

IPTV

- 00;00;08;16 Good evening and welcome to the Wednesday, March 10th, 2021 planning where it mean for the town of Raymond. The board will come to order. The boy does have a quorum and we'll start by holding roll call. Um, Kevin, will you go first? Kevin Woodberry, um, Mike, Mike doc, Angelo, Greg, you muted Greg foster and Robbie O'Neill. Um, this is a public
- 00;00;39;07 proceeding and unless the board proceeds to, uh, specifically goes to go into executive session, you have the right to hear everything that is being said. And to look at all the exhibits that are presented, there's nobody to chair. If you are unable to see or hear the board works from a published agenda and we'll be continuing tonight items the following, what are we having a application review from, uh, Wiley and sons, uh, followed by a public hearing for the 2021 proposed land use amendments, uh, volume that
- 00;01;08;28 any planner communications I own it is the incident in each instance is the burden is upon the applicant to demonstrate compliance with the divisions or the applicable ordinance or state war. Um, for the public hearing, the phone number was, um, published and also I believe is now being shown on the screen on when we get to that point. If you have any questions, please feel free to call in and we will try to get them answered. So we will start
- 00;01;40;06 with the pre-application here at mean, um, Jim, do you want to take us to start us off and then Dustin, you can follow it all up.
- 00;01;50;24 I think that the fairer to the board, I think everybody was on the site work, if I'm not mistaken. Is that correct? Kevin, Greg, you were there, right? Yeah, I was. Okay. All right. So go ahead, Jim. Yeah. Yep.
- 00;02;12;20 Um, this project, uh, did become before you back in, I believe, uh, 2017. And at that time you saw the, the carving out of what I believe, uh, three or four lots that were off patrician have in, uh, later on we did have an applicant. Well, I don't think it was ever a formal application, but we had a sidewalk as Bob pointed out of the property. And at that point they were looking to do an open space type concept, uh, subdivision, uh, with what we were hoping for at the time would be a loop connector road
- 00;02;44;18 between Patricia and pipeline. Uh, and if you remember correctly, this is right on the Raymond Wyndham, uh, timeline. Um, and if you're approaching it from pipeline, uh, to the right would be the Wyndham where there's currently an operating a gravel pit. And then to the right, there was kind of a, a little bit of area there. Then it drops down into a wet, uh, or resource protected area. Uh, what they're proposing to do now is to kind of do about half of what we'd saw
- 00;03;16;24 originally, which is to come in up Patricia, uh, design lots on both sides of the proposed road with a dead end road, uh, looking to do single family and a

IPTV

combination with, uh, duplexes, uh, all toll. I think we were looking, this is in the, sorry, this is in the village residential district. So again, um, it does include, um, smaller lot sizes. Um, I did

00;03;44;04 provide you a, uh, kind of a breakdown of what's required in the subdivision. Uh, tonight they're just here for pre-application. They haven't really applied for a formal, uh, application at this point. I just wanted to point out a couple of things that, uh, we would probably be looking at one would be the connectivity of the right of way, regardless of whether, uh, we, we do an open space or we do a conventional subdivision.

00;04;09;27 Uh, they have shown that on their plan of the right of way, continuing through to pipeline. Um, the second part of it, which was a big discussion back then, which, uh, they're not proposing at this point is connection to public water. So I think, uh, you know, regardless, uh, Wayne is on here as well. I mean, the minimum would be sprinklers in these residential homes as part of the subdivision, but then I don't know where the board will want to go. As far as favoring, uh, connection to a public water. It is a fair distance away. My understanding is, is that the, it,

00;04;43;06 Dustin probably didn't get into this a little bit more. Uh, there was some conditions around that waterline, um, the distance and the condition of the line itself that may be, uh, too much of an economic burden for the development. Um, the other piece of this is because if you look at your plans and the lot configurations, they're narrow and skinny, and we're going to have to fit Wells and septic systems. So if that is the route we're going, you know, we're going to be looking for nitrate analysis for the plumes, couple of the septic systems that just

00;05;13;08 everything's so tight in there that they're going to have to be pretty precise with their locations of those two items. Um, I think the rest of it is pretty much, um, same that, uh, you saw before, uh, we may want to get some, uh, information as far as, you know, the wetlands out back, um, what the setbacks will be and if there's any revisions to any of those, uh, there will be some stormwater provisions, obviously with the development of

00;05;40;27 the road, uh, access to things like that because they're planning on the storm water measures to be behind the houses that are on that wetland side. So where we have access, how they get access to those ponds or, or, or filtration devices will be important. Um,

00;05;58;12 But other than that, um, you know, uh, they are promoting here a pretty nice little subdivision, at least in the first phase. And I guess we'd be interested to see is, you know, are there plans in the future to continue this? Um, and if so, you know, you, the board will be in the dilemma of, you know, what should we ask for now? And, and what, you know, should we prepare them for if there is a future phase? So this, again, you're not taking any action tonight. You're just listening and you can chime in with suggestions, but nothing is binding at this point. So, uh,

## IPTV

- 00;06;31;01 Bob I'll return it back to you and whether you want to have Dustin present on top of mine there. Thanks for having us here tonight. I'm going to try and share my screen here.
- 00;06;48;19 Oh,
- 00;06;48;26 I don't know if somebody can enable me to do that or I'll, I'll put a plan after if that's okay.
- 00;07;13;02 I'm trying. Okay. Yep. This stuff does every time had I realized I would have asked you to send it to me ahead of time. Uh, it says one participant can share at a time, so you should be able to
- 00;07;33;04 Yeah. It says a host disabled participants screen share.
- 00;07;38;04 Okay. Security. There we go. Try it now. Looks good. Okay. Everyone. See that? Okay. Perfect.
- 00;08;02;24 All right. Um, so yeah, so, um, Justin Roma from DM Rola consulting engineers, um, representing RN, Willie and sons, Inc, uh, for this, um, proposed amendment to the subdivision approvals, um, as Jim indicated and, uh, 2016, there was one lot that was split off, uh, 2017, the board approved, uh, three additional lots, which all had existing frontage on, uh, either, uh, Patricia Avenue or pipeline road. So we had,
- 00;08;35;13 uh, proposed a larger project, um, as a pre-application back, uh, last about a year, little over a year ago. Um, and at that time that would have encompassed kind of the full development of the property. Um, and there was, we've had some discussions about, um, the existing ongoing use of that, um, pit on the adjacent property where that pit is still, um,
- 00;09;05;15 continuing an operation. Um, they utilize this driveway access from Viola, um, to get into that, uh, property.
- 00;09;14;05 So they're really not at a point yet where they're ready to fully build out that part of the site as a residential subdivision. So what we decided to do was to basically break the project in half and to propose the, um, the first phase of the project we could come in off of Patricia. Um, one of the items that we're proposing here, um, as an improvement to what we had proposed before was a realignment of where the, uh, the new
- 00;09;44;23 driveway intersects Patricia, as you may recall from the sidewalk that, um, our area of owned frontage right here, um, is just a little bit off the actual corner of the roadway. And while, you know, we, we probably would meet the technical minimum requirements for site distance at that location. It was certainly a much better, uh, scenario to, to move the driveway slightly, um, to the North, which would put it basically right at the

IPTV

- 00;10;17;20 corner to give much wider, uh, better sight distance is looking at both directions. So, um, the applicant has, um, um, discussed this with the, um, with the neighboring property owner and we'll be providing the town with, um, some documentation, uh, just showing that that, uh, that there will be an easement conveyed for this triangular, uh, portion of land in through here,
- 00;10;45;01 uh, so that the roadway can access, uh, in that new location. It'll also help to avoid a utility pole that's right there on the corner. So there's a couple of reasons why it's a better spot for that driveway. Um, as Jim indicated, we have, we have a, um, an essence, a clustered conservation fight subdivision layout here with some open space. Um, initially we were looking at having all of the lots, um, the, the smaller lot size, um, half
- 00;11;18;23 acre size with, uh, the rest of it being made up as an open space. Uh, we did want to keep some flexibility on three of the lots, um, to be able to be built out as duplexes as an option.
- 00;11;32;00 Um, those lots are, uh, two, three and four in the middle, the, um, the rest of the lots being the half acre size. Um, the way I understand the ordinances, those would be restricted to a single family homes. Um, the entire development, you know, watch two, three, and four, maybe built out as single family as well. But again, we just wanted to try and keep some flexibility. Um, for those three properties, the roadways proposed as a,
- 00;12;04;14 um, there'll be 20 feet of paved travel way, um, with two front gravel shoulders on either side. And that is the, um, the public road standard. Um, we, as far as whether the town is interested in, in, um, accepting this as a public road, um, I guess we would leave that up to the town, um, where we'll do our part to design it as a public road. And if the town wishes to
- 00;12;34;18 accept it would, you know, certainly be willing to offer it, uh, for public acceptance. Um, if the town would like to wait until the actual connection is made to pipeline before they consider acceptance, uh, we can delay it as well. So it will be this coordinating with the town on what their preferences there. Um, we are going to have a storm water filter base in right here at the
- 00;13;03;06 entrance that Patricia AF, um, high spot in the road here about 250 feet in. So this water will drain back into, uh, uh, pretty small storm water pond here, right at the entrance. Um, as we continue down the road, um, again, we'll have a hammerhead, uh, turn around. That's being built here around station 700. Um, at some point in the future, when the road is extended to extend into pipeline, then, um, you know, we can potentially
- 00;13;34;09 remove that hammerhead or, or we can leave it in place if there's a functional advantage for, um, firetrucks or things like that. Um, we can just kind of, uh, work through that scenario when we develop this deck, the next phase, um, all the

IPTV

stormwater will run down into this one, uh, channel here, uh, run down in between these last two lots.

- 00;13;59;26 Uh, we've got two more storm water filter basins here on the rear side of the property. Um, as Jim had indicated, uh, we will need to provide permanent, um, access areas so that we can, uh, equipment can get down behind these buildings and maintain these bonds. Um, so we will provide a, uh, kind of an easement area that runs down along this last lot, and then going around the back so that these lots, uh, these pawns back here can be maintained. Uh, we do setbacks from the edge of the wetland
- 00;14;33;19 since it's of a wetland, a special significance. Um, the standard setback is 75 feet. Um, we are proposing, uh, site work closer than that. So we'll be getting, are applying for in front of my role with main DDP, um, in order to build these ponds in their proposed location. Um, we're also required to get a stormwater permit through Maine DEP, um, just based on the amount of impervious area that's proposed here. So, um, that was the
- 00;15;02;29 main reason why we wanted to come back in front of the board as a pre-application sketch is because we're, um, getting ready to submit this to BDP for our stormwater permits. And we just wanted to get a sense from the board, um, that, you know, this was on the right track and that you didn't, um, want to see any substantial changes before we, um, made these applications, uh, to the state. Yeah. And these are the wrong cross sections here. Again, a proposal we
- 00;15;34;25 have built to the public standard. Um, we did take a, um, a hard look at the project feasibility to bring in public water. Um, we looked at it from a couple of different directions. Um, the closest water Bain is out on Roosevelt trail. Um, the two options are really to come, uh, down Viola app and then continue it down through what would be the future road connection
- 00;16;04;16 to come in and bring it in the way. Um, the second option would be to come all the way down Patricia Avenue. Um, I went through the projects entrance and then bring it in that way. Um, both locations required about a 1500 foot, uh, main extension. Um, also due to the, uh, water pressures out in the area. Uh, the water district was telling us that a main extension down
- 00;16;32;28 through these roads, I would likely be a 12 inch diameter Maine, um, which is significantly more cost than an eight.
- 00;16;41;24 Um, so we did look at the feasibility of running public water down Patricia Avenue, and then the additional 800 feet through the site. Um, and it just was not something that the developer felt that they could, uh, shoulder for this project. Um, not knowing how many years it's going to be before they decide to, um, fully reclaim the pit and build out this final phase of the development. Um, no, it would just be, uh, too much

IPTV

- 00;17;13;23 costs to bring in, uh, for this, uh, nine additional homes that they're proposing here. So instead of bringing in public water and installing hydrant, uh, we're proposing to sprinkle all of the buildings, uh, as fire protection for the project.
- 00;17;34;19 Um, so I think
- 00;17;39;13 That's a basic summary of kind of where we're at now. Um, certainly welcome to feedback, uh, from the board, if you have any. Um, and as I said, our step is going to be, to be filing our applications with the DEP and then we'll come back with a full application, uh, including septic system designs, uh, the hydro DOI analysis as indicated, um, well, placement areas, we'll address all of that in our, um, in our fall complete application when we come back to the board. So that I'll turn it back over
- 00;18;12;11 to you, Mr. Chair.
- 00;18;16;08 Thanks, Dustin. The a, doesn't just a one quick thing. If I remember correctly, the layout of the land, um, it's fairly open, um, for the buffered areas. Would you consider some plantings on between the lots in those buffer zones?
- 00;18;42;03 Yeah, we can propose a landscaping plan, which would include some interior buffering yet we can do that.
- 00;18;50;19 Does the board have anything specific? I guess I'm a little concerned about the tightness of the lots and the well septic scenarios. So I'm kind of curious, I know what's in the future, but I wonder how many lots would be proposed for the rest of the remaining lands between the end of the driveway and pipeline?
- 00;19;23;05 Yeah, I mean, there's, we had, um, proposed, I guess we had submitted a plan and come before the board about a year ago, a little before. Um, let's show basically, um, this many lots, again, coming down through here. So there was, you know, maybe another 10 lots or so that were going to be on this side of the road. There's, there's some different options. I mean, the ordinance allows for multi-family development. So, um,
- 00;19;54;13 there could potentially be, um, you know, some, you know, three or four unit buildings, which would have, um, which would allow more dwellings than the single family homes. Um, basically we're looking at the limit limiting factor being road frontage, and the ability to create these, uh, building windows for each of the lots. So, um, you know, you're looking at, you know, the potential of, you know, between seven and 10 lots that could
- 00;20;25;05 occupy that additional space.
- 00;20;29;03 Yeah. Just for disclosure. Uh, Mike, when they came back in, uh, previously they had 21 launch total, which would have included the four that Dustin talked about plus the nine tonight. So he's about right, it'd be about eight or nine more, lots likely, uh, could fit in there between the end of, and

IPTV

- 00;20;48;08 Up to those properties at a but pipeline.
- 00;20;52;27 Because then we just started thinking with that many lives, then maybe it would be more economically feasible to bring in water 1500 feet. But I know that we probably don't want to do it for the name of loss proposed now, but I guess when it gets future developed, maybe we could at least think about requiring these proposed lots to have to hook up just a thought.
- 00;21;25;14 So you're thinking Mike, what you're thinking about is to require, um, the water public lawyer pipeline one for the additional or adding additional locks. Is that what you're,
- 00;21;38;25 Well, maybe that's not a good way to go. I'm just kinda worried about the, the, um, how do we make sure that the septic and well is going to work on such a narrow lot?
- 00;21;52;16 Well, precisely we've asked for the nitrate study, um, obviously Alice can get into the state requirements for adequate separation between the two. And that's why I was saying, given the newness of the lots, they're going to be very precise with those when they give us the nitrate analysis that will generate plume, the shows where the nitrates from the septic will flow in a direction based on topography and soils. And from that you'll, you'll have a better understanding of what potential
- 00;22;24;16 contamination would be. Uh, two Wells now, obviously they don't feel put them outside of the, um, uh, department of human services requirements for, uh, acceptable digital plumes. But, uh, yeah, it's, uh, it is a concern given the narratives of the lots.
- 00;22;43;20 Well, that sounds like a reasonable approach to try to make it safe.
- 00;22;52;26 Dustin, could we go to the, uh, your, um, to your ponds that are being built, um, on two of the, two of the lots they're actually going to be on the property of those owners. Yep. And the maintenance of those are going to be, and they wrote association were correct. And the only reason why it has to be built on those property is because you want the acreage
- 00;23;27;08 for a duplex. My understanding that correct. Right. So, I mean the best scenario would be if we could, we to get permission to locate those ponds closer to the wetlands.
- 00;23;41;04 Um, and that would
- 00;23;43;11 Be the best scenario, but we've got, we're anticipating,
- 00;23;47;01 Um, that the DEP will require us to, um, keep these, uh, soil disturbance away from those existing wetland areas. Um, so that pushes them up here into the lots. Um, so when we try to occupy as a small of a footprint as we could, but you

IPTV

know, what it is, is we've got basically the area of road frontage here in front of the lot. Um, the backyard space is going to have some of the stormwater plans, um, but we'll need to provide

- 00;24;20;10 documentation through that hydrogeologic analysis that we've got room on each of these lots that include Wells septics, um, and the stormwater basis will all be part of that.
- 00;24;32;18 So I, so just under those areas of concern, that would be a concern of mine that we'd be building those bonds on there, on somebody's property, but yet giving the road association the rights to those bonds to maintain them. I think that's a, that's a problem down the road that would be nice to be able to avoid.
- 00;24;55;26 And that was one of our thinking and, um, having those lots be that the duplex slots so that it would be, you know, like apartment rentals type scenarios, right. To avoid some of those potential complications in the future.
- 00;25;11;01 Um, just a before I forget, just to answer your question on the, on the town road, um, the road really would not, the channel would not be interested in the road, according to what we've been in discussions and plans right now, until it is connected. Right. You're muted. Jim, I can see you talking, but we can't hear you.
- 00;25;36;12 Here we go. Um, thank you. Um, just for your insight too, under the subdivision ordinance, um, the way our ordinance is written, um, for any subdivision of 15, lots or 25 units, or would require a loop road. Uh, so once they do exceed 15 lots, somehow there's going to have to be some loop connectivity. So when they do get to phase two, this will have to
- 00;26;07;06 definitely connect into pipeline. Um, if they do more than, uh, six more lives, which is likely scenario.
- 00;26;16;22 Okay.
- 00;26;21;05 And one other question for Dustin, um, on lot five, there's a pretty narrow wedge of what you've called open space. Um, what, what is the benefit and what would be, you know, how would one, what are the expectations, I guess, around that open space, because it is pretty remote in the back it's wet. Um, would you be looking to with the open space too? Or why are we just picking this one? Sliver?
- 00;26;49;22 Yup. So, um, on that line, that's basically the we've left over land from lot five, um, that would otherwise make it a conforming lot in the zone. Um, our thought there was that we were trying to, trying to keep as many of the lots, um, in conformance with the clustered standards. Um, the idea of that being open spaces, that it would be less likely for a homeowner to try and do something out in that back land. If it was clearly,
- 00;27;24;07 you know, common, open space, not owned by the owner, then it would be more, uh, protected from someone that maybe isn't as tuned to, um, wetland rules and



## IPTV

things like that in the future, if it was clearly open space, then it would have a higher, higher likelihood of being protected. And, um, if it was part of somebody's land and they thought they might want to go

00;27;46;26 build some, you know, dirt bike trails on it or something like that

00;27;52;14 Is really a great segue into asking why does it continue through all of that wetland? That really is not unbuildable anyway.

00;28;02;12 Yeah. So I mean, I would be, I would be open to having all of this land here, the all contiguous open space, um, what our preference was is to allow these lots to potentially be built out as duplex locks. Um, so that was why they had eat more of that land together. Um, so that was really the only reason. Otherwise we could have more open space through here, but our understanding was that if we were to build these out as half-acre lots,

00;28;35;28 then they would all only be eligible as single family homes and that none of the lots could be built.

00;28;42;21 Yeah. I think one of the things we might want to take a look at, and I didn't, I didn't really look at this before tonight is if there's a possibility, at least we can put a, I think under the open-space provisions, you can have the open space either in a its own entity, um, of open space or maybe even a deed restriction over a lot. So I don't know if you would necessarily lose the lot area, but, um, you know, maybe the fact that we can protect that area. Yeah.

00;29;13;06 The ordinance for us to have the flexibility of duplexes on some of these lots and give more open space. Um, I'm totally up for that. Uh, if there's a way we can do it.

00;29;29;14 Okay. Anything else from the board questions, concerns

00;29;38;20 Just that when you folks see, is it

00;29;42;02 The size of the property? You know, one of the requirements in the ordinances is that technically you're supposed to determine whether you want to see a conventional subdivision or a cluster subdivision due to its size. Um, you know, I guess it would be good to give them some guidance tonight if there are, if you're on board with kind of this hybrid, uh, or, you know, whether you do want to see what one or the other would look like in its entirety, I guess my answer to that weekend somehow, um, and these

00;30;23;24 lots with some buffered area, um, and, and break off that wetland connected with the open-space wetland, which would obviously connect with his others wetland as it would carry through. I think that that as proposed, I don't, I wouldn't see any reason for in separate plan. Um, sorry, this board have

## IPTV

- 00;30;52;13 any, uh, questions. I, I can't Kevin, I can't see you for some reason. Well, you have to scroll the down, but I agree with what you just said. I was just going to say the same thing. I, I like to keep that the back of all those lots in the open space area, um, and have it continue on through, so that would, that would make lot five eligible for a duplex. Correct.
- 00;31;22;04 Which is a good thing.
- 00;31;25;13 Um, right. Yep. Um, and Mike, now I've lost you, Mike. There you, are. You have anything else, Mike? Yeah. Thanks. All right. Yeah. So I
- 00;31;57;08 think Alex and I will have to work, uh, take a look at the cluster provisions to see what is acceptable for open space provisions. Because I do know there w I believe they were two options, one word, it could be put in a, a separate lot of open space. And I think the other has a provision where, uh, it can be protected within the lots themselves. Okay. And I don't have to care when you're joined us, but are you, you know what we're talking about? Yep. Yeah. I have it up on my screen. Um, was the meeting
- 00;32;33;08 supposed to start earlier than seven tonight? I didn't, yeah, we started at six 30. I'm sorry. I didn't tell you don't feel bad or,
- 00;32;43;18 Yeah.
- 00;32;48;03 Um, but back at you, you see what we're talking about right now? Yes. Okay. Yeah. So you could just combine all the open space and reduce the size of those locks. Uh, so it's not part of each individual lot, and you'd still get credit for it. That's what we need to, we need to investigate under the open space subdivision, but it seems a sensible thing to do because these people aren't going to want to own one up, back like
- 00;33;20;05 that. And it's just going to be a nuisance most likely. Yeah. And I think our goal is obviously to protect the wetlands. So, I mean, either, either way, you know, they wouldn't be allowed to go in there because it is a restricted wetland, but, uh, you know, the fact is if you put it into a formal open space, then it's a little more formal on the plan and on the ground as far as what, where, where you can't go, anything else from the
- 00;33;52;29 board.
- 00;33;54;24 I'm good. Dustin, do you have any questions for us? Um, don't I don't think so. I think, um, yeah, we'll just work with Jim and Alex on, um, what we can do. I, I, I certainly share the same goals as what the planning board wants, you know, protect the wetland areas as best we can. So, um, we'll work with Jim and Alex on that, and also just, it's going to be important too, for that entrance to understand the speed limit and sight distance side from a, uh, traffic design standpoint for, for safe access in

IPTV

- 00;34;28;24 and out of that entrance.
- 00;34;30;27 Yep.
- 00;34;43;03 Yeah, I guess that's all I have for questions tonight. So, um, sounds like the board generally acceptable to the plan, certainly subject to review the details. We'll go from there. Okay. All right. Thanks.
- 00;35;00;20 Right. Very good.
- 00;35;07;27 Like on the screen. Okay. We will move to the, uh, um, public hearing section for the ordinances. Um, what I intend to do, um, since we're in the zoom here is, uh, open the public hearing, but leave the public hearing open why we go through on each of these proposed ordinances.
- 00;35;33;08 So if anybody is watching, um, there is a phone number, um, if you
- 00;35;38;25 Are catching this after the meeting, um, just so that, you know, the procedure that is that the planning board will act on these, um, ordinances will either, um, approve them for the recommendation. Uh, we'll we'll just, just approve them with no recommendation, um, or on, uh, uh, or vote no, on any of them on, we are just sending them to the way of selecting, um, the board of selectmen, then we'll act on each of them and put them on to the, um, tell me, so that's the procedure. So if you miss it
- 00;36;11;04 tonight, you still have, um, at least two other opportunities, um, to ask questions about each of the proposed ordinance changes. So with that, um, we'll leave that public hearing open, um, and we'll start in with the erosion, um, and street, uh, definitions.
- 00;36;32;26 Okay. Here. Um, the first amendment would be to develop some consistency within our ordinances throughout a word that says we use the word, uh, street and road interchangeably. However, there have been pieces in our ordinances where those may have different intent meaning. So the opportunity here was within our land use ordinance, article 12, Sugarland zoning section, uh, 17, and within our street ordinance, uh, to redefine
- 00;37;04;05 road such that it is basically, uh, in terms, a term commonly used to describe the route or track consisting of a bed of exposed mineral soil, gravel, asphalt, or other surfaces materials constructed for or created by repeated passage of motor vehicles. The term shall also include undereducated roads that are described in the recorded document, the term road, which is the most important, but the term road shall not include those ways which have been discontinued or abandoned for the purposes of the town of Raymond land. Use ordinances, a road must comply with the state
- 00;37;36;10 of the set forth under the definition of street to be utilized for all, except for what frontage and street front. Again, what we're trying to do is have consistency

IPTV

between the term road and street. So essentially what this definition would do, uh, within these three ordinances or forward. It's a, sorry, uh, would be to, uh, basically say that we're States the term road. It really means street.

00;38;03;12 Thanks. Is there any, uh, any discussion on the board we've been through these a couple of times, so we would need a motion to send to the aboard, uh, approving, uh, with a recommendation to, for approval, just to send to the board of selectmen where we would have the option to vote down,

00;38;29;14 moved recommended the recommendation for approval grade. Yes, but

00;38;36;01 That's amazing to, uh, send the ordinance, um, adjusting the road and street definitions through the selectmen, um, recommending approval, um, zooms or a number we'd have to vote by voice Kevin you're first up. I, uh, Mike, hi Greg. Hi man. I vote yes as well. So the motion

00;39;02;00 passes five to zero and the next one up Jim is the backlot driveway.

00;39;10;23 Yep. This is the Terminus, a redesigned for backlog driveway and private road, Terminator turnaround determinants design. Um, just give you a little background on this. This originated with some of the recent, uh, developments that we've seen being adequate for some of our fire protection apparatus. Um, so what we've done here is we worked with the fire department and, uh, ever revised the Terminus detailed such that it will operate effectively for, uh, current, uh, count Raymond fire apparatus and

00;39;47;07 emergency vehicles. Um, and there's two dependencies that have been added to this one is the actual design options for the street turnaround. And one for the backlog driveway Terminus, which is under appendix a and appendix B are various criteria that the fire department has included that they will be looking for, um, to maintain, um, both for slope access in geometric

00;40;14;15 access, as well as, uh, no parking signs where they would be located, um, where the turn around. There's some other information in there it's just to, you know, how we measure and, and, um, look at like things for the firetruck apparatus. And there was, there's an exhibit, there's an exhibit in there showing how we're, where we measure those from.

00;40;38;01 Okay. Um, and as found some, either kind of typos or things that were misconstrued in it, um, Alex, you have, I sent those to you. Um, did they make sense to you as well?

00;40;53;28 Yeah. Um, see,

00;40;58;25 I should have said that to you as well. Jan, I'm sorry.

## IPTV

- 00;41;01;02 Yeah, I believe it's on there. There's some references, uh, in the, in the fire one that had some references to what had a reference to Raymond road and we will make those clerical, um, revisions.
- 00;41;14;00 Um, okay. But what about, I think the line eight page 11 line eight, it's found it, um, something I think that is, uh, well that on at least eight degrees, as opposed to shall not exceed eight degrees is I think fairly significant 40 said no. Yeah, but going by the, uh, the picture on the bottom, um, you know, it's got the degrees approach and, you
- 00;41;44;00 know, in departure in, up in the text, it says it's, um, gotta be at least eight degrees. So I don't think you want it eight degrees or more, do you want an eight degrees or less,
- 00;41;59;13 Right.
- 00;42;03;11 Yeah. So those are just, you know, clerical things that I think we've got to fix.
- 00;42;09;11 Yup. I think the same thing applies to line three. Yep. Reference to North Raymond road can be taken out. Right. I think that
- 00;42;37;28 covers it right here. Did I miss anything?
- 00;42;42;25 Um, uh, number five, it it's, it's a little bit unclear. It, it seems like it's kind of out of place there. What do you think of that? I don't know what street they're talking about. It seems like it's for a specific project that was addressed and left in there with the copy and paste or something. Right. So would that, would that be removed or should
- 00;43;12;11 that be removed number five?
- 00;43;16;12 Yeah, that seems to be on a specific development case by case taking the five minutes. So I would recommend that we strike number five with those amendments. Would you like to, um, um, there's one more thing to
- 00;43;51;23 look at on page 10, appendix B under E it says departure angles. No greater than nine degrees. The sketch shows eight degrees. Yep. Letter. I got it.
- 00;44;10;23 It's just a, it's a typo. Yep. Got it.
- 00;44;21;01 So they should all be eight degrees. They should both be eight degrees. Yes. Okay.
- 00;44;36;25 There's one on the way down on the way back, you going have all that water in the tank and it's true. Anything else? I'll move that we
- 00;45;10;15 approve the ordinance proposed ordinance James for backlog driveway and private road turning around Terminus, designed with a recommendation for

IPTV

approval to the board of selectmen. Is there a second, second, any further discussion? All those in favor, starting with you, Kevin. Aye. Aye. Aye.

00;45;40;10 Aye. Aye. Vote. Aye. It passes on to dead ends in grade waivers.

00;45;52;04 I assume that somebody is keeping an eye out there in the public to see if we do have any public comments as we go through this. Thank you. Um, the next, uh, amendment will be on in the street ordinance. Um, this one, uh, captures a few things under section five, five, um, minimal travel way with was revised. Um, I'm not sure why we wanted Alex. Do you recall why we, I don't know if we actually want to do that on that one. Should've

00;46;26;28 been, well, we were talking about the grade change, not the width chain that should say it should be 10% for the operator and the 12, 12 foot, which should stay the same. We just, again, a typo.

00;46;47;19 So the minimum grade should be the maximum grade should be 10%, not 12. And the travel way should be a 1,210. So that was within the street design table. Um, the real changes are within section five, seven or dead end streets, uh, currently, um, within, uh, many of our ordinances. We have, um, a limitation on the width of the length of streets, but, um, we

00;47;17;25 do have cases where, um, requires a turnaround. And what we decided was that, uh, in those cases where we have more than a thousand linear feet, uh, we could be at the need for, um, either a bypass or a, another turnaround, um, to allow mercy vehicles in there. This is really applicable to a lot of, um, backboard driveways and smaller private roads where that travel way is narrow. And in often cases, these are long winding accesses,

00;47;48;20 uh, into deeper properties. So the idea is that, uh, when emergency call comes in to, to the, um, to the station and they want to reply, if they send a few virtual vehicles out there, things get gummed up pretty quickly. So, uh, as a manner to allow people to turn off and not, you know, go off into the ditches, we wanted some strategic areas where people needed to pull off and pass or, um, they could have a separate, you know, maybe intermediate turnarounds. So that

00;48;18;17 applies to section five, seven, and then finally, uh, section 10 was Wickers. Um, and this one has to do with the grade of the roads as you saw, we revised the, uh, backlog driveway from 12% down to 10%. However, uh, we've put in here and waiver criteria of, uh, let's see, I believe there's six items in the waiver criteria, um, where if somebody could prove to the board that they were eligible for a waiver meeting, these six conditions,

00;48;52;08 um, which could be anything from the geometric lock configuration, physical limitations, um, um, the steepness will be minimized in the section of the road.

00;49;04;17 So it will be an extended, you know, exceedance of the grade. Um, the shoulders could be widened in certain places where the steepness was great, um, would not

## IPTV

create an adverse conditions to the environment or drainage conditions or in winter. Um, and it would remain a safe and helpful condition for obviously the applicants in this case and, and neighbors as well, and have a design criteria for the fire departments, such that the value, which is, uh, uh, geometrical value wouldn't exceed

00;49;38;02 20. And then finally that, uh, it's, it's up to the applicant to provide the evidence that they've, they've met all of these conditions. That's just kind of a quick summary of, of what we've presented, um, or for the waiver country conditions. And that was the end of that section for, um, getting

00;49;59;25 dead ends and, and grade waivers. Is there any discussion from the board?

00;50;07;28 Yeah, I had a couple things I noticed going through there on page 13 under in that chart for the type of street, um, where it says private street, the, with the minimum travel way with is 18 feet. And then down below, um,

00;50;28;27 In, uh, footnote number one, it lists the trouble way of 12 feet, uh, with shoulders. And then, uh, it for, for, for residents is less, but for four to 10, it's got 16 feet. So I don't know what that 18, uh, feet really

00;50;52;00 18 and over, um, anything from 11 and over.

00;50;59;28 Okay.

00;51;01;10 So there should be, um, and there is, it's hard to see, but under, under the header, under private street, that's where that one footnote is. So, I mean, it is a barrier, it is a variable private road standard, um, you know, based on the number of residents that access it, but then 18 applies for anything over 11 months, 11.

00;51;24;01 Should we note that somewhere? Because, I mean, just for me reading it, I didn't catch that, that it applied to a whole lot, um, 11 and over

00;51;37;21 We can, you know, like in that footnote, we could add another sentence that for lots of living in over VAT.

00;51;45;02 Yeah. That seems like that'd be a good idea. Make it more clear.

00;51;53;06 Had you ever had a question on this

00;51;55;22 On page 14 under E D a letter C? It seems like it's just a sentence fragment. I, I don't know what it, uh, if something was left out, part of the sentence was left out. Yeah. I agree. And I think I should say or cannot be designed. Yeah,

00;52;18;04 That's right. Yeah. There's a not visiting.

00;52;21;14 Okay. Not an, a, B I'm a compulsive proofreader

IPTV

- 00;52;37;24 Better now than when we were in a publication. Yeah.
- 00;52;45;29 And the other discussion on the
- 00;52;48;05 Straightaway. Okay. I have a, I have a question. I didn't, I didn't have one to pick up on in the notes that we talked about 12% twice when we're, when we're trying to keep it to 10%. Is that something we overlooked gyms On five, five in the notes that we were referring to where we're going to add the language four 11 to the footnote. So those will be
- 00;53;22;16 reduced back down to 10. Good catch.
- 00;53;28;29 Thank you.
- 00;53;37;16 Catch it.
- 00;53;46;27 I move that. We approve incentives where it's like been recommending approval. You weren't just changes, restrict section 5.5, the ordinance section five points every day and the street word in section 10 for a second. Second. Any more discussion? All those in favor of starting with you, Kevin. Hi Mike. Hi, Greg. And I vote. Yes. As well. Motion passes
- 00;54;25;09 next up is clearing of vegetation and allowance and ballooning.
- 00;54;34;20 Yep. This is an ordinance change within the land use article, uh, for a minimal standards of vegetation for development. Uh, currently the zoning requirements limit the, uh, the 25% of the lot area or 15,000 square feet, which is ever greater, uh, with board discussion. You know, we felt that there needed to be a little more latitude, uh, for a vegetation clearing the tree clearing. Um, so what we've come up with, thanks to Greg's. Um, insertion here is, um, with, um, let me just read it then, you
- 00;55;12;12 know, event shall clear openings for development, including, but not limited to principal and accessory structures, driveways, sewage disposal areas exceed in aggregate 25% of the lot area, 15,000 square feet, which is ever greater, including land previously developed without sight then approval from the planning board for any clearing removal of vegetation, stumps or recreating above this threshold. If the development wishes only to cut or harvest trees in excessive with
- 00;55;37;22 fresh hope that a permit must be obtained from the code officer, if you're cutting trees or vegetation, one would proposing to cut or harvest trees and excessive two acres and a copy of the main or service forest operations notification Fon form shall be provided to the town code officer, the postman officer when proposing cutting or tree harvesting areas under two acres, the written notification shall be provided to the town code enforcement officer indicating the proposed areas to be cut or harvested



## IPTV

- 00;56;07;00 along with the properties, undertaking the tree, cutting operation and listing of equipment use schedule for the operation to be completed with data signatures of the landowner and tree removal, operation supervisor responsible this standard shall not supersede any restrictions or conditions of approval for development.
- 00;56;31;17 You're frozen
- 00;56;36;04 Was doing so good to plug them in, plug them back in. It's just too long.
- 00;56;56;24 Okay.
- 00;56;57;02 I think we're okay with this, Greg, are you okay with this one? Yeah, I'd rather eliminate it, but I'm good with that. When you say that about laundry, then you would say that about all of them wouldn't you? Yeah, probably would. It's better. A little better. All right. Then now I move that we approve and stand to the board of selectmen recommending approval. The changes to the land use ordinance, article nine, the minimum
- 00;57;27;02 standards for vegetation alignments in permitting for a second. Second. All those in favor, Kevin. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Motion passes Euro. And we're up to mix the building use and the commercial, the district. These are big 19, those falling along. Yes. This is a, um, this is a simple, uh, clerical
- 00;58;02;10 change, um, within the, um, commercial district, uh, it previously read that a mixed building use is provided. The upper floor contains the commercial uses. Obviously that was supposed to be the lower floor. It's a simple text change, converting upper to lower. In other words, the commercial used to be on the first floor. The residential would be on the second floor, not vice versa.
- 00;58;33;06 Yeah.
- 00;58;38;00 Um, I recommend we approve and we send to the board of leptin and recommending approval of the land changes to the land use ordinance, um, article for, um, for a mixed building use of the congressional district. Is there a second? I got all of those in any more discussion, all those in favor, Kevin I aye. Aye, aye. Aye. Motion passes five zero next step. Um, septic release disposal sizing John Page 21. This was a good,
- 00;59;16;17 yeah. Yes. This was, this was an inconsistency that Alex picked up on, uh, within the shool and zoning. Um, this probably goes back to some time when, when, um, early on when the assurance of things coming about, but it really pertains to second page septic waste disposal. And in particular item, number six, uh, previously read all development of construction within a
- 00;59;42;10 250 feet. The normal high water line of a perennial water bodies shall meet the requirements.

IPTV

- 00;59;48;13 Uh, regulations adopted by the port water district in the June 3rd, 1988. Uh, these regulations are to be enforced by the town of Raymond. Well, what we've found is since then that, uh, some of those regulations have been changed. Um, some of the governing bodies have changed. So what we've done now is we've, we it'll read as follows all development or construction within 250 horizontal feet. I be normal high water line of any great pond shall meet the requirements of the pool and water district, wastewater disposal system, uh, permit protocol. Uh, these
- 01;00;22;19 regulations are to be influenced by the town of Raymond. And I think Alex, you probably can chime in a little bit about what exactly those protocols are. Um, basically, uh, in its simplest form that is a larger gallons per day, um, calculation within 200 feet. The water district gets within 200 feet of
- 01;00;48;20 Sebago. So what we're saying is two 50 from any gray pond, um, you have to calculate bedrooms at 120 gallons per day instead of 90. And, um, I do think add you out a note I saw that come through on, uh, I think it's number three, um, in that section four above three, the last, the last one above number three. Yep. And then it also is in number three again. So I'll
- 01;01;22;27 just update those. So that they're all the same miss those ones. Sorry. That was a distinctive change that the board wanted to recognize that we didn't want to apply this to all perennial water bodies. Just the great ponds for simplicity. Yep. Any other questions discussion? I, um, I moved
- 01;01;52;09 out, we, uh, approved, said to the board of selectmen recommending approval or the changes to the shoreline during provisions in article 15 with aseptic waste disposal sizing for a second. Second, second. Any other discussion? All those in favor, Kevin, I like aye. Aye. Aye. Yes. Zero. And
- 01;02;25;16 next up is the ZPA findings zoning board of appeals findings for here. Um, land use ordinance changes to article six.
- 01;02;35;08 Yes. This is in land use ordinance, article six board of appeals and qualities to appeal procedure. What he added was a number nine, which basically reads if you're typical of variants or setback reduction must be recorded at the expense of the applicant in the Cumberland County registry of deed within 90 days of board is the Baron shall be now in Boyd. A building permit must be obtained after the Barron's is probably recorded before work is started. Uh, this was, I believe, a recommendation from
- 01;03;06;16 legal, um, that our decisions had to be recorded for any appeals because they go with the land, not with the project. Okay.
- 01;03;19;15 Is there any discussion?
- 01;03;21;22 Okay.

IPTV

- 01;03;26;01 So I believe that we, uh, recommend approval, send it to a board of selectmen recommending approval. The, uh, James drew, article six of leg news ordinance concerning the board of appeals. I'm sorry. It's on one second. It Kevin and I did perfect. Uh, all those in favor or Kevin Mike, Mike I Greg. Hi ed. Yes. As well. Last is five zero. Next up is the
- 01;04;03;28 junkyard.
- 01;04;06;17 Yes. The junkyard. This applies to land use ordinance article nine, minimum standards F waste material accumulation. This is a, uh, just a, um, update as direct title of the state, uh, ordinance. It applies to junk yards previously we had 30 M R S a section two, four or five one B the correct section now is titled 30 dash eight, section three seven five two.
- 01;04;35;18 So it's just a correction to the correct reference of state ordinance
- 01;04;44;27 Discussion board. I, I moved that we, uh, approved Reggie's Oregon's article nine changes to them standards to junk yard regulations, send it to the board of selectmen recommending approval there a second. I mean more discussion. All those in favor, Devin. Aye. Mike. Aye. Aye. Aye.
- 01;05;16;29 Motion passes zero. Um, next up is the amendment protection ordinance
- 01;05;25;12 Me to run through this Wayne? Or do you want to, you want to leave this one,
- 01;05;32;12 Jim? How's that
- 01;05;35;08 There you go. That's the way they take a dollar and pass it down the line. Thank you. All right. This has to do with the fire protection ordinance. Uh, you saw this one last year. Um, I don't believe a whole lot has changed within that from the recommendation last year. Uh, but it has to do with the fire protection ordinance article for NSPA life safety code one Oh one. And now we're adding an FPA fire code, uh, NFP one. Um, we, again, the first portion of that has to reference the, uh, newer fire code
- 01;06;10;06 is this in 2018 edition. Um, second piece of this is fire protection ordinance, article eight, a new building construction, uh, section B, uh, dealing with height of the structure and volume and areas. Uh, what it should now read is 35 feet, more 35 or more feet in height, 100,000 cubic
- 01;06;35;18 feet in volume or 4,800 square feet and gross floor area structure sharing a common foundation roof or walls totaling 4,800 square feet X section that was added in the same article is F any new or renovated residential buildings consisting of one or two family buildings or structures of 4,800 square feet or more in total gross floor area, jealous doll and approved fire sprinkler system throughout.

## IPTV

- 01;07;03;09 And then there are exceptions, um, for one and two family buildings or structures. Um, there's three sections to that. I don't know if we need to get into the particulars of that, but I think they're all referenced within certain NFP codes. Section two, the purposes of this article, the growth lawyer of a building structure shall include the sun's total of the combined floor areas for all floor levels, basement sub-basement and additions and aggregate measures from the outside walls,
- 01;07;33;28 irrespective of the existence of interior fire resistance, walls, floors, and ceilings. And then there's another fire protection ordinance. Number nine, again, referencing the square footage change, which was originally 10,000 now being dropped down to 4,800 square feet. And the additions of section three, four, and five, which again, um, discuss the conditions that were in the previous one, talking about, uh, reconstruction, rehab
- 01;08;04;15 alteration, uh, section four, uh, again, talking about the 4,000 square feet, um, and alteration over improvement of the building was structured equals or 50% of the existing gross square footage of the building. Um, section five for the purposes of the three and four, the Raymond fire department may consider the installation of impartial fire sprinkler system with the following conditions, uh, when the building is partly retrofitted.
- 01;08;36;16 Um, and when the property on response part of the resident chooses a partially retrofit, a building is section six, uh, again, references the gross square footage of a building restructure shall include the sum total of the combined four areas, four levels. Um, and basically it's just how we measure the 4,800 square feet summary, um, made. I don't know if you want
- 01;09;04;05 to chime in on any specifics or not, um, just, uh, for, um, article for that, uh, bringing our code references in line with, uh, what the state fire marshal's office currently has adopted. So that brings us in line with them. Uh, and then, um, you covered it real well, as far as, uh, we're
- 01;09;28;04 looking to, uh, to change the square footage down to the 4,800 square feet.
- 01;09;33;27 And that's because of 4,800 square feet and greater, uh, requires significant fire flows and water that needs to be available on the scene. So one of the ways to deal with that is with a sprinkler system, uh, the board asked for, uh, some kind of exceptions to that. Um, so we included some exceptions, um, choose the requirement for sprinkling. And then, uh, it's basically, uh, it also applies to building additions, uh,
- 01;10;06;25 adding on to buildings, including residential dwellings and, um, that that's the 4,800 square feet again. So I still had a, a question. I think I had the same question. The last time we talked about this, uh, this also would apply the way I read it to a barn or a garage that exceeded those. Cause it doesn't say residential building in article eight. Is that a true

IPTV

- 01;10;36;14 in the fire protection ordinance itself? One of the things that we're not seeing is the language that excludes, uh, excludes the type of buildings that you're concerned about. Okay. Find that real quick for you, but there is a, that it is included already in the fire protection ordinance, so we
- 01;11;05;10 didn't think we needed to add it. No. As long as it's in the overall ordinance. Yes. It is
- 01;11;18;04 Basically building for agricultural purposes that those types of things are excluded from the sprinkler requirement. Does that cover your question? Well, I guess, well, somebody builds a large garage, you know, or a workshop or anything like that. That's a different use that's those are all excluded in the residential. Yes. Okay. So I have a, a general question
- 01;11;54;27 for the board. Um, this is kind of it, this is kind of outside of our, even though we've been through, there's a number of times on it kind of outside the land use ordinance that we deal with, um, planning board. Um, my, so I'm leaning towards that. We, we take action on it, send it to the, to the board of selectmen, but send it without a recommendation from us one way or
- 01;12;19;14 the other, just sending it recommended, recommending it to the board of selectmen, as it seems to be more in lines of policy than it is with actual, um, substance that the board deals with on a regular basis. And am I reading that correctly? How do you feel about that? Is that, does it make a difference?
- 01;12;44;26 Maybe I interject Mr. Chair. Oh, please. I think traditionally, as I understand it from, I believe it was Chris Hansen that told me this when I first started that the, um, fire ordinances, well, they strictly don't need to be approved by the planning board. The select board have preferred that they go go through your eyes first because there may be things in there that you have to take into account in the, in the ordinances more so you'll be familiar with them and you'll, you'll be able
- 01;13;16;01 to see them before the changes go in. Um, yeah. So I, I completely agree with that. I'm just wondering whether or not the void wants to take a position of recommending approval or just recommending the ordinance to the board of directors. Yeah. And if, if you decide not to, then I would need, just need to know if you want to have it in the warrant with the planning board makes no recommendation or that I don't put anything at all about the planning board in there and just that the select board approves that's,
- 01;13;47;25 that's something you'd want to. Okay. Does anybody have any objection to, uh, to the, uh, regularly and changes and, um, we're just referring it to the select board and I, I'm sorry, again, I missed the beginning part of that and we just say that we have no objection to the proposed revisions and, uh, we're referring it to the select board for their review and approval. Right. I agree with that.

## IPTV

- 01;14;19;06 That's a good, good way I'm going to vote. No. So do you have any strong feelings we'll make up an agreement? That sounds good. Okay. So then, um, I would move that we, uh, send, um, you met the, uh, amendment to the, of the
- 01;14;48;01 five protection ordinance articles, uh, four, eight and nine to two, the board of selectmen recommendation. Okay. As soon as that cover it for you. Okay.
- 01;15;03;07 Any other discussion? Second second. Uh, Kevin aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Aye. Motion passes four to one. And our last one is tiny homes, tiny homes take us home. Okay. The final revision would be within the, uh,
- 01;15;35;03 land use ordinance for definitions and within the Sugarland zoning, uh, section 17 definitions, uh, the board as staff to, uh, address, uh, how we define tiny homes. Um, what was derived is the following a tiny home is structure that does not exceed 400 square feet. Excluding lofts that has one or more habitable rooms designed, intended were used for living
- 01;16;03;10 quarters by one or more persons living together as a family with living sleeping sanitary and cooking facilities, including within the meaning of cooking facilities, a stove, hot plate, microwave oven, or other devices for heating or cooking food shall include manufactured houses and rental units that contain cooking, sleeping toilet facilities, regardless of the time period rented recreational fields are not to be used as a tiny home or dwelling unit. A tiny home must meet all minimum requirements of a dwelling
- 01;16;35;16 unit. So with that, what that really means is it must, I believe Alex, you can correct me, but it must be in all the various living codes, fire codes and, and foundation requirements, correct? Yep. Yep. This is a kind of a hybrid of what the state or this is. We just added some more protection as far as it must meet all requirements of a dwelling unit. You know, you see on TV
- 01;17;10;16 shows a tiny home and they're often moveable, but in our case it's going to require a foundation, correct? Yeah. Okay. Okay. I, uh, I moved that we, uh, um, approve and send to the board a second recommending approval that
- 01;17;35;11 Jamie was to the tiny home definitions for land use ordinance, article 12 and the shoreline zoning division in article 17 definitions. Is there a second backup?
- 01;17;47;15 Any discussion? Kevin Mike, hi Greg. Hi, good. Then I voted yes, motion passes and I assume him, uh, Sue, we didn't get anybody from the public for, we did not get anybody calling in or requesting that is correct. No one called him. So I will close the public hearing as well on the land use ordinance changes and they are to planet communications. Um,
- 01;18;22;28 I'll let Alex chime in here as well. Um, I know Alex has been out of the office, but I do know in speaking with Dustin Romans tonight, he has, uh, I believe tried to, um, deliver a pre-application another pre-application for another, um, kind of

IPTV

clustered, uh, I guess I call it a multi-family, uh, design, um, off of, uh, Kim clear drive, I think is when it comes off

01;18;52;16 Patricia and off of, um, 85. So I haven't seen the application yet, but that is something that would be coming before you for pre-application next meeting. How large did you say? I think 26 units. Hmm. Wow. So substantial. Okay. Alex, do you have anything else that you're aware of? Uh, no, not

01;19;22;22 really. Um, a possible, um, site plan amendment coming in the next couple of months, um, for one of the marinas, that's the only other thing that's poking around and we did have a discussion and nothing more than that, um, for a potential solar farm, but that's a ways out. Okay. Was that it? I

01;19;55;26 believe that's it. So just, um, Mr. Reminder for the board as we go through this latest project, but Dustin, that we're fairly, we know that there is going to be further, but we can

01;20;08;02 Only act upon what is being presented to us. So we can't use what might come in the future when we make decisions or requests from the developer on what is being presented, but just as a point of

01;20;26;28 Yeah. And it gets kind of, um, it gets a little bit, uh, confusing too, because if they follow the, the open space development scheme in that case, the requirement does say that the board can request to look at both the conventional and, uh, the cluster development. Now that doesn't mean that you can't, you can take them and go through all their property, but you do have some latitude within these and take a look at what, what that configuration would look like

01;20;55;28 Right there. Everybody familiar with that, what Jim was just talking about. Cause we haven't done this a long time. Yep. Okay. Yep.

01;21;06;26 Yeah. And if you have it, I just go back and just kind of refresh yourself within the ordinance as a whole section there for the open space development.

01;21;16;17 All right. We're down to adjournment. Is there a motion? Just so you know, as soon as going to kick you out soon as you say yes,

01;21;30;12 This is a long drive home tonight As a removed journey. Is there a second, second? Uh, all those in favor, Kevin, I Mike, I, I, Greg and I vote, yes, we were adjourned by soon.