

**City of Lewiston**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
*Minutes of September 10, 1996*

**I. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 6:10 PM

Members present:           H. Milliken, D. Theriault, T. Peters,  
                                  M. Goulet, D. Jacques  
                                  L. Zidle (arrived at 6:20), H. Skelton (arrived at 7:00)

Staff present:               J. Lysen, G. Arsenault, A. Metivier

**II. READING OF THE MINUTES**

Mr. Theriault stated that he on page 1 of the minutes under public hearing for the Comprehensive Plan that the fourth paragraph should state that any future contacts with the School Board or with the press should be directed to the chairman of the board. Mr. Theriault stated that in some instances what the press writes may be slanted and feels that the chair should deal with these issues so there is no misinterpretation. Mr. Milliken stated that at some meeting the press is not there but a story is still written and who would it go to then. Mr. Theriault stated that press releases should reflect what was decided on in the minutes. Mr. Theriault stated that stories may be slanted by who they spoke to, and that the board should have one voice if dealing with the press. Mr. Arsenault stated that the press may get their own read on issues through the process of editing etc. so no matter who they speak to it could be slanted.

**MOTION:**           by Mr. Theriault, seconded by Mr. Goulet that any contact by the press or by staff should be dealt with through the minutes, if available, or handled through the chair.

**VOTE:**               5 - 0

**MOTION:**           By Mr. Peters, seconded by Mr. Goulet to accept the minutes of August 27 with modifications on pages 1, 2 and 11, is discussed.

**VOTE:**               Passed 5 - 0

The board commended Ms. Metivier on the fine job she did on the minutes.

**III. CORRESPONDENCE**

**MOTION:**           By Mr. Theriault, seconded by Mr. Goulet to accept the following two pieces of correspondence and place on file:

1.           Memo from Steve Johnson dated 8/27/96 regarding the Clean Water Act Master Plan;
2.           Proposed Future Land Use Map

**VOTE:**               Passed 5 - 0  
                                  Mr. Zidle arrived

**IV. PUBLIC HEARING**

A.           Review the Draft Update of the Lewiston's Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Milliken explained the format for the meeting would include the review of the Comprehensive Plan section on Economy and Public Services from 6:00 PM to 7:00 PM then the regular agenda will begin.

Mr. Milliken stated the issues that had been discussed at the last meeting regarding the Economy section.

**City of Lewiston**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
*Minutes of September 10, 1996*

Specifically he mentioned the changes to pages 52 & 53 which included changing goal one and adding goal 5, as well as listing AVCOG, LAEGC and The Chamber as "Supporting Agencies."

Mr. Theriault asked why the Maine Municipal Association was part of Policy II Strategies - A. Mr Lysen stated that the Maine Municipal Association (MMA) is utilized as an advocate for municipalities to coordinate efforts of Chambers and City officials around the state. Mr. Theriault asked what MMA would do. Mr. Lysen stated that both business opportunities and issues will be shared throughout the state through city managers and chambers. Mr. Theriault asked if it involved any legal opinion. Mr. Lysen stated no and stated that they would be an advocate for business and community interest and that is the role the chamber and city officials would play through the MMA. He explained that it would further cooperation and identify opportunities. Mr. Theriault asked if it would be a clearinghouse. Mr. Lysen stated yes. Mr. Theriault asked if the City Administrator was aware of the MMA setup.

Mr. Milliken mentioned the issue with changing the plan to include a focus on Lewiston. He stated that he would go through each of the policies. Mr. Theriault asked that they strike AVCOG, LAEGC and the Chamber from Policy 2 and make them supporting agencies. Mr. Milliken stated that this would be done throughout the plan. Mr Lysen stated that he would have a revised draft of the Comprehensive Plan for the September 24th meeting.

Mr. Milliken asked if there were problems with Policy 3. Mr. Lysen stated that under Policy 3 Strategy - D could probably be broadened. He stated that the visitation program was going well and that good information was gained through visitations. Mr. Milliken asked about "Maine & Company" being included Strategy F. Mr. Lysen stated that "Maine & Company" was a private non-profit agency with telecommunication as one of its major emphases. He stated that because of Lewiston's telecommunication capacity it could use "Maine & Company" and market that. Mr. Theriault asked if it could be changed to state market through appropriate companies instead of naming them. Mr. Lysen stated that it would be appropriate to say statewide agencies and include Maine & Company as a possible supporting agency. Mr. Theriault stated he did not have a problem with that. Mr. Lysen stated that under Policy 11 "Maine & Company" would be listed as a supporting agency as well.

Mr. Theriault suggested that Bates Mill be stricken from Strategy G, in case they want to consider someone else. Mr. Lysen asked what the board felt about Strategy J. Mr. Theriault stated that he did not feel it is something we are in the position to maintain only to support because they have control of what they are doing. Mr. Lysen stated that these agencies are publicly funded. Mr. Arsenaault also stated that public funding was provided such as to LAEGC and that we have representation on their board. Mr. Milliken stated that it maintaining the relationship could be put in that strategy. Mr. Milliken asked if the board would be more comfortable putting in "Maintaining a relationship." It was suggested to leave it the way it is, and the board seemed to be in agreement. Mr. Lysen asked if expand publicly funded should be in there. Mr. Milliken stated that it should be expand publicly funded. Mr. Milliken stated that expanding could be with other organizations as they become available. Mr. Goulet stated that it could say such as those administered by. Mr. Peters asked if that would be for businesses that couldn't get their funding any other way. He stated that he did not want to encourage spending of public funds when the private sector could do it. Mr. Goulet stated that he felt these programs were aimed at those who could not make a deal otherwise. Mr. Lysen stated that some of these programs are used as loans of a "last resort." Discussion ensued about loan programs being screened.

Mr. Theriault asked in "Maine & Company" would be changed in Strategy 11. Mr. Lysen stated that it would be listed as a supporting agency. Mr. Milliken stated that in Strategy M target seemed too strong and that it should be investigated instead of stating that a specific type of industry is being targeted. Mr. Lysen suggested using explore instead of target.

Mr. Lysen discussed Strategy N stating that Blue Cross & Blue Shield has mentioned linking with four hospitals in the state to basically create a large insurance company. He stated that this may have some effect in the future because of the placement of these facilities. He asked the board if they felt comfortable putting that in the plan. Discussion ensued about managed care and how the insurance company would work with the hospital. Mr. Milliken stated that Blue Cross & Blue Shield would probably need more neighborhood offices. Mr. Lysen stated that we are trying to identify business opportunities within Health Care and that in speaking with the head of Central Maine Clinical Associates he had many insights as to the direction of managed health care. Mr. Lysen stated that he wanted to know how the board felt about this. Discussion continued concerning how health care could play a role. It was agreed to leave Strategy N as is.

**City of Lewiston**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
*Minutes of September 10, 1996*

Mr. Milliken started the discussion on Policy 4. He stated that the second meeting of the School Board was held on Monday night and stated that the board will create their own component of the plan within the next 18 months. He stated under culture and arts it was asked to take all the goals and policies out related to school department and put in one goal which would be the same as the one under education and they will develop a plan. He stated that Strategies A & B of Policy 4 were the responsibility of the School Department and not the Development Department. Mr. Lysen stated that it was also the responsibility of business community focusing more on school to work transitions therefore it is a joint effort between the schools and the businesses. Mr. Theriault suggested changing it to have business more involved in the High School level in regards to technical courses. He suggested changing to state wherever the business community can contribute and aid in that area. Mr. Lysen stated he felt it was something you could bring to the attention of the school department during this planning process.

Mr. Theriault presented four goals that were written up about teenage involvement. He stated that it started with the Mayor but he wanted it to continue because he feels teenagers should be given the opportunity to get involved. Mr. Theriault proceeded to read the goals to the audience. Mr. Peters suggested that because goals 1, 3 and 4 are already done and are part of the curriculum they could be included but everything else go to the School Board. Mr. Theriault stated that he had no problem with that. Mr. Theriault stated that number 4 is very important. Mr. Milliken stated that he does not want to force the school to do something we have no authority over and felt it needs to be part of their plan. Mr. Theriault stated that it would push the politicians to speak in the school. He suggested that it be reworded to allow a platform. Mr. Peters stated that the School Board should put it in their policy but it should be sent to the School Board. Mr. Peters suggested sending everything over that has to do with education to the School Board. Mr. Lysen stated that strategies A, C, D, E, F could be kept. Mr. Peters stated that the Planning board does not have the right to do that. Mr. Lysen stated that the Board may feel it is related to businesses. Mr. Milliken stated that suggested that it be explored with the School Department to expand basic skills. Mr. Theriault asked if there were any problems with Strategy 1 being implemented as the basic goal. The Board agreed that the goal and the first strategy would be placed in the Comprehensive Plan where appropriate. Mr. Milliken suggested that have should be replaced with encourage. Mr. Theriault asked about Strategy C and suggested it be changed to explore and expand services where necessary. Mr. Milliken suggested striking Strategy C because it is an education issue. Mr. Lysen suggested forwarding it to the School Board for them to look at during their planning process.

Mr. Theriault stated that all items concerning education be taken out and sent to School Board. Mr. Lysen stated that within 18 months they will have explored more issues. Discussion about sending information to the School Board continued. Mr Theriault went over goal 1. Mr. Milliken stated that the word develop in goal C suggests we do not have any now and thinks it should be changed to explore and expand. Mr. Lysen suggests forwarding some of this information to the School Board during their process. Mr. Theriault suggested taking everything out that has to do with education and send it to the School Board. Mr. Lysen stated that in the 18 months that the School Board develops their plan they could explore these issues. Mr. Theriault stated he would want it to be sent over by the Comprehensive Plan committee and not the Planning Board because the Planning Board has not had time to review it. Mr. Lysen stated that he doesn't want these issues watered down until they are meaningless. Mr. Goulet stated that thought it should be sent over as is so its is not taken out of context. Mr. Milliken asked Mr. Lysen to take out the information concerning education.

Mr. Milliken asked if there were any questions on Policy 5. He suggested that Strategy E state expand where necessary and keep Strategy F as is. Mr. Lysen asked for the Boards opinion on Strategy C. Mr. Milliken suggested stating "explore and expand where necessary the services, etc." Mr Lysen asked if A & B could be combined. Mr. Lysen stated that B had been taken out. He also suggested linking business related private sector of A & B, focus more on school to work transitions. Mr. Lysen suggested that the focus be put on the school and not on the business community by stated "encourage the business support of basic skills and work retraining linked to workplaces etc." He stated that D would be stricken and C, E & F would be changed as previously decided.

At this time Mr. Milliken set the comprehensive plan portion of the meeting aside and would resumed the regular Planning Board agenda after a five minute recess.

- rezoned
- B. Proposal to amend the Official Zoning map where the Promenade Mall area would be conditionally rezoned from Community Business (CB) District to Highway Business (HB) District, to allow "Wholesale sales, warehousing and distribution facilities" subject to conditions.

**City of Lewiston**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
*Minutes of September 10, 1996*

Mr. Lysen discussed the letter from Rosalind Prince. Mr. Lysen stated that he suggested to Ms. Prince that one of the conditions be that permitted uses of the property would be uses that are presently permitted in the CB which are also permitted in the HB with the addition of specific permitted use of "Wholesale sales, warehousing and distribution facilities," with conditions on that specific use with respect to upper level (old Bradlees) area and have a date certain as April 30, 1997 as the last time they can occupy the upper area for "Wholesale sales, warehousing and distribution." Mr. Lysen continued to explain the conditional agreement. He stated that the conditions shall bind the owners and the owner has to record copies, conditions and the plans within thirty days of approval. Mr. Lysen stated that it was a unique situation so the plan should highlight the specific area that is presently being used for warehousing and distribution that will no longer be allowed after April 30, 1997.

Mr. Skelton stated that the conditional agreement should be amended because in the contract it says the upper level of the entire property. He stated that it should be amended to limited it to the area that is currently in use. Mr. Lysen agreed and suggested adding "as indicated on Exhibit A." Mr. Milliken stated that item 5 states "as if the rezoning never occurred and would return to the CB zone" and stated that it should be specific because in the future if there is redefinition then it is recorded that it was a CB zone. Mr. Lysen stated that it would return to what it was. Mr. Skelton stated that it should state that the contract would be null and void. Mr. Lysen stated that it would return to its original zone. Mr. Skelton stated that would be acceptable as long as it hasn't changed.

Mr. Theriault stated that in number 2 it says the change in zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and asked if that makes in consistent or is it going to revert back and asked why that language was used. Mr. Lysen stated that the Comprehensive Plan was used for guidance because we are proposing specific conditions to make it more consistent with the plan. Mr. Milliken stated that it was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because we are still protecting the residential areas. Mr. Theriault stated that it should be outlined as to what is consistent. Mr. Lysen stated that the last sentence states the consistency. Mr. Peters stated that on item 1 it should have added on the end "as defined below:" so there is no ambiguity. Mr. Lysen suggested subject to conditions contained herein. Mr. Peters stated that anything with that language would be acceptable. Mr. Milliken asked if the Board wanted to limit the hours of warehousing in the rear. Mr. Theriault stated he had been there recently and there were loading docks he also mentioned that neighbors had not had problems with noise from the back. Mr. Arsenaault mentioned that under number 2 it states Section 5(b)(2) and it should have an Article number XVII before it. Mr. Milliken opened the hearing to the public.

**Mr. Ron Jean**, Mr. Jean discussed the TIF agreement the city had with the Rosenthal's. He mentioned how the Rosenthal's had stated in May that they had a customer for the mall - Bookland, and now it is being used as warehousing. He wanted to know how R.D. Roy got therein the beginning and after April 30th where they will go.

Mr. Arsenaault explained that the Rosenthal's had made it clear that they would be doing warehousing. He stated that it was an oversight by the City when they assumed that warehousing was permitted as was a matter of right until the mall was developed. He stated that the Rosenthal's did not deceive the City and that it wasn't realized until recently that the oversight had been made by the City.

Mr. Lysen explained that at the last meeting these issues were thoroughly discussed. He mentioned how there had been grandfathering in the past on the site concerning warehousing and that this may have contributed to the confusion. He stated that the Rosenthal's they are anticipating the redevelopment of the mall and stated that the R.D. Roy lease will help make that happen. Mr. Theriault stated that the Planning Board did not know that this was going on. He stated that it should have been clarified to the Rosenthal's a lot better and researched a lot better than it was and stated that the board is in the process of trying to correct the problem. He stated that there was a problem and that he hopes everyone has learned by the mistake. Mr. Jean asked what R.D. Roy would do in April and asked if the City is doing anything to help them. Mr. Arsenaault stated that R.D. Roy had been leasing space in the Bates Mill, and could continue to do so. He stated that he felt there was not an issue that R.D. Roy would be left out in the cold. He stated that if R.D. Roy wanted to come back to the Mill, the LMRC could find space for them. Mr. Lysen stated that R.D. Roy has only been at the Promenade Mall since July. Mr. Milliken closed the discussion to the public.

**MOTION:** by Mr. Peters, seconded by Mr. Theriault to schedule a Public Hearing for the Conditional Rezoning of the Promenade Mall area from Community Business (CB) District to Highway

**City of Lewiston**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
*Minutes of September 10, 1996*

Business (HB) District on September 24, 1996, subject to the modification of the conditional agreement as discussed by the board.

**VOTE:** Passed 5 - 1 - 1 ( Mr. Skelton opposed, Mr. Goulet abstained)

Mr. Lysen asked Mr. Skelton to clarify why he opposed the motion for conditional rezoning. Mr. Skelton stated that he was concerned by the process and the oversights made by the City and did not want to support what he felt could be interpreted as ignoring the Code. He stated that he was very much on the side of neighbors and also sympathetic with the Rosenthal's.

At this time Mr. Milliken resumed the Comprehensive Plan portion of the meeting.

Mr. Milliken stated that he felt in Policy 3 Strategies C & E appeared to be redundant. He stated that E appears to be already included in C. Mr. Peters suggested striking the telecommunications section of C and leaving E as is. Mr. Lysen asked if telecommunications, fiber optics, digital technology and electronic communication should be left in Strategy C. Mr. Peters suggested incorporating those items in E.

Mr. Milliken began the discussion on Policy 5. Mr. Lysen stated that Strategy B should state "translation capabilities." Mr. Theriault asked if AVCOG/ LAEGC etc.. would be stricken from Strategy C. Mr. Lysen stated that they would be listed as supporting agencies. Mr. Skelton stated that he did not understand the meaning of Strategy D and suggested changing it to "assess the needs of business" rather than "assess business assistance exporting needs." Mr. Lysen agreed that should be reworded.

**Ron Jean**, asked what Policy 5 Strategy A meant and stated that the state already provided assistance to businesses focusing on technical markets and wanted to know what the City would do. Mr. Peters stated that if businesses were to form in the City of Lewiston we could use some of the french speaking talents to their business advantage by working with Canadian firms and providing any assistance technically or otherwise should be encouraged. He stated that it was different from what the state is doing. Mr. Theriault stated that Lewiston should explore on their own if they have the capability to do so and possibly open up markets to products and etc...

Discussion on Policy 6 began. Mr. Peters suggested taking out Auburn from "Market Lewiston/Auburn." Mr. Peters stated that he thought Auburn could be left in where joint marketing between Lewiston/Auburn was joint efforts for the "Cities of Androscoggin" but joint efforts for marketing the area could be only Lewiston. Mr. Theriault stated that Strategy B should be to "Market Lewiston to women entrepreneurs" rather than L/A. Mr. Peters suggested striking B out of the plan. Mr. Lysen stated that he would consider changing that or finding a different place for it.

Discussion began on Policy 7. Mr. Theriault stated that Auburn should be taken out of Strategy B. Mr. Skelton stated that transportation infrastructure included improving highways and rails and those are by nature not local. Mr. Theriault stated that if Auburn were to put in a turnpike exit they would probably not discuss it with Lewiston and he felt that Lewiston should be first. Mr. Goulet stated that it was going to be tied in regionally anyway and that LACTS is a regional study so he does not have a problem with striking Auburn from the first half. Mr. Skelton stated he was concerned with increasing the level of investment. He stated that the goal is not to put in more money but to increase the effectiveness and the efficiency of these Road Systems and if that costs more money we will spend more money. Mr. Peters asked if that would be a financial investment. Mr. Peters suggested "increasing the level of access" Mr. Lysen stated that focus is on the highway system. Mr. Milliken asked if it should be stated that the investment is from federal and state. Mr. Skelton suggested "increasing the level of federal and state funding into Primary roads and other transportation infrastructure."

**Ron Jean**, asked if Policy 6 Strategy B was discrimination because women are being singled out. The board stated that this item had been taken out of the Policy. Mr. Lysen stated that it may be placed somewhere else where it would be more appropriate. Mr. Goulet stated that if it is placed somewhere else it should be generic and not focus on any one gender.

Mr. Skelton asked for the meaning of alternative tourism in Policy 8 Strategy E and suggested "alternative" be taken out. Mr. Milliken stated that it could be focusing on the airport being used for warehousing for businesses and instead of restricting it to that we could get tourism involved. Mr. Skelton stated he did not like the use of the

**City of Lewiston**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
*Minutes of September 10, 1996*

word alternative. Mr. Theriault stated he agreed with Mr. Skelton. Mr. Goulet asked if Policy 8 Strategy D needed to be in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Lysen stated that they wanted to express expanding the agreement to include that additional land. Mr. Goulet asked if it was part of the expansion of the existing airport. Mr. Lysen stated as long the area of the joint agreement as far expanding. Mr. Goulet stated that if we have the statement in compliance with the agreement. Mr. Theriault stated that by itself we are preserving land for Auburn. Mr. Lysen stated that he would research it and find out what they meant. Mr. Theriault stated it should state in line with the joint agreement somewhere. Mr. Milliken stated that he had a problem with using the word preserve.

Mr. Skelton stated that he felt Policy 9 Strategy B should state reserve instead of preserve.

**April Clark**, asked if Strategy B had anything to do with a policy concerning rail transportation that had already been changed. Mr. Lysen stated that the policy changed was in transportation and that this section was economy but relates to the same issue. He stated that in this section it is reserving land with rail access. Ms. Clark questioned "reserving land." Mr. Goulet suggested instead of reserve or preserve changing it to designate areas of land with rail access. Mr. Lysen asked if that was changed would it mean you could go in and change stating that we are rezoning this land. Mr. Milliken asked if it should be explored. Mr. Theriault stated that he did not like using the word explore. He stated that the board needed to take a focus and either go for it or decide if it is something that should or shouldn't do. Mr. Milliken stated he did not feel comfortable, without knowing what is out there, in stating that it should be set aside for rail. Mr. Lysen stated that if an area was zoned for rail access there would have to be a lot of factors considered. Mr. Peters stated that preserving or reserving has an impact immediately. Mr. Skelton stated that just because it is stated in the plan does not mean it will happen. He stated that for Comprehensive Plan they had decide whether or not they wanted to focus on rail access possibilities. Mr. Goulet stated that if we do not something now there is a possibility that these areas could be developed residentially and then all opportunities to develop rail access would be lost. Mr. Peters stated that the bigger question is where the city is going how is it going to develop and what kind of community will it become. He stated that he did not want it to be misinterpreted because in the next ten years someone could say this means rezoning and that it was already passed by the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Lysen stated that this was an economic related transportation recommendation and that rail access is important for the economy of Lewiston. He stated that Lewiston has limited rail access facilities but should preserve those opportunities. Discussion continued about rail access.

**April Clark**, referenced the correspondence regarding the Proposed Future Land Use Map and asked how many of them dealt with rail. She stated that she that she was concerned with the use of reserving and preserving land. She stated that what she read is that the Comprehensive Plan is a legal basis for development in the City and that this language seemed very strong and felt the language that was used is very important.

Mr. Lysen stated that any changes must protect both neighborhoods and the environment. Ms. Clark stated that she felt the strength of a word makes a difference and changing it to explore makes a difference. She stated that she was more comfortable exploring. Mr. Skelton that there was no question that her interest would be best served by not having that in it. He stated that he understood her concern. Ms. Clark stated that the more watered down it is the better it is for her.

Mr. Faunce stated that the St. Lawrence and Maine Central railroads parallel each other from North Yarmouth to Auburn. He stated that both lines have no developable land in New Gloucester and that they open up in Auburn and the airport is probably the most desired area in the State. He mentioned that railroads were a monopoly. He stated that the only place with any significance north of Falmouth to develop rail is in Lewiston and that if those rails change ownership the could be developed for rail. He stated that the board should keep that in mind because that land can be very valuable if Maine Central railroad changes hands. Mr. Theriault asked Mr. Faunce what he thought she be used for wording. Mr. Faunce stated that it is a two part process and therefore he had no qualms with using a proactive statement identifying land because it is a two part process and all you are doing is preserving the opportunity. Mr. Milliken stated that he would feel more comfortable with using explore reserving land with rail access.

Mr. Milliken suggested exploring preserving land. Mr. Skelton stated that the focus should be on what suitable land is and stated that they should be as specific and use identify or designate. Mr. Goulet stated that this issue should be dealt with today so in the future there isn't more people out there with concerns. Mr. Skelton that there would be boundaries (ie. wetland here, neighborhood here, etc..) Mr. Milliken asked what if there were no

**City of Lewiston**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
*Minutes of September 10, 1996*

boundaries. Mr. Skelton stated that it would not happen then. Mr. Goulet stated using identify and if useable designate. Mr. Arseneault stated that using where suitable is implied. Mr. Milliken stated that it is not implied and that we are prejudging the public input by not leaving it with a no. Mr. Skelton suggested where suitable identify and designate. Mr. Lysen stated that we have to look into the future and at the potential of this land and that he is not looking to heavy industrial but we need to have something in the Plan. Mr. Milliken stated he felt more comfortable with explore. Mr. Skelton stated that if someone was interested in building a subdivision near this rail line maybe they would be told to maybe consider something else. Mr. Skelton stated that being specific as necessary by identifying and designating rail accessible land for use by rail dependent businesses where suitable and where the impact is suitable for the environment and neighborhood. Mr. Theriault stated that he felt that this addresses the public's concerns. Ms. Clark stated that her concerns were very legitimate.

Mr. Lysen stated that he felt the area eventually needed to be rezoned in order to be protected from residential dwelling units. Mr. Milliken stated that he did not know how the board felt but he thought it should be explore designating. Mr. Lysen stated that in the economy section we are stating that this is a potential important linkage for us, notwithstanding the residential issues and the potential resource issue which will have to be done. Mr. Theriault stated that we have to realize that the City needs development besides residential uses and that rail is an avenue that should be strongly explored. Mr. Goulet stated that this area may never be developed. However, he stated that in 10 years if the owner changes we may have lost any chance to ever develop it. Mr. Skelton stated that now they know of a particular parcel of land that could be developed for light industrial. Mr. Goulet suggested using identify and designate. Mr. Peters stated that they should use explore not designate. Mr. Lysen stated that he was concerned that someone come in with subdivision and we would have to approve it. Mr. Sargent stated he felt it should state identify and explore rezoning. Ms. Clark stated that she did not want rezone or designate land because that language was too strong. Mr. Theriault stated that he hears Ms. Clark's concerns but he also hears others with concerns that they have land they can not develop. Mr. Theriault asked how many others would be impacted like her. Mr. Peters suggested identify and explore the use land with rail access for rail related development. Mr. Milliken asked the board who agreed with Mr. Peters. Mr. Goulet stated that he was not necessarily opposed but thought it should be designated. Mr. Goulet decided to stick with it.

Discussion began about Policy 10. Mr. Lysen stated that they should strike strategy D under Policy 10. Mr. Milliken stated that Strategy D be stricken because it was redundant. Mr. Goulet suggested striking Auburn from everything in that Policy. Board agreed. Mr. Goulet had questions about entrances to the City. Mr. Lysen suggested changing the reference to Lewiston's gateways.

**Bob Faunce, TSI**, references correspondence regarding office buildings in the Industrial District. He stated that South Park was perfectly suitable for offices. He stated that the USDA building and People's Heritage Bank are really offices. He stated that there are 15 acres of Industrial District that and none can have offices. He suggested adding a Strategy to Policy 3 to "expand opportunity for redevelopment in the Industrial District allowing office buildings, business offices and tradesman offices as permitted uses." He stated that if the Board agreed with that, they should go ahead now and allow office buildings in the Industrial District. He stated with two hospitals in this town we will need more offices. He stated considering adding strategies and considering adding offices in Industrial District. Mr. Lysen asked if it was possible to look to an OS District which allows light industrial and offices. He stated that he was concerned about depleting whatever land is available for industrial land.

**MOTION:** by Mr. Goulet, seconded by Mr. Theriault to schedule a public hearing on September 24,  
1996 for proposal to amend the Official Zoning and Land Use Code to allow office buildings, business offices and tradesman offices as a permitted use in the Industrial (I) District.

**VOTE:** 7 - 0

**MOTION:** by Mr. Goulet, seconded by Mr. Peters to include as part of the Comprehensive Plan identify and designate areas for future Industrial development and request funding to hire outside consultant to identify and designate those areas of the City with future Industrial development.

**VOTE:** 7 - 0

**City of Lewiston**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
*Minutes of September 10, 1996*

Discussion began on Public Services and Facilities. Mr. Milliken referenced Goal 1 and Policy 1. The board had no concerns. Mr. Theriault asked what rescue services meant in Policy 2 and asked if it meant ambulance etc. He stated that there should be a discussion on streamlining for cost effectiveness. He gave an example of Auburn services. He stated that there could be cheaper services for people in the City in regards to ambulance services. Mr. Skelton suggested ensuring that police, fire and rescue services operate to efficiency and cost effectively to meet the needs of the community. The board agrees. Mr. Theriault suggested Public Works be placed under responsibility because they will be involved in responding to some emergencies. The board agrees. Mr. Theriault suggested Strategy B include Planning Board because of the mention of the LCIP. He stated that in C he wanted to include the DARE/GREAT program and PAL REC.

Mr. Lysen stated that the language in Policy 3 would be changed. Mr. Milliken stated that this would go to the School Board. Mr. Theriault stated that it is not entirely school related and wants to make sure they have a reference back to that.

Mr. Theriault stated he wanted Planning Board in Policy 4. Mr. Skelton stated that he wanted the acronyms to be stricken from Policy 4. Mr. Theriault asked why the Development Department is not involved in Strategy A but is involved in Strategy B. Mr. Lysen stated that he would add Development Department to A. Mr. Theriault stated that he wanted Planning Board to be included on Strategy D and E and stated that on anything with LCIP Planning Board should be included. Mr. Milliken stated that under Strategy A that would make the Planning Board included. Mr. Lysen stated that he had no problem including it in.

Discussion on Policy 5 began. Mr. Lysen referenced the memo from Steve Johnson. Mr. Theriault asked about Strategy A concerning maximizing the capacity of the treatment facility. He stated that it is always based on future flows. He asked if it had ever been analyzed what future flows would be if we undertook a plan to reduce our flows in the City. He stated that saving water on a large scale would cut back on pumping stations and would decrease flow to treatment plants and make it more efficient. The board stated that it was a good idea. Mr. Theriault suggested the issue be explored. Mr. Lysen stated that the program to reduce contaminated sources including water conservation efforts and include it in C under Policy 6.

Mr. Theriault stated that Policy 5 Strategies A, B, C, & D Planning Board be added. Mr. Lysen stated that C would be changed to may play. Mr. Theriault stated that the Fire Department should be included under D. Mr. Theriault wanted Planning Board and Fire added to Policy 6. He suggested adding Planning Board to Policies 8,9 & 10. Mr. Theriault Suggested that Fire Department, Parks and Recreation School Department and 911 be added to Policy 9 Strategy A. Mr. Theriault suggested changing wording to "try to exceed" instead of "meet" the State goal of 50% recycling in Policy 10 Strategy B. He also suggested that all apartment buildings be included in that. Mr. Jacques stated that there were two Policy 10's. Mr. Lysen recognized the error and stated it would be changed.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** By Mr. Theriault, seconded by Mr. Goulet to adjourn at 9:50 PM.

**VOTE:** 7-0

Respectfully Submitted,

Marc Goulet  
Secretary