing legally nonconforming lot due to its configuration and road frontage. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing structures and develop the upland portion of the property with clustered two-family duplex buildings, anticipated to contain three-bedroom units with attached garages and be offered as condominium units. The buildings would be located substantially back from Bridgeton Road and would maintain a buffer along the Willow Drive subdivision, including existing mature vegetation where feasible. Potential wetland areas have been identified based on preliminary observations but have not yet been formally delineated. The applicant noted existing drainage through the property and stated that stormwater and drainage concerns raised at the recent neighborhood

meeting will be addressed during the design process. The development would require an on-site wastewater disposal system. The applicant is preliminarily considering a septic field in the rear of the property, with a force main and walking/maintenance trail providing access. Roma identified driveway access and traffic as key issues currently being coordinated with City staff. The existing driveway would be upgraded to serve the proposed development, and the applicant is evaluating opportunities to consolidate nearby curb cuts and address applicable driveway separation and mobility corridor standards. Site distance was reported to be adequate. The applicant stated that future submissions will include detailed site, drainage, and wastewater plans, as well as building elevations showing the proposed scale and appearance. The project remains preliminary, and the applicant is continuing to work with City staff and neighboring property owners before submitting a formal application.

## Staff Comment

**Rebecca Spitella:** explained that the property is a legally nonconforming lot because its existing road frontage does not meet current lot-creation standards. However, the lot may be developed under its existing grandfathered status without a variance. Staff noted that the proposal is currently a high-level concept plan and that additional engineering and design details will be developed as the project progresses. The configuration of the property places the proposed development farther from Bridgeton Road, which may reduce visual and neighborhood impacts. Staff identified driveway access and compliance with applicable MaineDOT standards as a significant outstanding issue. Although the property is within the urban compact, the City has adopted MaineDOT standards for access within that area. Staff stated that compliance with those standards will need to be demonstrated as the project moves toward a final application.

## Public Comment

**Charles Fortin (942 Bridgton):** expressed concerns regarding existing drainage, wetlands, and traffic conditions. He stated that his property experiences significant water flow and requires two pumps, and questioned how the proposed septic system and site conditions would affect drainage to neighboring properties.
Fortin also raised concerns about increased traffic and roadway safety on Bridgeton Road, citing prior vehicle accidents and wildlife-related concerns. He requested that existing drainage infrastructure, site conditions, and traffic impacts be carefully evaluated as the project moves forward.

**Anne Sturgeon (41 Willow Drive):** expressed concerns regarding drainage and traffic. She stated that significant water already flows through the rear of the Willow Drive properties, with existing drainage areas, underground culverts, and sump pumps needed to manage water. She questioned how the proposed development, septic system, and removal of trees would affect existing drainage and neighboring properties. Sturgeon also expressed concerns about traffic congestion and safety on Bridgeton Road, particularly during busy periods, and questioned the impact of additional vehicles accessing the proposed development.

**Maureen and Louis Mathieu (970 Bridgton Road):** expressed concerns regarding existing drainage and traffic conditions along Bridgeton Road. She stated that water flows toward her property and has significantly impacted her driveway over the years. Matthew also described Bridgton Road as heavily traveled and unsafe, particularly for vehicles turning into and out of nearby properties. She expressed concern that additional traffic from the proposed development would increase congestion and safety risks. She also noted frequent deer activity and wildlife crossings in the area and requested that these conditions be considered in the project review.

**Pedro Hernandez (979 Bridgton Road):** expressed concerns regarding traffic, access, drainage, and emergency response. He stated that the existing driveway is narrow and raised, making access difficult during periods of heavy traffic, and questioned whether the proposed development could safely accommodate increased vehicle volumes. Hernandez also raised concerns about fire department access and emergency vehicle maneuverability, noting the size of current fire apparatus. He described existing drainage issues on his property and questioned how the proposed development and stormwater management system would affect neighboring properties. He also asked whether any

proposed stormwater detention areas would be secured for child safety. Hernandez stated that he supports providing housing but emphasized the need to address safe access, emergency response, drainage, and stormwater safety.

**Andrea Langlais (36 Willow Drive):** questioned the proposed number of units, noting that the plan shows 20 units while the application references 20–26 units. She asked when the applicant could increase the number of units or buildings. Langlais expressed concerns that the preliminary wetland mapping does not accurately reflect existing drainage and wetlands in the area. She described existing drainage patterns and culverts affecting neighboring properties and questioned how redirecting stormwater could impact downstream properties and Mill Brook. She also questioned the proposed setback from the Willow Drive property line and whether the current design differs from what was discussed at the neighborhood meeting. Langlais asked about the next steps in the review process and how residents can remain informed and access project information as the application progresses.

**Anne Sturgeon (41 Willow Drive):** asked whether the existing common area associated with the Willow Drive subdivision would remain under its current ownership and use or be incorporated into the proposed development, including potentially being used for roadway access to Duck Pond.

**Ralph Hatt (12 Willow Drive):** expressed concerns regarding speeding and traffic safety on Willow Drive and Bridgeton Road. He stated that he has contacted the Police Department regarding speeding and believes the roadway is already unsafe for residents. Hatt acknowledged that broader traffic enforcement may be a City Council matter but expressed concern that additional development and traffic could further impact existing conditions.

**Dustin Roma:** acknowledged residents' concerns and stated that detailed plans, studies, and reports will be submitted for City review as the project progresses and will be available to the public. The applicant clarified that the proposed buildings would maintain a buffer from the Willow Drive properties and that the existing wooded area along the northern property line is intended to remain. The proposed access drive would be newly constructed to a minimum width of approximately 20 feet and designed to accommodate two-way traffic. Regarding the Willow Drive subdivision's common open space, the applicant stated that it was not intended to be incorporated into the project but that ownership and restrictions would be reviewed with the City. Dustin identified stormwater management and traffic as primary project considerations. Stormwater ponds and best management practices will be designed to control runoff and provide required water-quality treatment. Traffic and driveway access will be evaluated in coordination with City staff, with the results provided as part of the formal application.

**Rebecca Spitella:** clarified that the existing driveway is elevated and narrow, but the proposed access would be reconstructed as a wider, road-like access with shoulders and other safety improvements as appropriate. The applicant will be required to provide turning templates demonstrating adequate access for fire and other emergency vehicles. She confirmed that the Willow Drive subdivision's common open space is separate from the proposed development and cannot be incorporated into the project. An existing easement for a potential future connection to Duck Pond is shown on the subdivision plan, but no such connection is currently proposed. Staff noted that traffic and driveway spacing will be reviewed under applicable City and MaineDOT standards due to the speed and safety concerns along Bridgton Road Staff clarified that the reference to a stormwater "pond" does not necessarily mean permanent standing water, as the final stormwater management design may use various best management practices. Regarding the proposed 20–26 units, staff explained that the final number will depend on the amount of usable land after wetlands and other applicable deductions are determined. A formal wetland delineation will be required with the final application. Staff explained that the current workshop represents conceptual review. A future final application will include detailed engineering, wetland delineation, stormwater, traffic, and other required information. The timing of the final submission will depend on the applicant's progress.

**Dustin Roma:** The applicant clarified that the zoning ordinance establishes a maximum number of units based on the usable area of the property, but the final proposal may include fewer units. The current range of 20–26 units reflect the preliminary stage of design and the need to complete engineering, wetland, wastewater, and other site studies. The applicant stated that the final unit count will depend on site constraints and project feasibility. The

applicant anticipates returning with a final application after the necessary studies and permitting work are completed, with the timing likely falling between a few months and approximately a year.

# 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