Vassalboro Planning Board Minutes August 2, 2022 Vassalboro Town Office 7:00 P.M.

Board Members Present: Ginny Bracket, Chair, Doug Phillips, Marianne Stevens and Paul Mitnik

Staff: Ryan Page, CEO, LPI, BI, AO

Public: Rosalind Waldron, Kimberly Leblanc, Ransford Bubar, Andrew Cousins, Jenna Pigney,

Ryan Nored and Mike Poulin

1) July 12, 2022 Minutes

<u>√</u> Approve	Motion by:	Seconded By:	<u>√</u> Approved;
Deny	D. Phillips	M. Stevens	4-0

Minutes were approved after 2 corrections were made.

2) Applicants

a) Rosalind Waldron

Minor Site Plan Review

991 Main St

Map 23 Lot 5-1

Single Provider Medical Office – New Business

Completeness

<u>√</u> Approve	Motion by:	Seconded By:	<u>√</u> Approved;
Deny	P. Mitnik	D. Phillips	4-0

Discussion: Ms. Bracket open the conversation with some clarifying questions. First she ask about the location of the proposed structure and the driveway dimensions. Next, Ms. Bracket questioned the length of the parking spaces. She then asked what the distance from the proposed structure to the proposed parking lot. Ms. Waldron explained that the current paved area would be extended to the new paved area which would be the parking. She further explained that the changes would create a separate entrance and exit to the property. Ms. Bracket asked the overall length of the parking area and Ms. Waldron stated, the parking area would be 75' x 17'. Mrs. Stevens added map 2 showed the details of the parking. Ms. Bracket then questioned the sign locations, in which Ms. Waldron stated there would small entrance and exit signs with low voltage lighting and a business sign will be 24" x 30" with low voltage ground mounted lights. Mr. Mitnik asked what the proposed hour of operation and Ms. Waldron replied that she tries to accommodate her patient's schedules and the hours could be as early as 8:00 am and as late as 6:00 pm. Mr. Mitnik asked about the vegetation on the backside of the property. Ms. Waldron replied that it used to be a horse pasture and that it would remain the same being mowed once maybe twice a year. Ms. Bracket began reviewing the requirements of the maps. The Board confirmed that all the required items were identified on the maps.

Performance Standards

Standard 1	The provisions for vehicular loading and unloading and parking and for vehicular and pedestrian circulation on the site and onto adjacent public streets and ways will create no hazards to safety. Finding: Existing circular will be used. New paving will be added away from the street to provide more access. The parking lot will consist of 7 parking spaces. Maine DOT driveway entrance permit must be obtained for this project.				
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	D. Phillips	M. Stevens		
Standard 2	The location or height of proposed structures and the proposed uses thereof will not				
	be detrimental to other public or private development in the neighborhood.				
	Finding: A 60' x 14' single story structure will be added. The structure will provide				
	handicap access.				
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	M. Stevens	P. Mitnik		

Standard 3					
	properties from detrimental features of the development.				
	Finding: The site near the road will be maintained as a lawn with vari				
	The field on the backs	side will be mowed	l seasonally.		
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	D. Phillips	M. Stevens		
Standard 4	The proposed use will	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	burdens so as to exc	ceed the capacity of the	
	1 ' '	•		otection, or other public	
	facilities.	worm arams, water,	, some traste, me pre	receiver, or other public	
	Finding: Not expecte	d to exceed 6-8 vis	its a day 5 days a w	eek and 3 nart-time	
			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	vith no food prep on-site.	
	Structure will be con			nen no rood prep on site.	
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	√ Approved; 4-0	
				<u>v</u> Approved, 4-0	
Clarita de	Not Met	P. Mitnik	M. Stevens		
Standard 5	The Site Plan provides				
	adequately drained fr		adverse impact on o	other property or	
	publicly-owned draina	• ,			
				to abutting properties.	
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	P. Mitnik	D. Phillips		
Standard 6		•		water and surface water	
	shall be prevented. Gi	round water shall n	ot be adversely impa	acted in quality or	
	quantity.				
	Finding: Project will I	have minimal earth	work. Soil erosion	is not anticipated.	
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	M. Stevens	D. Phillips		
Standard 7	The provisions for ext	erior lighting do no	t create hazards to n	notorists traveling on	
	adjacent public street	s and are adequate	for the safety of occ	cupants or users of the	
	site and such provisio	ns will not damage	the value and dimini	ish the usability of	
	adjacent properties.	_		·	
	Finding: Sign illumina	ation will be directe	ed at signs and will r	not affect motorist.	
	Structure and sign lig		-		
	provide adequate cover for abutting properties. Light will be facing downward.				
			í -	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	M. Stevens	P. Mitnik		
Standard 8	 	!		his financial capability to	
Standard	complete the develop		ovided evidence or	ms maneral capability to	
	Finding: Adequate fit	•	provided.		
	_√_Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	√ Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	D. Phillips	M. Stevens	_ <u>v_</u> Approved, 4 0	
Standard 9	 	•	1	l will provide adequate	
Stallualu 9			•	d will provide adequate	
	access for emergency		_	on the site.	
			ea.		
1	Finding: Adequate ac	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	<u>√</u> Met Not Met	Motion by: D. Phillips	Seconded by: P. Mitnik		
Standard 10	Not Met Not Met The proposed develop	Motion by: D. Phillips oment will not adve	Seconded by: P. Mitnik ersely affect the use a	and enjoyment of abutting	
Standard 10	<u>√</u> Met Not Met	Motion by: D. Phillips oment will not adve	Seconded by: P. Mitnik ersely affect the use a	and enjoyment of abutting	
Standard 10	✓ Met Not Met The proposed develop property as a result of Finding: Proposed de	Motion by: D. Phillips ment will not adve f noise, vibrations, fevelopment will no	Seconded by: P. Mitnik ersely affect the use a fumes, odor, dust, gl produce noise, fum	and enjoyment of abutting are, or other cause. es, etc No more than 2	
Standard 10	✓ Met Not Met The proposed develop property as a result of Finding: Proposed de	Motion by: D. Phillips ment will not adve f noise, vibrations, fevelopment will no	Seconded by: P. Mitnik ersely affect the use a fumes, odor, dust, gl produce noise, fum	and enjoyment of abutting are, or other cause.	
Standard 10	✓ Met Not Met The proposed develop property as a result of Finding: Proposed de	Motion by: D. Phillips ment will not adve f noise, vibrations, fevelopment will no ith families will be	Seconded by: P. Mitnik rsely affect the use a fumes, odor, dust, gl produce noise, fum at the site, resulting	and enjoyment of abutting are, or other cause. es, etc No more than 2	
Standard 10	✓ Met Not Met Not Met The proposed develor property as a result of Finding: Proposed defindividual patients with the proposed desindividual patients with the proposed developed and the	Motion by: D. Phillips ment will not adve f noise, vibrations, fevelopment will no ith families will be	Seconded by: P. Mitnik rsely affect the use a fumes, odor, dust, gl produce noise, fum at the site, resulting	and enjoyment of abutting are, or other cause. es, etc No more than 2	

	Not Met	P. Mitnik		M. Stevens
Project Appro	oval			
<u>√</u> Approve	Motion by:	Seconded By:	<u>√</u> Appr	roved; 4-0
Deny	M. Stevens	P. Mitnik		

b) Kimberly LeBlanc

Minor Site Plan Review

17 Main St

Map 11 Lot 74

Doggy Daycare - New Business

Completeness

<u>√</u> Approve	Motion by:	Seconded By:	<u>√</u> Approved;
Denv	D. Phillips	P. Mitnik	4-0

Discussion: Ms. Bracket started the conversation by asking if she is the property owner. Ms. Leblanc stated that she does not own the property. She does have an agreement to with her mother to start the development. Ms. Bracket confirmed the location of the mobile home, garage and septic field as shown on the map. There will be no new structures added to the property. One half of the garage will be converted into housing for the dogs with individual kennels. The dog will be leashed while be transported from the garage location to the fenced in play area. Mr. Mitnik asked if there is any State licensing requirements for this particular daycare. Ms. Leblanc informed the Board that she is currently under the limit for licensed boarding but does have the State application if she where to expand. Ms. Bracket confirmed the fenced in area consisted of 150' around and the smaller area is 40' around. Ms. Bracket continued to ask the pick-up and drop-off procedures. Ms. Leblanc explained that vehicles will enter in one side of the u-shaped driveway and exit through the other. Mrs. Stevens asked how close the road was to the fenced in areas and Ms. LeBlanc responded 15'. Ms. Bracket also confirmed that Ms. LeBlanc will use a black-out fencing along the road to provide comfort for the dogs and screening from abutters. Ms. Bracket wrapped up the opening discussion by identifying all required items on the site plan map.

Performance Standards

Standard 1	The provisions for vehicular loading and unloading and parking and for vehicular and				
	pedestrian circulation on the site and onto adjacent public streets and ways will create				
	no hazards to safety.				
	Finding: The driveway is circular with an entrance and exit. Maximum of 10 cars to				
	be expected. Drivew	ay will adequately	handle the traffic flo	ow.	
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	D. Phillips	M. Stevens		
Standard 2	The location or height	of proposed struct	ures and the propos	ed uses thereof will not	
	be detrimental to oth	er public or private	development in the	neighborhood.	
	Finding: The existing	structure currently	has no impact.		
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	M. Stevens	D. Phillips		
Standard 3	The provision for on-s	ite landscaping pro	vides adequate prot	ection to neighboring	
	properties from detri	mental features of t	he development.		
	Finding: The property	y is currently scree	ned adequately.		
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	P. Mitnik	M. Stevens		
Standard 4	1 ' '	•		ceed the capacity of the	
	sewers, sanitary and storm drains, water, solid waste, fire protection, or other public facilities. Finding: Dog feces will be properly store while on site and properly disposed of at				
	the Town's Transfer S	Station.			
		Motion by:	Seconded by:	√ Approved; 4-0	

	Not Met	M. Stevens	P. Mitnik		
Standard 5	The Site Plan provides sufficient information to show that storm water will be				
	adequately drained from the site with no adverse impact on other property or				
	publicly-owned drainage systems.				
	Finding: Proposed ex	isting property has	no adverse impact	on other properties.	
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	M. Stevens	D. Phillips		
Standard 6	Soil erosion and all oth	her adverse impacts	s on the soil ground	water and surface water	
	shall be prevented. Gr	ound water shall no	ot be adversely impa	cted in quality or	
	quantity.				
	Finding: Project will h	nave no earth work	accomplished.		
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	P. Mitnik	D. Phillips		
Standard 7	The provisions for exte	erior lighting do not	t create hazards to m	notorists traveling on	
	adjacent public streets	s and are adequate	for the safety of occ	upants or users of the	
	site and such provision	ns will not damage	the value and dimini	sh the usability of	
	adjacent properties.				
	Finding: Existing light	ing will not create	a safety hazard.		
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	M. Stevens	P. Mitnik		
Standard 8	An applicant for Site P	lan approval has pr	ovided evidence of h	nis financial capability to	
	complete the develop	ment as planned.			
	Finding: Use of existi	ng structure, minin	nal financial develop	ment.	
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	D. Phillips	M. Stevens		
Standard 9	The proposed develop	ment will not creat	e safety hazards and	l will provide adequate	
	access for emergency	vehicles to the site	, and to all buildings	on the site.	
	Finding: Adequate ac	cess will be provid	ed.		
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	P. Mitnik	M. Stevens		
Standard 10	The proposed develop	ment will not adve	rsely affect the use a	and enjoyment of abutting	
	property as a result of	noise, vibrations, f	umes, odor, dust, gla	are, or other cause.	
	Finding: The Board m	entioned the risk o	of having barking do	gs and creating a noise	
	complaint. Applicant said if this situation arises, the dog will be place inside in a			I be place inside in a	
	kennel. Amended mo	ption to include ho	urs of operation will	be 7:00 am to 7:00 pm.	
	<u>√</u> Met	Motion by:	Seconded by:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0	
	Not Met	D. Phillips	M. Stevens		

Project Approval

, , , , ,			
<u>√</u> Approve	Motion by:	Seconded By:	<u>√</u> Approved; 4-0
Deny	D. Phillips	M. Stevens	

c) Andrew Cousins and Jenna Pigney **Shoreland Zoning Application** 11 Cote Rd.

Map 5 Lot 122-1

Install Foundation Under Existing Structure

Discussion: Ms. Bracket started the conversation by asking applicants to explain the project. Ms. Pigney stated that the plan was to remove the current wooden post foundation and replace with a concrete foundation. She explained the current location of the structure is on a slope and a more permanent foundation would eliminate the camp from moving again. Ms. Bracket commented that proper drainage around the foundation would also aid in removing runoff around the structure. Mr. Mitnik added that they may have a drainage problem and proper land contour would be critical in

successfully maintaining the integrity of the foundation. He also stated moving the camp back is not possible due to land contours and a heavily wood area behind the camp. Mr. Cousins, added the existing deck would be removed and replaced with the same square footage. Mr. Mitnik added his concerns about the framing. He advised the applicants that they may have a bigger project if the framing is not adequate. Mr. Page clarified the applicants are removing the deck and Mr. Mitnik added that they have 18 months from when it is removed to replace it. Mrs. Stevens voiced her concern with the structure being 44' from the high water mark. Ms. Bracket stated the holding tank would prevent moving the structure back to 100' mark. Mr. Mitnik also stated the contour of the land prevents moving the structure. Mr. Mitnik also identified the property was heavily wood and it would create a negative environmental impact. Ms. Pigney stated that they were willing to plant new vegetation to help reduce the impact.

Project Approval

<u>√</u> Approve	Motion by:	Seconded By:	<u>√</u> Approved;
Deny	P. Mitnik	D. Phillips	4-0

Discussion: Mrs. Stevens stated the deck has to be replaced within 18 months with no dimensional changes or they would have to return to the Planning Board.

3) CEO Report –Mr. Phillips had request time to discuss a Site Review Application revision. He stated that with recent applications and frequently asked questions that are not addressed in the performance standards, it was time to revise the Site Review Application. He specifically mentioned answering "N/A" (Non-Applicable) on a performance standard question and applicants requiring State licensing to accomplish their job. Mr. Phillips stated that his purpose was not to make immediate changes but to take some time to and make necessary changes that would be best for the Town and less confusing to future applicants. The Board collective agreed that site plans need to be more accurate and have greater detail. Mr. Mitnik stated that bigger projects may require engineered drawings for better accuracy. Ms. Bracket questioned how to determine the price point at which they require engineered drawings. She further explained that they could establish that between a minor or major project. Mr. Phillips closed this topic by tabling for next meeting in order for the Board Members to compile a list of possible changes. Ms. Bracket opened the next conversation asking if the Town needed to have an ordinance for solar arrays or could it be addressed in an updated Site Review Ordinance. She stated that solar arrays are based on land use and do not necessarily need a specific ordinance. Mr. Phillips added that the residents have requested through the Select Board that the Town have a solar ordinance. Next, Mr Phillips provided the Board Members a copy of the Planning Board Rules. Mr. Phillips stated that between 1957 and 1971 if a Planning Board was created it would be governed by MSRA 30 Section 4952. In 1971 the Legislator repelled the planning and zoning sections of that title. Giving the Towns the option of home rule and author their own Rules of Order. Mr. Phillips also stated that they also allowed a town to continue under those guidelines of the original title. Mr. Phillips was not able to discover when the Vassalboro Planning Board was established, however he did find a document showing Nikki Shad, the Town Clerk had certified a letter stating the Planning Board was created in 1958. Mr. Phillips was unable to find any documentation changing the Planning Board from a 5 member board, 2 alternates and 5 year term to its current 5 member, 1 alternate and 2 year term. The question Mr. Phillips presented to the other members was that if they do have rules in place, why they are not being followed. Ms. Stevens and Mr. Mitnik stated they were unaware the rules existed. The Board agreed that more research was necessary to see when the changes may have occurred. Mr. Phillips ended the conversation with the suggestion to the Board that they purchase the Planning Board manual from Maine Municipal Association (MMA). Ms. Bracket recapped a list of follow-up items that she wanted the Board members to consider between meetings. She stated, wording in the Site Review Application such as, a more detailed narrative about the new business, i.e., business hours, licensing and specific work being performed on a daily basis.

Meeting adjourn at 9:26 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan Page, CEO, LPI, BI, AO