

IPTV

- 00;00;05;12 Uh, welcome to the Wednesday, January 13, 2021. I'm playing board meeting for the town of Raymond, um, report does have require, but I do not anticipate any, um, votes this evening. So I'm going to dispense with a lot of normal reading of the introductions. Um, so to start off with, uh, there is a workshop, um, we do have a budget ordinances to go true to start with. I'd like to thank both Alex and Jim for putting all this together for us. I
- 00;00;36;21 know it was a heck of a lot of work, um, and it makes our job a lot easier, um, when it comes down to time to reviewing ordinances. And also just so thanks guys. And then just take a moment, um, on your screen is Tom Hennessy, Tom, um, was interested in the zoning board of appeals, but there's no, um, they have a full board right now and we do have an opening. So, um, I asked Tom to join us this evening and kind of watch it and see
- 00;01;08;04 what we do. It's not, uh, for Thomas, this is not kind of a normal meeting and that we're not looking at reviewing a project. Um, but just for kind of review half of our job, or maybe a third of our job is also prepping ordinances for the town meetings. Um, so there's two kind of funnels in the town. The financial stuff goes through the financial reward and all the ordinance work goes through the planning board. Um, so sometimes we're
- 00;01;35;23 looking at things that are not directly related to, um, planning issues, but if it's an ordinance change or request that comes through the planning board tonight, and we do not have any, any reviews, any our projects review, but we do have a list of ordinances. This is kind of an annual thing that we start working on, um, months ago.
- 00;01;58;23 And we kind of build a list, um, usually derive from what, um, Alex or Jim sees his problems in the ordinance or the board runs into problems and interpretations. Um, so one more thing, just so that you'd know what you're getting yourself into the plan, we kind of view projects based upon the ordinances ordinance work is kind of important to us. Um, but we do not kind of make decisions based upon what the community kind of say once on a particular project, our decisions have to be based upon what
- 00;02;33;17 the ordinance is, tell us we can and cannot do. Um, so with that, I think Jim you've changed our order of events here. We can't hear you, Jen, Jen you're muted.
- 00;02;56;03 Jimmy, where are you? I'm still married to Jim, Jim, you, you reviewed it yourself.
- 00;03;11;17 Mine's un-muted there. You're good. Now I didn't touch it. Swear to God. Um, I did change the order a little bit to kind of pack it these up together in kind of topics to help us kind of go through. Um, so road backlog, driveway, both kind of

IPTV

deal with street and road construction standards. Uh, those are the first two that we're going to look at. And I think the road section is the first piece of your packet. Um, the biggest issue we have there is when we were doing a backlot, uh, development

00;03;42;14 recently, we realized we had contradictory terms in our ordinances with road and street. Um, road had a different connotation as to what it is versus a street. Everything in our ordinance from a design practice uses the term street road, I think is just a term that's been in that ordinance for a long time.

00;04;03;22 Um, and so where it's deeply delved into the ordinance, uh, what we decided to do was, um, strike it out into the backlot section, um, where w that was one area that we noted that it was in, but there was several others. And rather than, you know, like we always try to do is find every little road definition we defined road. And, um, if you scroll down through it, you'll see what we came up with a term commonly used to describe a route or attract consisting of a bit of exposed middle soil, gravel,

00;04;35;01 asphalt, or other servicing materials constructed for created by the repeated passage of motorized vehicles. The term shall also include undereducated road that are describing a recorded document. The term road shall not include those ways that have been discontinued or abandoned for the purposes of the town of Raymond land use ordinances for road must comply with the state who set forth under the definition of street to be utilized for accessible lot frontage or street front. Um, again, that's because we have, uh, ensure land zoning and throughout

00;05;07;17 the, or all our ordinances, we've got these little nuances and changes in the definition. This kind of makes it all come back. This will be the consistent, we want to put this in all the subdivision ordinance, shoreline zoning orders, the site plan ordinance, so that it is consistent throughout those ordinances. And in the event that road is defined somewhere in some performance standard. This sets it back to the basic of the definition. So that essentially when somebody uses the term road or purposes of design,

00;05;38;07 they are really implying street. And then they go into the street standards and street ordinance for how to construct and what you would accept a four viable street frontage or online frontage. Yeah. Any questions on that one? That's I think that one's a little straightforward. My description might've been long, but I think it's pretty straightforward what we're trying to do here.

00;06;02;05 Great. Kevin looks good to me.

00;06;06;16 Okay. The next piece, which unfortunately in your packet is I think, closer to the end. Let's see if I can find the page for you.

00;06;15;06 Yeah. Just what, what, uh,

IPTV

- 00;06;21;24 It's uh, it'd be the backlog ordinance, uh, the road Terminus, private road, Terminus and backlot driveway.
- 00;06;30;14 Okay.
- 00;06;32;17 No parking sign on it. Yep.
- 00;06;35;20 Okay.
- 00;06;38;11 Was trying to pull it off myself here. Um, again, what we found with that is working with the fire department. Um, we found that our standard in our ordinance doesn't really work that great for the fire department, as far as being able to turn a bird and see vehicles around. So one of the things we want to do is make sure that that geometric, uh, configuration works for Trinny, fire trucks around, um, what the equipment is we have today. The other piece of that, that we've run into over and
- 00;07;09;24 over again, is people illegally parking in these turnarounds or using them for temporary or permanent parking, lots for boats or whatever. Um, that's not the case. So we've, if this, if it's not signed that nobody can take any enforcement action. So by the fire department requesting the sign that you see there, uh, that enables them to take some action in the event that they respond and they have to move something, they have the authority to do such. Um, the only thing, uh, within that is too, is there's some descriptions
- 00;07;41;19 about, um, street and, and break angles. And that all makes perfect sense from a design practice. The only item in here that we need to have some discussion about is under, um, summary of changes. One E a Roman numeral four street grade shall not exceed 10 degrees along the entire length under our backlog driveway provisions standards that we have. Now, we do allow,
- 00;08;08;28 um, the road slope street, I said, road, um, violation the street grade, uh, is allowed to go up to 12%. Um, but they are discussing here is, uh, under their provisions. They're not supposed to go up anything over 10%. Um, I think there's some compromise in here that we may be able to look at. Um, we haven't gone into that yet. I wanted to get some feedback from the board and let way maybe describe what his concerns are as well.
- 00;08;38;17 Um, if it is a practical thing that the fire department can't do want an extended lengthy run, uh, we have a lot of properties in town that have excessive slopes and access issues. Um, there may be a way that we come up with maybe a waiver criteria under this that allows for short sections to exceed 10% up to 12%, as long as we look at very carefully, some safety criteria that will affect the, um, maneuverability of the emergency vehicles or firetrucks. So I don't know if Wayne, you want to say
- 00;09;11;14 anything to that, or whether they, the board members want to have any opinions or questions or concerns.

IPTV

- 00;09;18;21 Wayne, is this an ordinance? Is this a direction, a directive out of the fires manual? You're amuse land.
- 00;09;30;00 Okay. There you go. Can you hear me now? Yeah, it is one of them. It is the standard, um, for fire department access where this 10% grade comes from. That's the standard that, that we work with the national fire.
- 00;09;46;10 Oh yeah. Regular roads in Raymond that are greater than 10%.
- 00;09;50;12 I'm sure you do. I'm sure we do. Yes.
- 00;09;55;18 So why would we read that?
- 00;09;56;19 Well, I know one that road that the chief, uh, refers to a law when we discussed this is like a dark inhale is greater than that. And that was a discussion that happened at that time. So had, I think you had a winter incident up there where it was difficult for you. I can't remember is it to get onboard and get down and get down, um, just because of the excessive slope and fear of icing conditions and going off the road. Um, so
- 00;10;27;22 again, back to that idea of a waiver criteria, one of the things we would look at is trying to limit the length of anywhere, where we had to go in excess of 10% up to 12%. And if it were on a curve, looking at safety positions, safety provisions, such as guide rails, or other widening of the curves to allow for a more convenient turn of equipment.
- 00;10;50;14 Um, you know, like I said, we have a lot of properties in Raymond, uh, where access at 10% is one going to be very costly to, it's going to take, you know, likely a lot of blasting. Um, and that gets into its own questions. Uh, and again, um, we've already got some, some roads in town as you pointed out that exceed that. Um, I just think that probably from a public standpoint or landowner standpoint, we might, might get some
- 00;11;21;07 pushback on this. I just think that we don't want to necessarily box ourselves into a corner here where we can leave maybe some out for special cases. Um, you know, where we do get into short bursts of, of steep slopes. Yeah. And the chief, the chief, and I discussed, uh, your email back to us on this with some of your thoughts on the waiver criteria. And we would certainly be willing to, um, work work with you to try to develop a waiver,
- 00;11;53;26 um, for that 10% of the grade for those backlog. I mean, that's, that's, that's my opinion. Obviously, you know, I am an engineer, I work in the profession, but obviously I want to get some input from the board members and what their thoughts are as well.
- 00;12;07;08 Exactly. Okay. Kevin, Greg

IPTV

- 00;12;17;22 To the 12%, but we even maybe make it more well, you could. But I think what we found is we had a, uh, project Floyd Brown had a, um, um, he wanted to do a back lawn driveway or a shared driveway earlier. I think this was it this year or last year. And we took the fire truck down there. That one was around 17% or what happens Greg, as we found out is when those trucks go up, that for an extended period of time, they lose water out of the tanker. Um, and in the winter, obviously that becomes an icing
- 00;12;49;08 condition on top of losing the water. So there is a magical point there where just the slope, they lose water out of the trucks. I don't know if that's 12%, 14%. I don't know. I think the idea is you try to limit those to a short duration, so the truck can come back and get to a level more level. Um, yeah, for sure. If you had a short distance with a 17% grade issue, so this is probably an issue of a ratio of our centered soap and distance, right. Exactly. Centers to limiting us too much. So maybe, maybe
- 00;13;24;09 we can say an excessive 10% and just leave it at that. And then you'll let the, let the, whoever is designing that, you know, provide us the evidence that they can meet the safety criteria. And that's the crux is really coming up with what will be the safety criteria. Yeah.
- 00;13;41;19 We want to include in the regulation the way of getting a waiver or just have it like other regulations where, you know, we can, I think we want to wait for criteria because I don't want to leave the general jurisdiction up to you to kind of make it up on the fly. I think it's a lot easier if the waiver criteria is in place, then you've got something that you can at least follow as far as the standard. And it's all going to be
- 00;14;12;17 around safety. Um, that's going to be first and foremost safety and fire truck maneuverability. Um, and I think if they can meet that, if you can meet it with a firetruck, then you can meet it with basically anything else.
- 00;14;25;08 Right. Well, I guess, Oh, sorry.
- 00;14;31;24 Ask what the fire department might be comfortable with in terms of distance and degree. Well, I was just going to ask some of those things. I'm surprised there's no national standard on,
- 00;14;42;18 Um, on that, um,
- 00;14;46;11 That's where the 10% comes from.
- 00;14;49;08 No, I mean, but more than that, you know, like
- 00;14;52;00 We've been discussing the length of the slope and the degree, like a table that she has, here's their here are acceptable approaches, you know, based on length and degree. Yeah.

IPTV

- 00;15;03;05 Because clearly, clearly in other regions you take North Conway or somewhere up in New Hampshire where you have really steep, excessive slopes. Maybe they have different equipment, but I'll let Wayne speak as far as to the standards. But I really think it's, sometimes it comes down to the equipment they may have.
- 00;15;17;20 Well, then that would be another set of tables to beat, you know, four-wheel drive what you're going off the weight of the vehicle. I mean, it's, it's just an engineering problem that you have to put those together. Right, right, right.
- 00;15;30;13 And that's what we would work on with the fire department. Right. I don't have an answer for you sitting right here at the moment, as far as, you know, percent of slope versus distance and what would work, but we can certainly try to look into that and work with Jim on that. You know, we have things that, you know, it talks about like K values, which is a derivative of slope versus distance of, of, of the curve and everything like that. And, um, I'm guessing that there's probably something on a national level that talks about the K value that's acceptable for the
- 00;16;02;21 firetruck. Um, you know, in a, in a low speed limit, that's also derived on a speed limit basis. So if you're going slow, obviously you can do a little bit more if you're going fast and transitions can cause more problems because that's also going to be a transition when you're going from 17% somewhere, you've got to belly out cause we can't come off the street at 17%. So there's a transition in there as well. Um, we don't want the tanker
- 00;16;29;00 or firetrucks economy out.
- 00;16;33;13 It'd be 10 degrees here. We're going to be in conflict, right. With our,
- 00;16;37;01 If we go 10th, if we go 10, here we are in conflict with our table in our street ordinance, that's all I'm pointing out. So either this changes, didn't the street orange is going to change or we either way, uh, Bob, I think we're probably going to get into both ordinances to tweak a little bit.
- 00;16;55;08 Okay.
- 00;16;57;15 The only way we don't tweak it as we just say 12% backlog driveways and leave it at that. But, um, you know, it sounds like we, we don't want to necessarily recommend that. Um, 12%, it sounds like we really want to do our best to keep it at 10, Except for unique cases or situations where we can limit the big button.
- 00;17;28;03 So we're going, am I hearing we're going to leave it at 10, but we're going to try to come up with some sort of way verbal condition that addresses a steeper slope for a shorter period of time. Does that sounds good to me work swing. We'll walk in there,
- 00;17;49;14 Alex and I

IPTV

- 00;17;50;00 Will work with Wayne and Bruce to, uh, come up with some, some language there with some waiver criteria. We'll try to keep it short and sweet, but obviously safety is first and foremost. Right.
- 00;18;02;00 Okay.
- 00;18;05;16 Okay. Um, yes. One question on the Terminus is that you, that you put in your packet, you know, what the radius is of that Terminus? I don't, but I can look it up. I don't know, off the top of there. Now I'm guessing it's probably around 20 feet, 20 foot radius, um, for that fill it. But, um, I will double check that and we'll work with you on that as well, as far as, you know, what we'll do, like the board knows, you know,
- 00;18;40;03 you know, street ordinance right now, we have an appendix, which has an example of the service, which I believe is in this packet as well. We'll revise that and match what is acceptable to the fire department. And we'll fill in those radiuses to what works with the firetruck. So when you see this next time, you'll get an updated, um, Terminus detail as well. This
- 00;19;07;13 one that's in here right now is the one that we have currently in our origins is we haven't revised it yet to match the fire department's request.
- 00;19;15;25 Okay.
- 00;19;18;24 Okay. Yeah. By the way, sorry, here we go. Okay. All right. All right. The next one is, uh, clearing of vegetation. Um, right now we really, um, have it restricted, Alex, is it 15% of the law? Is that 25? 25? Yeah. All lots are restricted to a 25, um, 25%, lot, uh, clearing. And, uh,
- 00;19;56;26 I think it might've been, uh, Greg who brought this up to us that, uh, in some cases, um, you know, these people have decent sized lots and they may want to tree harvest and we really, um, restricted them doing such. So what we came up with and I'm trying to dig it up. Yes. If you just a second Is
- 00;20;22;15 to change it in the ordinance so that, um, folks can, uh, clear to a certain level and then it 36 and the PDF, if you're on that too. Perfect. Okay. What we would like to do is, um, if they only wish to cut
- 00;20;49;00 trees, um, then the threshold would be, um, 15, uh, get this out here without a binder site plan approval from the Playboy, very clear Moodle's vegetation of stumps regarding above this threshold. So they have right now up to 15,000 square feet or 25% of the lot area. Uh, what we would like to do is if they want to go higher than that for tree cutting alone, then they have to get a permit from the code enforcement officer. And just prove that
- 00;21;21;26 it's been part of a harvesting plan done by a Forester. Um, anything, um, for a clearing would require a minor site plan review. And the reason we thought that was if we're just cutting trees, we're not getting into as much soil and erosion

IPTV

concerns, but could contaminate runoff, uh, get into waterways. Once we start grubbing, we are getting into a situation where we're opening up the land for vulnerability of erosion and contamination of

00;21;53;11 nearby waterways. That's something we want to be much more careful about that. Just the cutting. So that's the plan at this point would be permit by code officer. If it's for cutting anything over 15,000 would need a site minor site plan review.

00;22;11;03 I was looking for something a lot more simple, like change it to 75%. Not all that other stuff. I'm not looking to make things more difficult, but having an addition to this in regard to the we've got 600 foot chalets on, around all our lakes, 100 feet around all the maps, uh, uh, streams and why we have to do this beyond that point, uh, to protect the waterways is questionable. And I, I talked to Chris Hanson all today. I

00;22;42;04 hope it was all right with the planning board that I did that, uh, because, uh, uh, he's familiar with the issues that surround, um, his concern over this. And I asked him if Wyndham did anything similar. And he said, no, but he did say that, uh, they have an impermeable limit. I think that was, it may have been 25% in Wyndham, but, uh, we like to look at other towns in terms of what they do for ordinances. Wyndham doesn't do anything like this. They don't limit how much you can clear. I kind of agree with that

00;23;13;29 because the impermeable limit makes sense, but some people like open lot. Some people like trees, you know, and you're, you're, you're taking the choice away from them.

00;23;24;23 Well, the issue that I have with it, the only issue I have with that is when we look at phosphorus export, which is the main contributor to obviously our Lake and water quality. If you take a forest and you make it a lawn, you are going to add phosphorous to your local waterway. Yes.

00;23;42;26 Well, you're assuming they're going to be

00;23;46;06 Fertilizing the lawn.

00;23;47;11 Yeah. Maintain. So that's the, that's the caveat. I, again, the tree cutting was just to make sure there was a cutting plan. That's not done half hazardly. Anybody who cuts it for harvesting is going to engage somebody like Greg or, or somebody with a forestry background. If they're cutting for purposes of timber harvesting, as far as for clearing to have a big lawn again, if this were the subdivision and I'm just throwing this out, if there were a subdivision, we would make them either limit or provide a stormwater computation to show that they're meeting, um, the

00;24;21;18 phosphorous export in this case, you're saying, all right, I have 10 acres. I can clear cut whatever I want. As long as I've got a Forester, soon as you go over 50,000 square feet, we just want to see a plan as to how you're going to regulate that clearing.

IPTV

- 00;24;40;06 Well, my, my, my point was, let's not, let's take the lawns out. My point is if somebody wants to put in solar panels and they got a bunch of trees in the way, and they want to put in a fairly good size solar panel installation that works, you've got to cut a fair amount of trees. And if you have a small lot, that's going to exceed easily. The twenty-five percent limit. And the solar panels is not like that. I mean, that's, a lot of people are starting to do that now, but
- 00;25;08;14 How big are a solar panel for a single family?
- 00;25;13;04 Uh,
- 00;25;14;12 What'd you go be able to see with family home now you're in a commercial use. You're a utility service. If you're, if you're feeding back to the, you know, like we see a lot of these solar farms, you know, they're feeding back as a solar,
- 00;25;27;03 But that the, the, the direction of solar panels is to store your own energy. So they know I'm seeing you, but you put more panels in to do that, to get you by and to get you by the low periods, you know, the dark periods of the snowy periods. So you put more, more panels in gather more energy. And so I'm just saying we're going to probably see more panels and that leads to having more open sky. Yeah, I think we should just put
- 00;25;59;01 that in as a, as a, as something to consider.
- 00;26;03;11 I mean, we can put in there, um, I don't know if we quite call it solar panel or a utility, but we could put something in there as far as for utility purposes of utilities on the lot. You may exceed that as well. Um, again, like,
- 00;26;19;01 I mean, you can also put in, you know, don't the law and the foster is concerned, and I agree with that too, but just putting in a blanket 25% just seems to be rather than
- 00;26;29;10 That's what's in there right now. So that's what we're working with. That piece I didn't add. All I'm just saying is that if you want to change it to 50% and say anything open 50% of you got to get a permit. I don't know. I, I think 75% we're to open up maybe some, some issues with some people who clear out their lot and you know, all of a sudden the buffers are gone and things like that. Plus you got to remember too, that if it's part of a subdivision where there are restrictions, subdivision,
- 00;26;56;13 restrictions override this, this request.
- 00;27;03;01 So I'm in favor of some sort of restriction. Maybe 25% can go up a little higher. And I really liked the part about if you do any grubbing stump, removal, that sort of thing. We really need to protect that. I think that there's a little bit of an issue. Um, I mean, I know that in general, we want to be able to use our property as we want, but I think there is an issue with how removing a whole bunch of trees can

IPTV

impact surrounding lots in terms of just what it looks like. Um, specifically there's a little lot

00;27;36;26 on one 21 just after you leave three Oh two and they, I dunno if they clear cut the thing. I don't know how big the lot is, but they've cut a whole bunch of trees. And to my eye, it looks terrible in terms of what the neighbors are working. So I just think there's a little bit of concern that, that we ought to have regarding a budding lots as well as the lot in question.

00;28;02;08 Yeah, I would agree. And actually Kevin brings up a good point that I think we really haven't addressed is, I mean, if we are truly going to be going to a lot of solar panels and we are going to be cutting lots for solar panels, I mean, is that something that we need to look at as far as the amount of land that's going to be devoted to solar panels all across the town? Um, you know, I mean, do we want a town that has nothing but

00;28;27;28 solar panels? Yeah, this is, this is starting to be,

00;28;32;27 This is starting to pick up a little momentum as we've seen a massive burst of solar farms across the state. Um, it's something that planners and towns are starting to ask some questions on because some of these farms are massive. Um, and you know, you'd take a nice open field, farm field, and suddenly now it's filling, you know, black squares everywhere. Um, some people have absolutely no problem with it. And some people think it's an eyesore, um, from a standpoint of the GP has taken on them because they are low impact on the land. Uh, they really haven't made

00;29;06;14 them do anything as far as, uh, storm water. The biggest issue has been, most of these farms have gone into open areas, but some are now popping up into wooded areas and are clearing and grubbing those areas. So DP does get some involvement with those. Um, but I, I don't think we've thought about this on an individual basis and without consulting somebody from the solar industry, I wouldn't have a clue at this point, what would be a decent

00;29;35;10 amount of land that somebody would need to operate a solar array in a manner that they

00;29;42;03 Can generate a hundred percent of their own electricity on you? Kevin,

00;29;52;13 It's not so much just the land because it's the, it's the open sky. So you may only have, you know, 50 feet wide and maybe eight feet high of solar panels, like staying on top of your roof, but you need to have the view, you know, that the trees are in the way left and right of that, to get together that energy from morning tonight to the evening. So it's, it's a lot more than just where the panels are.

00;30;19;20 So yeah, you need that Southern, um, Southern orientation to get maximum,

00;30;24;18 At least the West, because you really got to gather all day to make it worthwhile.

IPTV

- 00;30;29;00 And honestly, some, we get down on the shore land zoning that that obviously becomes an issue, but I think most of our lots are two to three acres minimal. So, um, you know, you're talking 25% there, you're talking half an acre that could be available for most lots. So that's a fair amount of land that you have available to put, to, to generate electricity for your home. Again, there may be cases where it's more and maybe we can look at putting something in there for self utilities or
- 00;31;01;14 something like that. Um, know we didn't think of that when we were looking at it. Well, Mike's concern about, um, grumping and assault force. I think clean water act regulates to care more than an acre land. You've got to install all those silks on a thing. I don't see that as an issue that we have to address.
- 00;31;23;03 What about if it's less than an acre though,
- 00;31;26;27 For some reason it's not regulated below that amount, we put limits on all kinds of things. For some reason, one acre was far as I know, miss Jim knows anything different than me about the clean water. It depends on your proximity, or it depends if you're in the watershed at risk, uh, different thresholds, it's 20,000 square feet of impervious and usually anything over an acre request to get a permit by roll from DEP. Um, and,
- 00;32;00;09 um, again, you know, just that, okay. Maybe Alex knows that when somebody cuts, uh, an acre in a residential zone, I'm sure he probably gets a phone call or two from time to time about what's going on. What's going in there. Um, again, we're not asking for a whole lot here. It's just a permit through the code officer. If they're cutting grubbing. I do think if you're grubbing, what's the purpose for grubbing? Are you creating a larger lawn
- 00;32;27;14 or again, if it's agriculture, it doesn't fall under anything that's exempt problem with that creating a larger loan on it. I know you do well. I mean, everybody has a two acre lawn. Suddenly we got some runoff issues from an engineering perspective. It's just what happens.
- 00;32;46;08 Yeah. No main soil is very acid that typically doesn't go very far. I think a lot of your runoff is immediately next to these lakes. I don't think it's 600 feet or more back from a hundred feet from streams. That's my opinion.
- 00;33;02;07 Well, I think the DP looks at it is if it gets into a water belt, it gets into a stream. You know, it, once it gets into the stream it's industry, until it has a chance to settle out, it gets going to transport. I think that's the concern. But again, this is, this is your decision. You as a board, I'm just presenting you. You know, what we see is common practice. Again, I agree with you. I haven't seen the 25% in a lot
- 00;33;32;27 of ordinances. Some towns have it. I'm guessing it probably evolved from some little state model and in some towns, it probably phased it out and others haven't. Um, I don't know if the 25% is an arbitrary number. If it's based on it's, it's an old number it's been in the ordinance for awhile. I'm fine if you want to move at

IPTV

North or South. Um, but I do think that I'm definitely fine with clearing of trees, but when we start getting into grubbing lodge areas, I think the town again, should just take a careful

00;34;02;24 look at what's going on and make sure that erosion sedimentation, maybe it does need to be, again, this would be a mindless site plan. This doesn't go to board. This would be a staff review. So it's not as cumbersome as you might think. Well,

00;34;18;20 W is that of maturing trees? I've visited a lot of, lots of people have trees that have gotten too big. They can't handle them and they have no way to get them down except to hire a company with thousands of dollars to remove these trees. So this is apparent on the other end, too, if you, uh, you know, people are required to keep their trees to the point where they become a liability. That's not a wise thing for the landowner or a homeowner either.

00;34;44;28 I don't think we're meaning to restrict that. I think all we're saying is just, you've got to just get a simple permit or a notification to the code officer, if you want to cut those. And that's very simple. I don't think, I don't think that's a huge burden on anybody.

00;34;59;06 Yeah. It's, it's another staff. Yeah, but

00;35;02;29 I mean, that's not even me. That would be just Alex. Yeah. Making sure. Yeah.

00;35;08;14 Oh, you know me, I think we just have too much government in our lives, right?

00;35;13;14 No, I never knew that from you, Greg. I don't know. What's blocking the moment again. This is, this is not a Jim and Greg show others, please feel free to chime in

00;35;27;04 All these things are reasonable to discuss. For sure. I don't have any issue with that. Yeah.

00;35;34;01 So, so where do we, uh, Bob, I'm going to take your mind, where do we want to go with this folks?

00;35;40;00 Well, I, I liked the way the things written and I Karkin back to that a lot. I drive by an hour every day and they've got a big pile of dirt and trap and stumps, and it is the protective for erosion, but, but it needs to be. And I think the minimal, um, review that we're doing here is going to help make sure people do the things they need to do to protect from runoffs and that sort of thing. And also I think, um, it might help

00;36;10;23 protect against larger clearings in what is, is sort of sensible for neighbors to look at

00;36;20;09 No, to that point. I just want to make clear that agricultural purposes are exempt and maybe Kevin, we can find a way to exempt some utility, um, provisions as well.

IPTV

- 00;36;33;07 Yeah, that'd be good. At least at least something in there to, you know, to me promoting, you know, green energy is, is a good thing.
- 00;36;46;07 Well, the, as written it doesn't exclude that Kevin, it just doesn't require a permit.
- 00;36;51;21 Right. Uh, I mean, I guess, I guess that depends on who's sitting in the code office at the point, because that's kind of his purview then, right? I mean, I don't care about getting a permit as long as it's not going to be denied. I think that should be something in the ordinance to say that that's a permitted or
- 00;37;11;18 That could be good, but like any pyramid it's appealable to either one or two, and it's our ordinance that comes to us. Um, or it goes the zoning board of appeals. If the permit's denied Alex, what happens now, if somebody comes in and I, again, I don't know when this has happened, because again, most of our lots outside shoreline zoning are fairly large, maybe the village, but have you had any cases where you've had issues with
- 00;37;40;14 people clearing a lot or other things?
- 00;37;43;19 Uh, there's been two since I started, um, one would be, uh, the stereotypes across the street, but that's been, that has been an ongoing issue for a couple of years. And, um, they do have a open notice of violation, which does include the, uh, clearing limitations in that. And then the other one would be the one that I'm assuming Mike's talking about, which is seven main street down near three Oh two. Um, that's another one. I didn't specifically cite them on this clearing limitation because I
- 00;38;16;07 couldn't exactly prove that they've cleared more than 25%. I do feel like they have probably cleared more like 75, but it wasn't as easy to prove, um, as the stairs one is because, uh, the stereotypes on the youth in 20, sometime between 2016
- 00;38;36;13 And 2018. So it's very easy to see through aerial imagery on Google. Um, so it's, it's very easy to calculate exactly how much has been cleared. Um, so it is something that is taking place. But the key word in, in this section I think is development. Um, because if they're not clean during for develop, I mean, it kind of goes out the window, but that's just
- 00;39;05;21 my opinion. And I do know that's how, uh, Scott and Chris also viewed this.
- 00;39;15;18 So when you say development meeting, you mean like the initial building of something and installing the related stuff like septic. So like, so like if a house is already there and they've got all their, everything in chef tick and so forth, then the 25% isn't applicable.
- 00;39;34;07 No, I mean, I would look at it as if someone's clearing to build a house that's clearing for development, but if there's already a house on a lot and they've got, you know, a substantial amount of land say they've got three or four acres behind the house, um, if they just want to, uh, do a harvest, go down in there and, um,

IPTV

clear a bunch of the timber off of it. Uh, they're not clearing that for development. They're simply clearing it for harvest. And it's just going to go back to its natural state over time. Um, I, that in my mind that wouldn't be clearing for development because

00;40;07;03 there is no inversion of the land it's simply just to harvest.

00;40;13;00 So currently under your reading, we don't, we don't have any limits on that sort of thing.

00;40;21;02 Well, there are there, I mean the department of forestry, um, has a whole set of laws that they are, they're more harvest to follow and Greg knows all about those and they we're actually a state enforced talent as far as the shoreline goes. Um, and there's very specific rules to timber harvests. Um, so there are limitations to what you can do, what you can't

00;40;51;18 do. Um, but you know, there it's a whole other roll set and it's pretty lengthy.

00;40;58;27 Hmm. This is an FYI. We do not define development under the land use ordinance, sorry for opening such a can of worms. I, you know, I mean, it's a good discussion though. I mean, it does lead into, you know, I mean every once in a while, or every 10 years, somebody tries to come in here and manipulate these, these ordinances to their benefit. So it's a good practice to do it before somebody else does it to us. So is it the opinion,

00;41;31;10 um, Alex, are you pretty comfortable

00;41;34;09 With like the scenario we just described where there's already a house and they got three acres and they just want to do some, basically some harvesting, are you pretty comfortable with the forestry regulations in terms of protection for, um, maybe making, uh, cutting too much? So it's a blight from the neighbors or I'm sure I would guess that the erosion concerns are pretty well covered.

00;42;04;29 Well, most of the time, I mean, Greg knows more about the practice and what goes on with tree harvesting, but most of the time you're not, you're not, uh, ripping the ground up when you're tree cutting. I mean, yeah, you're going in with a skidder or what time of year you go in can make a difference in conditions can make a difference as far as mucking it up a little bit. But for the most part, you aren't really doing substantial soil damage such that you're going to get major erosion, uh, unless you're on really steep slopes or something, um, that without cutting

00;42;35;12 a single tree. Absolutely. Absolutely. Um, but once you go in there and you formally decide, I'm going to stump this and grub it now, you've, you've made yourself vulnerable. Um, so I guess that's all I was coming in. And then the question is, you know, if you own a, if you own 10 acres and you cut 75% of the lot, that's still a fair amount of trees, but if you have two acres, you've got 75, that looks a lot worse.

IPTV

- 00;43;07;12 Yeah.
- 00;43;07;25 Well, that's the thing. It's got a two acre lot and you're limited. You, you may need more than that by the time you put your driveway in and your build your house and you have your open area, free lawn. I don't know. It seems too small to me on this polar law, 25%. What do you want to have a garden or solar panels.
- 00;43;34;06 Okay.
- 00;43;35;21 Yeah. Yeah. If you want to go more than 25%, then maybe it's, maybe it's 50%. I don't know. I have no vision or know who, um, the way to figure out what other towns are doing because it's, it's obsolete some towns and some are twenty-five. Yeah. I wouldn't know. How would, how would you make the call that Greg just described? If you have a two to three acre lot and somebody has all those things on it and they want to, you know, cut
- 00;44;06;10 some trees cause they want it on their barn. They want to put a bunch of solar panels to get the evolves. Cutting. Let's say that 50% of the trees are already gone because it's a small lot, but you know, you've got to cut enough so that they can get the panels can get the light. What are you doing? What are you saying that, you know, if it goes up, we say, all we would say is you need to file a minor site plan through staff just to be quickly reviewed. And I think all we'd be really at, there would be basically erosion control practices.
- 00;44;35;20 So I think that should be put in is what we're concerned with is the and control practices.
- 00;44;41;10 And that's primarily what we'd be looking at now is erosion control practices and what is going to become of that surface. Is it going to be a lawn? Is it going to be, you know, it's agricultural purposes, like I said, it's exempt. And if it's, you know what, and if we decide we want to put utilities in there that could be accepted.
- 00;44;57;24 Yeah. Well just shorter trees.
- 00;45;02;20 I understand. I understand you want it. I mean, with the tree clearing is different than, than the grubbing. Right. You know, I get that. But what it says in the article is, is
- 00;45;13;19 Clearing, right.
- 00;45;16;04 And that's where you get into it because cutting and clearing the two different terms used in construction. Right.
- 00;45;24;22 So it seems to me pretty, um, uh, not real onerous on the, on the property owner, because it's the development wishes only to cut trees and access as in excessive of threshold, then a permit must be obtained. Well, what's that permit? What's that going to be based on that, getting that permit? I mean, I would think, well, I guess

IPTV

I don't know w what, what criteria is going to be looked at for that permit. Good question.

00;45;55;04 Primarily, it's going to be erosion control of the tree cutting or for the cliff

00;45;59;25 For just the tree cutting

00;46;02;00 Tree. Cutting. All we want to make sure is that it was re uh, reviewed by, uh, a Forrester, I believe.

00;46;07;28 Right. Okay. Well that sounds that's, that's not, to me, that's no problem at all for a property owner or hardly a problem, but I guess at this point, I'm a little more concerned about the issue of whether it's a development or not. So in other words, if there's an established lot, and then someone wants to go kind of whole bunch of their trees, and that could really make things look pretty crappy for the neighbors. And this doesn't

00;46;38;08 seem to predict that at all, not to open a bigger can of worms, but that's kind of what I'm seeing on the site at seven main street.

00;46;49;02 Yeah. And one of the things Mike, that I've kind of run into with that one is, um, I, my first conversation with him was, well, what are you planning on doing here in the back? Cause he's cleared a bunch of land out in the back and it looks like he's going to build something. And he says, well, I don't know, I'm not planning on doing anything right now. If he had said, well, I would like to build X. Um, then he cleared that for development. Uh, and I can say, okay, well, you've cleared access of what you're allowed for development. Um, but he doesn't currently have a plan to

00;47;23;23 do anything. He just wanted to cut the trees. So is he clearing for development or not? You know, so

00;47;30;22 It's something where if I'm going to take someone to court for it, um, my concern with that one is it is pretty open. We don't have a definition, um, and I would need some proof of them clearing for development. Um, even if it is, you know, it looks to be pretty clear,

00;47;51;00 Well, maybe I'm missing something here, but for my, I just assume, take out the whole issue of, for development and just say for any lot, whether it's already developed or not, because then that would sort of cover you. Wouldn't have to get into that issue with the guy at seven main street. And then to me we're protecting all these types of scenarios, regardless of whether or not there's already a house restructured there or whether or not that they want to develop. I mean, that's not the issue.

00;48;21;00 So you'd rather say something if, if the owner or property owner wishes to only cut trees. Yeah. I thought this was a simple one. You know, I told Chris these

IPTV

things, we, uh, you know, we included the purpose of what we, uh, you have a little blurb intro blurb to our ordinance and in

- 00;48;51;09 that purpose we could kind of state what we're, what the goal of the, or what the goal of the restrictions are. And those being that we want to maintain, um, water quality, we don't want to restrict, um, for utility development or solar panels or, you know, along those lines. I think that would, that would, um, enter Kevin's problem. Um, probably not grace problem, because it's a, it's an ordinance so will never, antegrade.
- 00;49;28;06 I have a lot of faith in people, but when we take off and we think that the development is that that workable is an article it's within the article. And typically I'm just trying to look at our ordinance this year, as we're, as we're on the line here. Um, typically under standards, we don't do the
- 00;49;56;07 purpose. Um, I think rather than the purpose, I would rather just lay out what exemptions we would consider, whether it be for agriculture or whether it be for, uh, private utilities, such as, but not limited to solar panels. And Ted is solar. You know, I don't think anybody, well, there may be some still out there, the dishes, you know, the satellite dishes and things like
- 00;50;21;21 that. Um, you know, so I would, I would be open to say that those could be exempt from the, um,
- 00;50;28;21 From this standard, as long as we include the erosion control as a primary response. Yeah, we can, we can finesse some, some language in there.
- 00;50;40;07 Do you want, I think that makes sense because I don't think anyone, you know, based on the cost and expense of putting in solar panels, I wouldn't think someone's going to cut a whole bunch more trees than they need to, to get, you know, the full day sunlight. So if we just exclude that use from this ordinance, then, um, maybe we're sort of not really creating more harm and we're, I agree with Kevin, you know, green energy
- 00;51;12;10 is, is good.
- 00;51;13;28 Yeah. And I think, you know, to, to Bob's point, the purpose of this was to, was to really just stop people from being able, just to go and clear, cut their lawn for the sake of clear cutting their lot, or just to create massive, massive lawns. I think we're all okay. With a big lawn just as you have adequate protections in there to protect your neighbors and in the environment. I mean, okay. So we'll, we'll clean that. Well, we'll fix that up a little bit. Now, the provisions for utilities and for agricultural purposes and put a little erosion control language in there.
- 00;51;48;02 Okay. Next up next one. Next one I hope is easy. It has to do with the, um, mixed use. Um, this was just a case of, I think, a clerical error in the ordinance. Um, it basically said that, uh, both floors had to be only for commercial uses. We know that's not the case. Uh, we do allow in mixed

IPTV

- 00;52;15;14 juices that we want residential upstairs and commercial downstairs. So it was really just a matter of, uh, clarifying what was, what anyone have any problems with that one. Okay. All right. Um, next one has to deal with septic waste disposal. And I know Alex did a little research on this. I'll just quickly summarize, but then I'll let him chime in. Basically when
- 00;52;44;26 we're within a certain distance of originally, it was such a big Lake. The poor water district has its own standards and regulations for sizing of septic systems based on daily use per bedroom.
- 00;52;58;27 Cause that's how we size septic systems in the state of Maine, uh, when this ordinance was written. Um, I think we just adopted that for all water bodies in the shoreline zone. And what we are thinking now is if you look at that section section six, uh, it just helps clarify a little bit more that you shall meet the pool of water district wastewater disposal system permit protocol. One thing that we did discuss after that, um, provision that Alex made is we thought it would be more practical for
- 00;53;33;27 easier for people to understand if that applied to just great ponds, because with perennial water body, it could mean anything from a wetland to a stream, to any large area, ponding water. And that's not necessarily the locations that we need to be that stringent on. It really is around the larger water bodies where that direct effluent can get into the Lake quickly. And that's why it's a setback of, uh, I think we use 250 feet, but
- 00;54;04;01 I'll let Alex explain a little more in detail.
- 00;54;08;28 You're doing a great job, Jim. I don't even think I need to say anything. Yeah, no, you've got that pretty much spot on, you know, the, the Portland water district is no longer on the 1988, uh, regulations. They have a permit protocol that I think was most recently established and I've dated in 2014, something like that. But the big takeaway is they only regulate within 200 feet from Sebago. So our work has taken that further
- 00;54;40;22 and said all perennial water bodies within 250 feet. Um, so, you know, we talked about possibly a MIS, uh, weren't really sure how it was going to go, but we've at least set it up so that, um, like Jim said, we would get rid of the perennial water body and just say great ponds, uh, and, um, update the, uh, reference.
- 00;55;04;01 We also stayed with the two 50, because we thought 200 was a number that most of us aren't familiar with. We're familiar with two 50 from DEP standards. We thought two 50 was a better regulatory setback everybody's aware of. Yeah, we should do that with a 600 foot show land zone. I actually agree with you Greg, on that the rest of Raymond doesn't agree with us. Oh gosh. That was fought 30 years ago or more. Yeah. I'm

IPTV

- 00;55;39;21 sidetracked Dina. Any thoughts on that? And I, Alex, is it, um, a hundred gallons per day or 120
- 00;55;53;18 In 20? So it goes up from the standard, which is 90 to one 20 day.
- 00;56;01;03 And another reason we thought that this was still practical was that obviously now with a lot of Lake front development, we're seeing more Airbnb seasonal rentals where they're probably more occupants in the structure. This provision at the water district put in was to be conservative so that the septic systems would be larger, uh, to be able to handle flows. So we didn't get into failed systems.
- 00;56;24;18 So I thought is that this is a good backup because we are seeing more and more rental properties with a lot more people than we're probably anticipated in some of these, um, single family residence. The point makes a lot of sense to me, parents problems. Okay. Okay. All right. Next one is the ZBA findings. And Alex, I'm going to let you let you run with this one,
- 00;56;55;22 but I think it's mostly about making sure we, there's a section that you added in there about findings.
- 00;57;02;29 Um, basically what this requires, if there's a variance granted, um, we generally will issue a certificate and that gets recorded in the registry of deeds, um, and thought that this was our so state law, but I could be wrong on that. Um, but it is pretty standard and has been for many years that if a variance is granted ZBA issues, a certificate, and that gets recorded in the registry of deeds in order to, um, you know, record
- 00;57;34;19 that and make sure that it runs with it
- 00;57;36;22 Problem. And just clear the first part of that, I saw it, it was red line. We actually made that change last session. It just, uh, was I think you carry over for the dates of the meeting. Yeah. I remember that this is important because it is a document that goes with the land. Yeah. Again, makes sense to me that I take it. The board of appeals was involved
- 00;58;09;29 in this one, Alex.
- 00;58;14;11 Uh, no, it was actually Mary that point in this one out to me, it's on our application for the ZBA. And she had noticed that it wasn't actually in the ordinance, but it was on the application and thought it might make sense to correct that.
- 00;58;27;24 Right. So you really do do something in that office. man, I know where you live. Thanks Mary. Okay. I think that one is pretty straightforward too. I mean, it is, uh, it is, it makes a whole lot of
- 00;58;58;15 sense. Uh, the next one would be a junkyard regulation update and that is on page 42 of your packet. And basically what's happened. There is the state regulations I

IPTV

believe have changed. And this is the new section that describes that, that correct Alex.

00;59;18;08 That is correct. The old reference reference was actually repealed

00;59;22;13 At some point in time. I don't even know.

00;59;24;21 Um, so this would be the updated reference problems and more clerical than anything. Okay. Okay. Now we get into, uh, the next two topics have to do with the fire department. And, uh, I believe both of these, um, correct me if I'm wrong. Wait are basically the same as what we

00;59;55;16 saw last year. That's correct. That's correct. This is just again, you know, again, we can have this discussion, but last year you did endorse this to go to the, uh, board of selectmen. It was at that level that they nailed it and subdued this, I dunno, it's a where it's back again in 2021. Um, I don't, I think everybody was here at that point. So, um, again, it's

01;00;26;17 just to recap, the sprinkler systems would affect any single family home over 4,800 square feet. And, um, the is to really just update the standards following in FPA one Oh one provisions to the 2018 version that correct. That's correct. Then FPA one and an FPA one Oh one to the 2018. And that language is then just sitting there eagerly waiting since 2020. So, um, I

01;00;59;22 don't see any reason to revisit this here. Well, we just have to go through the formality of, again. I think we kind of beat this one. Anyone have a change of heart since last year.

01;01;15;13 Can I just ask about, um, under article nine, section four, it's on the last page of the small handout, it's the first sentence says a fire sprinkler system is required throughout any existing, large residential, one family or two, a 48, a hundred square feet or more. I sort of like to get rid of the word large. I just think it might cause confusion. I mean, it's clearly defined in terms of square feet. So I don't know that we need large. And I think if we leave the word large in there, it might allow some

01;01;45;29 argument or some sort later,

01;01;49;22 That makes sense to me. Okay. That's really a wordsmith issue, but we can address that. And that was again, article four. Yeah.

01;02;12;09 Article nine, section four. First sentence on page three of the handout. Yeah.

01;02;25;02 Yeah.

01;02;40;05 Um, are we good with this now? Yeah. Okay. Now we go back and get into a little more, what I thought would be more discussion on tiny homes, tiny houses

IPTV

- 01;02;55;16 That takes us back to the
- 01;03;00;27 We Alex and I both have been trying to peruse this, the state. Um, obviously I attach the legislative action that they took on this. Um, it's still up in the air as far as a lot of the requirements. They, it looks like a lot, but when it comes, push comes to shove, um, it's really still a difficult thing to, for code enforcement officers to regulate. Um, they did do a nice job. I think as far as if you look at the piece, I handle out 80 dash C tiny home, they did define and have a decent criteria
- 01;03;36;16 in there is what defines a tiny home. The issue. I think that we're still struggling is, is where do we, um, where do we re under what portion of our orders do we regulate these, um, you know, you read through this and it talks about the, um, the axles and everything like that. And it starts to make you feel that it's, it falls into the category of mobile home, but then it is a standalone structure. Um, our thought, at
- 01;04;04;26 least my initial thought would be to kind of put this into the same section as we did the manufactured housing. Um, just because, you know, we, we had a, quite a discussion about that a year or so ago and about foundations and what constitutes a structure. And what's the regulations on that. Um, again, this will come down to a lot of what Alex will have to do as far as regulating this. Um, so the, currently the definition says that the tiny
- 01;04;34;23 home will not exceed 400 square feet.
- 01;04;37;08 Um, and
- 01;04;39;20 The vehicle is without motive, power. Um, tiny home does not include trailer semi-trailer camp, trailer, recreation vehicle, or manufactured housing. I guess what I might recommend is we just take the state definition, put it into our terms of definitions and then maybe just put tiny homes under that whole manufactured housing piece, but I'm sure somebody's going to tell me they don't have to be manual a tiny home. Doesn't have to be manufactured in there's no certification and everything like that. So then I'll leave it to Alex to where we should go from here as
- 01;05;14;19 far as the coincide.
- 01;05;19;25 Yeah. I mean, Jim and I always struggled with this one. I think that that's probably pretty clear, but, um, I mean, I reached out to other code officers. I reached out to, um, our attorney and I think what I got back from pretty much everyone was, there's just not a whole lot of stuff out there for us to rely on right now. Um, there's a, you know, there's an IRC, uh, appendix, uh, for specific to tiny homes and there's a lot of
- 01;05;52;28 questions on the standard that the tiny homes are being built to. You know, is it similar to an RV or does more like what's like a park model type structure, um,

IPTV

the way that I've always looked at it and really the way I'd like to continue to look at it is if it's a stick-built tiny home, it probably should meet the standards of that.

- 01;06;17;04 A large, tiny home has to meet as far as specific to safety. So you grass, um, and, uh, you know, plumbing, septic, waste disposal, stuff like that. Um, electric should be done to the electric code. I mean, we still want to make sure that, um, these dwelling units are safe and have to meet the, the bare minimum of a regular dwelling unit. They're just smaller and more efficient. Um, if that's kind of where I'm leaning with it. And I
- 01;06;50;07 think that what I've been, what was recommended to me from a couple other code officers was if we're going to look at bringing or putting anything into the ordinance, it might just be a definition to start and see where things go in the next couple of years and work with it. But the larger municipalities there really isn't anyone out there that has a specific code
- 01;07;14;10 or real standards for tiny homes. I agree with you, Alex. I think we should have a standard that agrees with the current standard for larger houses yet in the safety, electrical, plumbing and everything you to allow them to have smaller dwellings. Um, I think a lot of the tiny homes that I looked at, you know, they've built them and they're very similar in construction, uh, to a full-sized dwelling, but they're just smaller. Cause people are one or two people can live in a very small dwelling, very comfortably. So they don't require to
- 01;07;50;14 have X amount of square feet in the living room or kitchen or whatever. And these it's more like, you know, I'd say building yourself an apartment to house standards,
- 01;08;03;23 Kevin, do you see it with our manufactured homes and mobile homes? Or do you see it more as a, just a dwell in a normal dwell or done a little residential development, downsize, residential
- 01;08;16;14 Dwellings? What I see it. Yeah. Um, so in which case, what we would really need is what we really need to specifically address it. If it's just going to be in under what we would consider to be in level single family construction. I do think it's important to define it just because it's a term that becoming popular in the, in the industry and people coming
- 01;08;47;09 into town may just want to know, I want to put a tiny home and if it's voided our ordinances, that that just creates a lot of confusion. If we at least define it, it gives us some kind of baseline to start the review. Um, from a code standpoint, I guess in the definition that the state has, the only thing I would add, which I heard you say, Bob is tiny home, means a living space permanently constructed on a frame or chest system designed for permanent living quarters. I would like to have a word dwelling in there somewhere because we do

IPTV

- 01;09;17;27 define dwelling in our ordinances. And just so that people understand that there's no exemptions for tiny homes, they fall under Rod's dwelling requirements. Uh, we can define it just so that if somebody does come along and wants to put some tiny homes in, um, they understand that it falls under this category and I just have the depth and the definition to our definitions. Correct. Yeah. I think we'd add Tony home in our definitions and then, you know, just make sure that we refer to it as, as a dwelling or
- 01;09;47;08 a dwelling unit. Yeah. Kevin does that.
- 01;09;49;22 I think that it probably would. Yeah. Then that's, that's what I'm looking for. I mean, they can be manufactured, tiny homes that meet standards, right?
- 01;09;58;10 Yeah. Yeah. I think we can use that state model that the definition that they have, we can just dress it up a little bit. So again, it refers to a dwelling unit. I have a question, Oh, here comes the NFTA guy. I'll let, whoever else was jumping in first. And I can, I can follow up.
- 01;10;20;11 I guess the only thing I would say would be in that definition, it might be best to say something along the lines of it's still needing to meet the requirements of a dwelling unit. So that because what's going to happen here is there's going to, there'll be dealers that, and there already are dealers that are making these things to a different standard and they're selling them to people saying, Oh, they meet all of the requirements. You can use this as a dwelling unit. And then these people are coming in and saying, okay, I was sold this thing and kind of similar
- 01;10;50;12 to a mobile home where you get it and it's still legal and built to, you know, the HUD standards. Um, they think that they're just ready to pull it up in into the lot and they're good to go. So I think it would be best to have something in the ordinance that makes it clear that we don't have a substandard, um, allowance for tiny homes. It needs to meet the rules for everything.
- 01;11;11;18 Sure. And under that definition, um, ADC, tiny home aid gets into some American national standards. Do we want to strike that? And maybe you start that language you just described Alex, because it does get into an FPA standards, 1192. And you know, I don't, I don't know personally what, 1192 is Wayne. Maybe you do it's recreational vehicles, right. So we don't want that. We want it to be a higher standard. Right.
- 01;11;40;07 Which is exactly what I've been with. A few other code officers have told me is this standard is essentially allowing someone to use a park model or an RV as a dwelling unit.
- 01;11;54;01 So Alex, you and I probably can wordsmith this down a little bit based on this discussion tonight and definitely take out that section in it and change that around a little bit. But I think we've got a good sense of where the board wants to, wants to take this and obviously where you need to take it so that you have some

IPTV

jurisdiction as far as how these are built, that worked for the board. Yep. Thank you. Um, moving on, I guess at

- 01;12;24;26 this point, the last one is, um, to deal with affordable housing, um, and what we, I gave you some, some information here on the back end of the S uh, uh, which I get from the state actually, uh, into incentives for affordable housing. Obviously we've heard a lot of that in the news with some of the larger municipalities, um, as these prices for homes are
- 01;12;54;11 skyrocketing right now, affordable housing is getting more and more, uh, pitched and difficult to find.
- 01;13;00;27 Um, we are, I believe our comp plan is already outdated, but, uh, one of the major components of a comp plan is to provide means for affordable housing and makes you eligible for a number of grants. I'm not going to get into where we are with any kind of comp plan. I mean, that's a discussion, another sidebar, but, um, I think what Bob and Alex and I had talked about is how do we encourage, uh, developers or entice them to provide affordable housing? And where would we want that? Um, so I, I, this
- 01;13;35;23 again is just the early discussion on this. We haven't really developed anything. Our thought process would be, we should really look at our village districts, uh, B one, because they are the center of our community where smaller lot sizes are allowable, um, where services are more readily available for people with economic strain, um, and where it just seems to make more sense than to have them in remote areas of the town to put them
- 01;14;02;14 in the village district where transportation and amenities are much more easily accessible and affordable. Um, so that would be the district we'd be looking at as far as what we want to do for incentives. I don't know if we want to look at, if somebody comes in with a subdivision, do we want to look at a density bonus? Um, do we want to give them the ability to do less frontage is, um, it is a whole gamut of things we can do. And I guess I'm just trying to get a feel for
- 01;14;33;09 what the board thinks is, is a good approach to send devise, you know, the village district for some more affordable housing. We haven't seen anything for, since I've been here in town since 2012, but really for a form of housing. Um, so just interested in what the board has for opinions.
- 01;14;57;24 It seems like maybe some, some density, uh, reduction recall, you know, reducing some of the density requirements. Maybe that would make sense.
- 01;15;07;18 Yeah. And if those board members, Bob and Greg, um, you folks were here before we used to have a density bonus for elderly housing, um, over 65, uh, actually we just reapproved of subdivision a couple of years ago. They had that and we, somewhere along the lines that got eliminated, um, again, it is a difficult thing to, I think that was probably a difficult thing to enforce. Uh, you know, you

IPTV

go up and knock on the door. Can I see your ARP card? Um, but, um, it does become a little bit of a

- 01;15;39;02 challenge as to make sure that people aren't subleasing or other people of other retirement age or living in those communities, but this one is pretty it's, it's just, it's a different beast. Um, just because it's trying to help out those that are in economic, you know, stress or in a different place economically and can't afford right now, obviously we're in a massive spike in real estate prices. Things are escalating extremely fast and those
- 01;16;07;22 people that are less well off are getting left behind and they are a viable part of our, all of our communities. So how can we, how can we assist in and provide them at least some development opportunities, not the restaurants open again, All of the above, but if we're going to do a comp plan, it will be a necessary component of our comp plan as well. And I know that there's discussion started who despite about that, as well as, you know, we, we
- 01;16;40;09 need to start kind of looking at the comp plan going forward, some here in the near future, because our old one is expired and outdated.
- 01;16;49;01 I mean, to me, it's kind of challenging for a town to try to promote affordable housing because when we needed the most is in situation like now where real estate prices are just going crazy. So why the heck was the developer going to build affordable housing when they can build something and sell it for a whole lot more? So it seems like a big challenge
- 01;17;10;08 To find enough ways to financially incentive that sort of thing. Well, I think what we see in a case like this is you get organizations like a Vesta that are looking to, you know, they're, they're always looking at around Cumberland and Androscoggin counties to find affordable, um, developments to put in apartment units or multi multi-units, uh, for that purpose. So again, if an organization like that, where it comes to the town right now, they would be stuck utilizing a current zoning densities. And if
- 01;17;45;02 they did approach and we had something on the books and maybe we could fit a few more, you know, um, multiplex units in or duplexes in or something like that. And I do think that we want to look at that from a standpoint, probably from the idea of multiplex or multi units developments. Um, it might make the most sense where affordable makes the most sense, uh, single
- 01;18;10;19 family affordable housing is probably difficult just because of the land consumption. And we're trying to be efficient. I would think that developer was doing affordable housing would more likely come in with a multiplex type development rental properties.

IPTV

- 01;18;29;13 Do you think we could do something along the lines of a density calculation, which you would need to know where some sort of target point would be that would make it attractive enough for a builder to build, right.
- 01;18;45;08 Yeah. And I think you and I had a conversation too, is maybe we could even reach out, um, yeah. Maybe reach out to somebody like a Vesta or some organization that does a lot of these affordable housing projects and just see what is their breaking point or, or what is the incentive that they need to look at a community like Raymond, I know they're looking at a community like Poland right now. Um, so they are starting to reach out more into the rural areas than just the urban centers.
- 01;19;14;14 And could we, is it possible to look at something besides income, but have it targeted to the, um, the dwelling price?
- 01;19;24;11 Right. Well, when I say income, that's what I mean, it's what people can afford. So it's really the price of the unit that will be. And I think there's some information that may be available at the state, um, as to what criteria they would put that like everything else though, that bottom line is, is escalating, right? It's like, if you look at FHA now, I think it, FHA is somewhere up in 300,000 range, you know, for first time holder, that just seems crazy, but that's where it's going. Um, anybody
- 01;19;59;23 else have any thoughts as to what areas we might want to incentivize? I mean, there's things in there too, that if you're on public water, obviously you get a higher density.
- 01;20;08;22 Um, cause you don't have the septic and well competent competing on the land. Um, some of this will play out basically on what can sustain on the land for sewer and water consumption. That is usually one of the bigger things we have to be careful about, but, um, you know,
- 01;20;28;27 Models Jim, that we could, uh, copy off of,
- 01;20;34;08 I think for a community like Raymond, it might be a little thin stretched. I, you know, when you get into the cities or in some of the Cumberland County, coastal areas, obviously they've got things in there for affordable housing, but it's on a whole different, I mean, you've got public sewer, public water, the densities can be much different. Um, we can take a look to see what might be available in some of those communities and maybe see what maybe what the thresholds are that they use to, to find terms or things like that. But I, you know, where we don't have a huge
- 01;21;09;06 amount of our town on public water and we have no availability to public sewer, you know, that itself dictates what the land can hold. Yeah. Well, the issue is a lot bigger than Raymond. Absolutely nothing wrong with aggressiveness somehow. No. And, and to your point, it gets into

IPTV

- 01;21;38;21 public transportation and everything that you can possibly imagine as far as you know, where we'd want to put these things again, that's why we thought the village, you know, or close to the commercial district off 300 to where people would be potentially connected to public transportation. And again, many of these of the town close by shopping centers, service centers, you know, we don't want these people utilizing their vehicles and
- 01;22;05;20 racking up expenses as well. Okay.
- 01;22;11;29 For affordable housing, I guess we can ask, uh, Jim and Alex to keep on pursuing. Right. See if we can find some other models to look at it.
- 01;22;20;29 Yeah. And just as a warning, now this may be one that maybe, maybe just trickles over, um, maybe this is maybe this is a bigger issue that it might take a little bit longer time, but let's see what we can do in the short run. And if we don't feel we're comfortable with it, you know, we can carry it into the next year. But, um, obviously, um, again, this should be paired up with whatever we end up doing with a comp plan down the line as well. Would it be feasible to, um, study the, um, making land that
- 01;22;52;11 we have in town to see where this would work? I mean, there's not a lot of sites you may have to look into maybe the zone change or something to provide incentive, no
- 01;23;08;06 Residential area and, um, you know, residential or, or we could add, you know, I think that's where we were going add is that we'd be looking at maybe a new section of the ordinance right now we have open space ordinances for cluster development. Maybe we could come up with something equal that would be for affordable housing development. I think at least my take is that it would be easier to have a complete development that's affordable housing, as opposed to bring in, you know, say
- 01;23;42;00 arbitrarily the price you have the family houses that are going from 200,000 and you, if the 50 developer sells one house for a hundred thousand, he gets in advantages. No, I, I agree with you that, that's why I was like saying it shouldn't be like an affordable housing development ordinance, where again, it's, you know, um, if they come in with that, then they, then they get the benefit because to your point, like we did with the
- 01;24;08;18 elderly housing, somebody comes in here and they maximize the density and get six or X, three units in there. And five years down the road, we have no idea who's living in there and they could be on the market for back to every market price or the wage restriction. It's just difficult to track where if you do what affordable development, you know, the whole thing it has to meet the criteria.
- 01;24;35;04 Any other thoughts? No, I think that's, I mean, it's, we'll look at the model. We'll look at some models. Um, we'll have the, the, um, the density calculation. We'll,

IPTV

we'll look to see what will make it attractive and it will be a soul fully affordable housing development, no mixes.

- 01;24;54;18 Yeah. And I, and I think, you know, maybe offline Bob, you and I, and Alex, maybe, maybe we can get a zoom meeting with somebody, like from a best way to understand what they look for or suitable development.
- 01;25;07;21 Good. Okay. Timeline. So I'm guessing that we didn't have, there's no real major problems. Um, we've got, uh, where our timeline would be. We'd have to have our public hearing in March. Is that correct?
- 01;25;29;04 Yeah. That's typically when we've done them in the past, we haven't marched. And that time that gives the council or the board of selectmen time to review our recommendations and process it to get out in front of the town meeting typically held in June.
- 01;25;44;06 So we would need the ordinances ready for voting in our next meeting. Let's see. Yes. Right. I mean, this is January anywhere. We, we need the ordinances to vote on. Is that in that, to have the notes, you mean we'd have the ordinances, right?
- 01;26;04;20 Right. You need a, you need a full red line review version ready for the next meeting. Correct. And then we'd have a public hearing in March,
- 01;26;14;23 Right. With a ball with the boat. Is that doable with the exception of the affordable housing? Is that all doable for you guys?
- 01;26;21;28 Yeah, I, Alex D I don't, I think most of it's there, it's just a little bit of wordsmith. I don't think there's much work at all there to have that ready for the next meeting. Right.
- 01;26;30;11 Yeah. I agree for those, uh, the late arrivals. Um, I asked Tom to join us, uh, this evening. Um, uh, this is a repeat, um, was interested in, in the zoning board of appeals. Um, and I asked him to join us tonight to see if he would consider the planning board for our openings and zoning board of appeals, um, does not have an opening and hopefully we didn't scare him away. You have any questions for us? Uh, well, you haven't scared
- 01;27;07;09 me at all. So I stayed silent on a lot of those issues because I have my own, um, uh, questions, I guess, on some items of concern, but, um, Nope, Nope, no. Yeah. I'm scared of me away. Okay. Great talk.
- 01;27;24;09 Feel free to come back when we have a public Eric.
- 01;27;27;18 Well, that might be a scary, so, you know, I, I do have a, you know, a semi engineering background. Perfect. Yeah. Spent a lot of years at bath iron works and in the Navy, so we can sign you up, Tom. Um, let me think about that. Just, yeah, very warned me about this meeting versus the other ones with the exception of, he probably likes this meeting better.

IPTV

01;27;59;14 Right. Um, it seems less contentious so far. Do we have, is there anything else that we need to talk about?

01;28;13;29 I don't believe so. And Alex, I'm not aware of any, um, any applications that are forthcoming to the board. Um, are you

01;28;24;18 No, not at this time

01;28;27;07 As we stand right now, it looks like we'll again, be, uh, doing ordinance review, um, At the next regular meeting. Okay. Move to Jaron. What's doing all those in favor. Oh, we're done.