

**MINUTES**  
**TOWN OF GORHAM**  
**ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Meeting of August 21, 2023 – 8:30 a.m.**  
**Gorham Municipal Center, Conference Room A**

Present: Councilors Ronald Shepard and Seven Siegel.

Absent: Councilor Wilder Cross – Committee Chair.

Also present: Town Manager Ephrem Paraschak; Town Planner Carol Eyerman; Assistant Town Planner Damon Yakovleff; Town Engineer Charles Norton; Fire Chief Ken Fickett, and Executive Assistant Jessica Hughes.

1. **Consideration of the minutes of the July 19, 2023 meeting.**

A motion was MADE by Councilor Siegel, SECONDED by Councilor Shepard, and VOTED to accept the minutes of the July 19, 2023 meeting. Unanimous vote.

2. **Current Business**

- A. Review revising parking ordinances and forward any recommendations to the Town Council for Consideration (referred by Ordinance Committee on January 17, 2023).

Director of Community Development Tom Poirier said that a couple of meetings ago, the committee started talking about parking standards with a focus of on-street parking first. He referred the committee to two exhibits prepared by Town Engineer Charles Norton. He further said that staff have also been working the off-street parking standards in the Land Use & Development Code, and how staff could prepare a memo identifying uses and new parking standards to streamline and identify the uses that staff see. He said we [staff and the Planning Board] typically see site plans for which the Town does not have standards for. Regarding on-street standards, Mr. Poirier then deferred to Mr. Norton.

Regarding on-street standards, Mr. Norton said he was instructed to take a look at the potential for adding on-street parking on Main Street, east and west of the South Street intersection. He referred the committee to take a look at the first exhibit reflecting west of the intersection where there is currently an extended right turn lane heading east down Main Street turning right onto South Street; the idea being that is a vestige before the bypass, where before people left Town to get south, they would stack up to go right. Mr. Norton said we could potentially reduce the storage and taper length of that right turn lane to more accurately reflect the usage of that right turn lane, and potentially capture some of that additional on-street parking on the south side of Main Street. He further said we could reduce the right turn lane by 175 feet of storage and 75 feet, which is the minimum taper length for a right turn lane, and then add some additional parking along the south side of Maine Street.

Mr. Norton said that he did not go out and conduct any type of in-depth analysis of obstructions in the way, and he does know that there is one or two fire hydrants along the south side, so

there is potential for that not being a good area for parking spaces directly in front of a fire hydrant.

Mr. Norton noted that although you won't get 20 to 30 parking spaces along that area, there is a potential for additional parking spaces using existing pavement, which would be a very low impact change with some possible erratic pavement markings. He said you could reflect what is shown on the north side of Main Street where there is some parking there.

Town Manager Ephrem Paraschak said that staff took a stab at this when MDOT came through, so it was too late in the process to make changes. He said that he, former Public Works Director Robert Burns and Terry Deering went out and evaluated this years ago. Regarding the thought process, Mr. Paraschak shared that the Town gets a lot of complaints of people speeding down the hill, including big trucks speeding 35+ mph through the village. He added that this could have the potential, besides added parking, to narrow the road. He further said that even when the turnpike spur is built, we probably still won't see a lot of right turns as a result of this, because people will take the bypass.

Mr. Norton said that what the Town has now is probably what the Town will have, unless there is a massive need for people to come through the center of Town heading west into Westbrook.

Councilor Siegel asked if the term "storage" was referring to parking spaces to which Mr. Norton said that storage, relating to a right turn lane, refers to a full width lane that people can stack up into to make a right hand turn, so storage is the length of the right turn lane, and the 75 feet is where it tapers from the turn lane back to a single lane.

Councilor Siegel asked if 175 feet was the minimum to which Mr. Norton said we'd likely go to a traffic engineer and get a head nod on what they think storage length would be and drop that down to 100 feet. Mr. Norton said that you don't want to reduce it in length such that you get stacking that impedes through-movement, so he reduced the storage to what he thought was minimal based on what he has seen. He said that anecdotally, staff have talked about that there is never more than a couple of cars making that right turn at a given time, but we'd like to get some actual counts just to confirm that the queuing length doesn't exceed that, but his guess is that we wouldn't exceed that.

A brief discussion ensued between Councilor Siegel and Mr. Norton regarding length per passenger vehicle.

Mr. Paraschak said that the photo exhibit provided is actually pretty helpful, because it caught a tractor trailer going through and making a right turn. He posed a procedural question for staff, asking how we word the standards that would be referred to the Town Council if we don't know where the stop and start points are to which Mr. Poirier suggested saying that we recommend that staff and the traffic engineer review the possibility of adding parking on State Street, and a reduction of the right queue lane so as to incorporate the minimum necessary and not impede traffic.

Mr. Poirier further said that maybe the standards could shrink up to 120 or 125 feet to pick up more parking spaces.

Mr. Poirier said that he thinks the most he has ever seen in the right turn lane is two or three cars daily. He said that this would pertain more so for when a tractor trailer queues there or a

car or two to which Mr. Paraschak said that it is more of a slip lane, if someone is taking a left and people are trying to go around them on the right to continue straight.

Councilor Shepard clarified that the first exhibit/aerial provided by staff is of State Street and not Main Street as it is labeled. Regarding the right turn lane, he said that it has always bugged him why there was a stop set back further as opposed to being located up closer to the crosswalk.

A discussion ensued in which Mr. Norton said that it could be closer to the crosswalk and Councilor Shepard said there was really no reason that was set back.

Mr. Norton said that the thru-left would need to stop further back from turning movements. He added that it likely couldn't get all the way up to the crosswalk as you would have to have an engineer do an auto turn analysis to determine right up to where it could go to, but he said that Councilor Shepard was correct. Mr. Norton said that his guess was that when the street was modeled, the left hand turning movement from South Street dragged the back wheels close enough so that they established the stop line back where they did.

A brief discussion ensued between Mr. Norton and Councilor Shepard regarding other right turn lane examples.

A discussion took place regarding making a right turn on red lights.

Councilor Shepard said he was not opposed to a no right turn onto Main Street on a red light sign for traffic traveling north on South Street through the village intersection.

Town Planner Carol Eyerman asked if we need to look at the traffic ordinance to add the ability to add parking there, because we have a list of streets where it is allowed to which Mr. Poirier said they are allowed on the other side of the road, but we can double check it.

Mr. Paraschak said that staff could just make the ordinance language change.

Regarding the topic of storage, Councilor Shepard said if we move the stop line down closer to the crosswalk, it could provide one additional parking space.

Mr. Poirier said we could also shrink the storage and have John Adams look at it, and we could pick up additional spaces.

Mr. Poirier then referred to the second exhibit provided by Mr. Norton in which he looked at Main Street, the section between Fort Hill Road and New Portland Road, for pedestrian facilities and on-street parking.

Mr. Norton said that without pulling out the CAD file, he started drawing in lines in an effort to try to figure out where we could slot some additional on-street parking. What he found and his recommendation was to not do it. He said that if you realize there are some left turn lanes on Main Street, like into Water Street where Burger King and the thrift store is, you have people making some of those movements. He said getting rid of the bidirectional turn lane in the middle, you could have a pavement width that could allow for some additional parking on one side of the road. He added that what happens is that vehicles end up having to meander down

Main Street to make room for those parking spaces, allowing for three or up to maybe five based on the drawings that he was doing.

Another consideration that Mr. Norton said he was told to take a look at was some pedestrian facilities. Based on the pavement width, he said there might be opportunity for bike lanes on Main Street, and he wanted to show in this image – what we show in our GIS as far as trail systems and how bike lanes came down Main Street, or some sort of additional pedestrian facility might enhance that movement heading from east to west.

Councilor Shepard asked how much pavement width were we talking about to which Mr. Norton said about three to five feet, depending on how much shoulder there was past the fog line, but he has seen them as minimal as three feet and as wide as eight feet.

A brief discussion ensued regarding pavement width and shared traffic lanes in which Mr. Norton said there were a couple of different ways in which this could be approached through the Uniform Traffic Control Design (UTCD), which included getting rid of the fog line, painting some of the bike symbology, and the fog line could be moved and painted green. As far as parking on Main Street, Mr. Norton said that he couldn't go out and recommend spending a lot of time shifting lanes north and south since there are some turn lanes in there that need to be accounted for.

Councilor Shepard stated that right now, bikes are basically sharing the travel lane to which Mr. Norton stated that was correct.

Councilor Siegel asked if we can shrink the lanes to 10 feet to which Mr. Norton said we'd have to research that. He said he knows you can shrink the lanes, and with that street being a 25 mph zone, there is probably a little more leniency on doing something like that. Mr. Norton added that he believes the bidirectional turn lane in the center is 14 feet wide as it is accounting for striping lanes and bidirectional turn lane that could inherently have opposing traffic coming into it – it is usually a pretty wide lane. He said we would want to take a look at traffic counts and truck traffic as we don't want to arbitrarily reduce things and end up with potential incidents of rubbing. He added that if there is a heavy commercial corridor, you end up with a lot of large trucks coming in and out, which is not the case in this intersection.

Mr. Norton said that if we did something like a defined bike lane, you would see the symbology exist on the pavement. He said that if we used the left turn lane such as on Water Street, you would have 11 feet, 12 feet, and 11 feet, which is the actual width of pavement there, so it is a shared lane.

Councilor Shepard said for the most part, he thinks a 10 foot lane could handle most traffic.

Mr. Norton said that we could even narrow it down to nine feet and most people would not likely even notice it until an 18 wheeler passes side by side.

Councilor Shepard said that if we reduced the lane down from 14 to 10 feet, and got rid of the fog line, you're probably maybe getting three feet.

Mr. Norton said to keep in mind that the minimum width for parking spaces is eight feet, so if you have to taper your traffic around that parking lane, that is eight feet of taper you would have to do and there is more you would have to do.

Mr. Paraschak asked the committee if it they would accept the recommendation that additional parking spaces on Main Street is not practical, being what we are going to gain for the amount of effort.

Mr. Paraschak also asked if any ordinance amendments need to take place to allow for future projects like bike lanes and things of that nature.

Mrs. Eyerman suggested having a look at our own ordinances regarding our street design standards and certain widths. She then gave the example of how the street widths were reduced in Topsham's village area so that the lane widths could be reduced, which had to be tweaked based on where it was in town rather than just all over, because they wanted to focus just on the village area.

Mr. Paraschak said he thinks this item originally started with the intent of determining how to make the village look more like a village, and how can we use things like parking and lane widths to do that. He said that he assumes that the committee is okay with staff still pursuing that, but we would have to do that behind the scenes with an engineer, and bring that back to the Town Council. He said that could just be paint. He added that in his mind, he would love to see an island in place of suicide lanes or something to break up Main Street, but that is probably beyond the scope of this committee. He asked the committee to think of other pedestrian/landscaping/road narrowing concepts to make the village look and feel more like a village, which could make the truck traffic seem like it's not there.

Mr. Paraschak asked to confirm if any ordinance changes were needed to which Mr. Poirier said – no.

Mrs. Eyerman said that staff was going to put together a complete streets policy, but MDOT and GPCOG have the complete streets policy so we may no longer need one.

Regarding the Fort Hill Road reference on the exhibit, Councilor Siegel asked Mr. Norton to explain why he stopped where he did to which Mr. Norton said that was the only area he was looking at. Councilor Siegel said he was wondering why Mr. Norton did not extend it into the trail system to which Mr. Norton said that he stopped where he had, because we had already looked at the parking west of South Street. Mr. Norton said that he was really just focusing on the portion before New Portland Road before he drew the green line on the pedestrian connectivity exhibit. Mr. Norton clarified that the white line on Fort Hill Road was a limit, and that there were arrows extending from the potential bike lanes.

Councilor Siegel said that he would love to see a reduction of shoulders from Cumberland Farms down to the limit line to which Councilor Shepard and Mr. Poirier said that that area had parking spaces. Councilor said the spaces are very large and rarely used, and what is happening now is they are a cheating lane so that when someone is turning left, other cars will drive into it.

Councilor Siegel said that if we are looking at greater bike lanes, one of the areas he would like to include is the intersection of Gray and Libby Road, because we have a protected bike lane in that area, which would stop people from cutting around and causing accidents. He further said that if protected bike lanes were put in just that one spot, it would stop people from being able to go into the shoulder, changing the design to prevent accidents.

Mr. Paraschak said that PACTS has a potential intersection improvement interest in that area as he believes that it does skirt the PACTS boundary.

Mr. Paraschak referred to the Zoning Map hung in the Conference Room and referred to the no parking area on Morrill Avenue from Ball Park to Access Road, and that the road was substantially wider in front of the high school. He asked if the committee had any thoughts with allowing on-street parking in that area. He added that 10 to 15 parking spots could be picked up in the area, which could help to alleviate the parking issue around the high school. A choke point could be when the buses come out.

Mr. Paraschak said that any changes would require an ordinance adjustment. He added that he has always looked at this road and thought it was pretty wide. He further said that the high school has a parking management problem, not a parking problem, but he cannot resolve that and it is usually in the spring when there are more kids that are picking up their licenses.

A discussion ensued regarding installing a “no parking from x hour to x hour” sign if needed.

Councilor Siegel was in support of putting some parking spaces in the as long as it would not impact anything at Robie Park.

Councilor Shepard was in support if the width would support the change.

A discussion ensued regarding parking in the Little Falls area near the new Red City Ale House. Mr. Paraschak said that the Villages Master Plan that was just done tried to emphasize more of a pedestrian feel. He said that there was a preliminary discussion with staff regarding parking on Gray Road, and if we can see it there, it will benefit the whole area.

Assistant Town Planner Damon Yakovleff said that a goal in the Little Falls Recreation Area is to encourage on-street parking for the food truck festival and other needs to which Mr. Paraschak said he thinks that section is allowed parking in the ordinance, and we just need to make the adjustments. Mr. Paraschak said that if we just narrow up lanes and shift things over, we could get a lot more parking there.

Mr. Poirier read aloud to the committee ordinance language that allowed two-hour parking between two specific CMP poles.

Regarding the westerly side/Public Works side of Gray Road – the Huston Road Extension to the bridge in an area deemed appropriate by the engineer, Mr. Paraschak asked if the committee was okay with allowing on-street parking.

Councilor Shepard said he would go from Tow Path Road.

Mr. Paraschak said you could still have parking with a mirror over the white line and be parked illegally to which Councilor Shepard said – yes, technically.

Mr. Paraschak said if the committee or Council allows on-street parking from Tow Path Road northerly, people could still be parked illegally if they are being negligent.

A discussion ensued regarding two-hour parking signage in the area.

Mr. Poirier said the language currently identifies two different standards, and he would recommend going with one standard.

Councilor Siegel recommended implementing a two-hour standard for local businesses to support their patron turnover. He added that he is good with parking there as it sounds like it is already allowed.

Mr. Poirier said that the entire length of Morrill Avenue allows on-street parking for one hour.

Mr. Paraschak asked if the committee was okay with allowing parking from Access Road to South Street, and alternately designating Access Road to Douglas Circle as no parking.

Councilor Shepard suggested allowing one-hour parking from 7am to 4pm on Access Road to Douglas Circle, and pulling the inaccurate signs on Access Road to South Street.

Based on a request from Public Works where they just rebuilt Middle Jam Road, Mr. Poirier said that they want to add to the list that food trucks are not allowed on this road.

Councilor Siegel said he was good with that because Middle Jam Road is a cut-through.

Mr. Norton said that where it was just rebuilt and repaved, it could be very enticing, but it is very narrow at times and has substandard curbs. He further said that we are already working with Standish to get the road posted for trucks as well so that both towns can be in agreement.

Mr. Paraschak asked the committee if they have any thoughts on the recently rebuilt Great Falls Road that runs between Route 237 and North Gorham Road. He said that up until a couple of years ago, it was probably one of the worst roads in Gorham.

Councilor Shepard said you could post it as no-thru for trucks, but then you have to figure out how to enforce it. He further said that Flaggy Meadows has a similar issue as it is posted as no-thru road for trucks with three axles.

Mr. Paraschak said that businesses pay more in taxes, but it is proven that heavy trucks exponentially damage roads more than commuter cars.

A discussion ensued regarding enforcing no thru trucks with three/four/five axles.

Mr. Paraschak that he could talk to all Councilors regarding the proposed changes to the ordinance for Middle Jam Road to see if any would sponsor an item to talk about the whole Town.

Regarding no thru trucks on State Street, Councilor Shepard said that the only way they are going to get there is to go down to North Gorham Road, but they won't be able to make the turn because of the pole there.

Regarding that intersection, Mr. Paraschak said that at some point we'll need to talk to the landowners there to find out who owns what.

A motion was MADE by Councilor Shepard, SECONDED by Councilor Siegel, and VOTED to send the discussed changes on Morrill Avenue, Gray Road and State Street, and adding Middle Jam as

a no-thru for trucks in the ordinance to the Town Council for their review and consideration. Unanimous vote.

Regarding off-street parking, Mr. Poirier said he would provide more information at the next meeting.

- B. Review amending the Town's Storm Water Ordinance as outlined in memos from staff, to bring the Town into better compliance with Clean Water Act and municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit, and send recommendations back to the Town Council (referred by the Town Council on May 2, 2023).

Mr. Yakovleff shared that the Town is subject to the stormwater permit that was last issued in July 2022. He said there are four ordinance changes of which three were due by July 2023, so the Town is overdue. He said the other change we are not talking about today to keep on the radar is the LID (Low Impact Development) ordinance for construction, which has been appealed. He added that after November, we will have more direction so stay tuned for that.

Regarding the first two ordinance changes, Mr. Yakovleff said they are quite simple – they create a set deadline for follow up on deficiencies where before it was vague, so the new language is more specific and less vague. He said for example, there is a 60-day deadline when there is some kind of elicit discharge, so you have 60 days to correct it or by an expeditious schedule to fix it.

Mr. Poirier said that because the Town is an urbanized area as identified by the MDEP, the Town is required to adopt these ordinances and what is before the committee are the proposed changes to the ordinances, which have been dictated to us as changes that are needed.

Councilor Siegel asked if the changes were required by law to which Mr. Yakovleff said – yes, the first two ordinance changes were.

Mr. Yakovleff said the third ordinance change was with regard to erosion control, and that Mr. Norton put that language together.

Mr. Norton said, unlike the first two changes previously discussed, this change entails the addition of a third chapter. He said that as required by the permit, the permittee needs to implement an ordinance or other regulatory mechanism that requires the use of an erosion or sedimentation control BMP or best management practice at construction sites consistent with the minimum standards outlined in the appendix C of the general permit. He noted this is in addition of chapter 3 that shows what is necessary for erosion/sedimentation control at construction sites. He said that this is going to require, based on the square footage of a disturbed area, an applicant to submit an E & S [erosion and sedimentation] plan. He further said that unlike now, he doesn't believe we require an actual plan for some of these developments, they would be required to submit an actual plan, and this chapter 3 outlines exactly what is needed, including a professional engineer's stamped set of plans for E & S control.

Mr. Paraschak asked if this would be required for all construction to which Mr. Norton said that it would be required for all construction that results in one or more acres of disturbed area, or more than 10,000 square feet of new or redeveloped impervious area.

A brief discussion ensued regarding examples of a disturbed area.



Councilor Siegel asked how the map is determined to which Mr. Poirier said via Census data.

Mr. Yakovleff said it was a federally-determined area and Mr. Paraschak said that the Census data and map are reevaluated every 10 years.

A discussion ensued regarding the map displayed reflecting all areas governed by the ordinance.

Mr. Yakovleff said that the new area will be the 2027 permit since they didn't have the data in time for the 2022 permit, so the new map will reflect different areas for the next permit.

Mr. Norton said that the proposed ordinances are pretty bare bones, and were modeled after what the City of Saco does. He further said that he sent the proposed ordinances to the MDEP and received back feedback with no big red flags.

Regarding the fourth item that this committee will review at another meeting, Mr. Paraschak said he understands that part of the contention is that it is pushing more on the municipalities with more specifics in their ordinance, where we have a little bit more of a free range here with regard to the language. He further said that Gorham, Scarborough, Westbrook, Saco and Biddeford identified bare minimums are required for permits, which is what staff are proposing for our ordinance, because we are not LID experts; we rely on the MDEPT for that and have been pushing back on the MDEP to say that they need to tell us what are requirements are and we'll put them in our ordinance. He said that the MDEP accepted that, and they are looking to re-write chapter 500 to incorporate the LID requirements as part of it, and then the Town could look to adopt it. He further said that the Town is in lock-step with the MDEP now since our ordinance language was approved by them.

Mr. Poirier said that the Friends of Casco Bay think we need to do above and beyond the permit requirements and they are appealing the MDEP's decision.

Mr. Yakovleff said the hearing is scheduled for November 7, 2023.

A motion was MADE by Councilor Siegel, SECONDED by Councilor Shepard, and VOTED to send the three ordinance changes to the Town Council for their review and consideration.  
Unanimous.

- C. Discuss Aquifer Protection Zones, and send recommendations back to the Town Council (referred by the Town Council on March 7, 2023).

Regarding this item, Mr. Poirier said that we don't need to act on it. He wanted to the committee to know that he has reached out the MDEP to let them know that we are thinking about having an aquifer protection zone, and to get their guidance and recommendation on which aquifers we should do in Gorham, and he has not heard back. He is hoping that they provide a recommendation that the committee can review.

Mr. Paraschak cautioned the committee that "protected" could be a very ranging word that he would want the committee to be aware of. He said that recommendations and/or policies of other municipalities are all over the place. He added that the protection would be more for large chemical spills, storage tanks and things that could really damage the water supply.

Mr. Yakovleff said the protection would be more proactive against things could pollute an aquifer.

The committee members said they would table this item for discussion at a future meeting.

- D. Review increasing the minimum square footage exemption for a fire suppression system from 400 to 800 square feet and report back to the Town Council with a recommendation (referred by the Town Council on March 7, 2023).

Mr. Paraschak said the history was that Gorham has had a fire suppression system ordinance since 1987, which had varying degrees of requiring fire suppression systems from sprinklers to hydrants in neighborhoods to fire ponds. He further said that the Council four years ago passed a law that all residential properties be sprinkled, and commercial businesses under 10,000 square feet have a small system. He said that the thought process of the Council at the time was reducing the long term costs for fire rescue services and also using it as a growth management tool. He said the Council added an exemption about a year ago for tiny homes, and Councilor Siegel back in March sponsored this item to help put this in alignment with our current ADUs (accessory dwelling units).

Councilor Siegel said that if that ADUs are detached and not connected to a property, we don't ask them to be sprinkled to which Fire Chief Ken Fickett said that there is no language in the ordinance currently requiring detached ADUs to be sprinkled.

Chief Fickett said that if a house is not sprinkled now, and it has an attached ADU, then the ADU is required to be sprinkled.

Mr. Paraschak said that there is a provision in the ordinance that is based in the house's value or assessment in which you have a \$600,000 home and you attach a \$100,000 ADU, and the home is not currently sprinkled, the Town would make you sprinkle it, whereas if you build an 800 square foot tiny home behind your house on your property, currently the language requires that ADU to be sprinkled, because it is over the 450 square footage requirement.

Councilor Siegel said he is hoping to reduce this barrier a little bit, which he is aware will reduce safety in the long run, but it allows for better balance.

Mr. Paraschak asked where else this would apply in Gorham.

Chief Fickett said there has been some interest in ADUs.

Mr. Paraschak asked if there is a scenario in Gorham where we envision 800 square foot homes being built in a subdivision, not ADUs, where right wrong or indifferent – a developer would use the square foot mechanism to build houses slightly smaller to circumvent the fire suppression system ordinance.

Mr. Poirier said he thinks it is important to note that if you did an 800 square foot modular house that was being delivered, it is exempt from the ordinance – no matter the size.

Mr. Paraschak said this was because the state preempted the Town although they may not have known that the preempted the Town.

Councilor Shepard asked what the pros and cons were to which Chief Fickett said that an 800 square foot home by itself should be sprinkled, because everyone else is required; tiny homes and modular homes are exempt.

Councilor Siegel said that if we open up the restrictions just a little bit, it lessens the hurdle and cost for something that no one is using.

Mr. Paraschak asked if there was a way to define it as it has to be an accessory dwelling to which Mr. Poirier said it could be done.

A brief discussion ensued regarding building, utility and service requirements for a separately-built 800 square foot ADU and how to adjust the language to incorporate the proposed ordinance change.

Councilor Siegel said he is not trying to make our town unsafe, but just have somewhat of a balance.

A motion was MADE by Councilor Siegel, SECONDED by Councilor Shepard, and VOTED to ask staff to bring back the adjusted ordinance with the changes discussed for review at the next meeting. Unanimous.

3. **Items Referred for Future Meetings/Action**

- A. Explore a vernal pool transfer program consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan (referred by the Town Council on August 2, 2022).
- B. Review zoning in the Gorham Village Districts to increase economic development (referred by the Town Council on February 7, 2023).
- C. Review municipal ordinances that would restrict access of dogs on public athletic fields, and send recommendations back to the Town Council (referred by Town Council on June 6, 2023). Mr. Paraschak said that Chief Fickett can be invited, and staff will provide real-world examples.

4. **Other Business**

Councilor Siegel said that parking maximums was an item that was he had been thinking about.

Mr. Poirier said that he if was going to do parking maximums, he would limit it to just the village area. He asked why we would care about parking maximums in the rural area if someone builds more parking than they need.

Councilor Siegel said he also supports with sticking with parking maximums in the urban areas.

Mr. Paraschak said that perhaps staff could reach out to Windham to find out how they did the calculation to determine the number of parking spaces that would be needed.

Mrs. Eyerman said we have a section of our ordinance that allows for alternative parking on-street as long as data can be provided.

Councilor Siegel said he was looking at how Gorham Savings Bank in the village has a very large parking lot that is always empty.

A discussion ensued regarding how banking trends have changes so less people are going into a local bank.

Mr. Paraschak suggested a discussion for the next meeting could be how we find a matrix or ordinance change that can allow for all those different types of businesses and residential uses, because some require a little bit more and some less.

Councilor Siegel said that in terms of revenue for businesses downtown, so many lots are underutilized.

5. **Schedule next meeting and discuss agenda items for next meeting.**

The next meeting of the committee is scheduled for Monday, September 18, 2023 at 8:30 a.m. in Conference Room A. The following items will be discussed:

- A. Review revising parking ordinances and forward any recommendations to the Town Council for Consideration (referred by Ordinance Committee on January 17, 2023).
- B. Discuss Aquifer Protection Zones, and send recommendations back to the Town Council (referred by the Town Council on March 7, 2023).
- C. Review increasing the minimum square footage exemption for a fire suppression system from 400 to 800 square feet and report back to the Town Council with a recommendation (referred by the Town Council on March 7, 2023).
- D. Explore a vernal pool transfer program consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan (referred by the Town Council on August 2, 2022).
- E. Review municipal ordinances that would restrict access of dogs on public athletic fields, and send recommendations back to the Town Council (referred by Town Council on June 6, 2023).

5. **Adjournment**

There being no further business, a motion was MADE by Councilor Siegel and SECONDED by Councilor Shepard and VOTED to adjourn. Time of adjournment: 10:00 am.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jessica Hughes, Executive Assistant