



PLANNING & ENGINEERING REVIEW MEMORANDUM

Date: June 11, 2025

To: Chris Hanson, *Code Enforcement Officer*
Jason Williamson, *Assistant Code Enforcement Officer*
Town of Raymond, Maine
401 Webbs Mills Rd., Raymond ME 04071

From: Brett Wiemken, *Planning Consultant*
James Seymour, PE, *Engineering Consultant*
Sebago Technics, Inc.
75 John Roberts Rd. Ste. 4A, South Portland ME 04106

Applicant: Brandon Chase
PO Box 37, Raymond ME 04071

Agent: Andrew Morrell, PE of BH2M
380B Main Street, Gorham ME 04038

Subject: Pine Ridge Estates
Preliminary Plan Application
Raymond Cape Road, Raymond ME 04071
Tax Map 4, Lot 29

Existing Conditions:

The property subject to this Preliminary Plan application is an undeveloped tract of land located along Raymond Cape Road in the Town of Raymond, Maine. The site can further be identified on the Town's Tax Map 4 as Lot 29. The property is approximately 37.3 acres in size, and has existing road frontage along Raymond Cape Road. The subject site is wholly zoned under the Limited Residential – Recreation District II (LRR2) zoning district, with a portion of the lot also containing Resource Protection (RP) overlay.

Project Description:

Brandon Chase, the "Applicant", is proposed to construct an eleven (11) lot residential open space subdivision on the subject property. This proposed development also includes the associated private way to provide access to each lot, as well as a turnaround to provide sufficient maneuverability for emergency vehicles. This application is subject to a review by the Town of Raymond's *Land Use Ordinance §300 Article 13 – Open Space Subdivisions*, the Town of Raymond's *Subdivision Ordinance Article 9 – General Requirements*, the Town of Raymond's *§350 Shoreland Zoning Ordinance*, and the Town of Raymond's *Street Design*

Ordinance. For reference, we have provided each of the ordinance sections *in italics* and our related comments **in bold**.

I. §300-13.3. LAND USE ORDINANCE – Open Space Subd. General Requirements:

A. Use and district requirements:

Comment: The proposed project is residential in nature, and aligns with the permitted uses of the Limited Residential – Recreation District II (LRR2) zoning classification. Thus, this standard is met.

B. Allowable density:

Comment: Density calculations have been provided on *Sheet 1* within the Plan Set. The calculations show the total area of the lot (1,493,416 sf.) and deductions (295,254 sf.), leaving a remaining 1,198,162 sf. From there, an additional twenty percent (20%) is added, bringing the total developable area to 1,437,794 sf. This total is divided by three (3) acres for the minimum lot size requirements of the zone, amounting to a total allowable density of 11.002 lots. We recommend that the Applicant break down the deduction calculations to show how that amount was reached, utilizing *§300-8.1 Net Residential Area Calculation* criteria. For example, please show how much of the deducted amount was for steep slopes, floodplain areas, associated wetland areas, resource protected zones, and other standards as listed.

C. Layout and siting standards:

Comment: The proposed open space conservation subdivision provides frontage for access to the open space on each lot. The property subject to this application does not contain any existing trails or recreational corridors. The property also does not contain any listed historical or archeological resources adjacent to the site. The proposed layout provides sufficient buffering from adjacent properties through the use of the strip of open space lining the site's border. Wetland areas are shown on the plans submitted. However, we request that the Applicant provide the locations of the vernal pools on-site indicated in the *Vernal Pool Assessment Letter* in *Attachment 6* in the application binder. This letter refers to three (3) vernal pools found on-site; however, the locations are not shown on any attachments or the plans submitted.

D. Space standards:

Comment: The proposed open space subdivision includes a private drive that provides sufficient road frontage to each of the proposed lots. We recommend that the Applicant double-check the minimum lot size requirements, as the LRR2 zoning district has a minimum lot size of 1.5 acres (stated on plans submitted at 1.0 acres). The proposed project meets most of the Street Design Standards, as outlined within Section IV of this Memo.

E. Utilities:

Comment: The proposed open space subdivision will utilize private, individual wells to supply each residential lot with sufficient water supply, and uses on-site, individual subsurface disposal systems for septage. The Applicant has submitted a soils map from the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), but has not submitted documentation or test pit logs to provide evidence that the soils present on each lot are able to support the proposed method of waste disposal. Further, the Applicant has stated that electrical service will be accomplished by extending power underground into the proposed subdivision for each lot.

F. Affordable housing:

Comment: This standard is not applicable, as the proposed project includes a total of eleven (11) residential lots to be sold at market rate.

II. SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS – §9 General Requirements:

1. Conformity with Comprehensive Plan:

Comment: The proposed project aligns with the intent and objectives of the Town's most recent and adopted Comprehensive Plan.

2. Relationship to Community Services:

Comment: The proposed open space subdivision is minor in scale and nature, and is not anticipated to generate an unreasonable demand on community services.

3. Retention of Proposed Public Sites and Open Spaces:

Comment: The proposed subdivision's allotted open space exceeds the minimum 10% requirement; thus, this standard is met.

4. Preservation of Natural and Historic Features:

Comment: The Applicant should denote on the plans submitted that there is sufficient spacing for the required fifty (50) ft. buffer strip along Raymond Cape Road. It does not appear that any wetlands will be impacted by this proposed subdivision.

5. Traffic Sight Distance:

Comment: Traffic generation and distribution calculations were provided within **Attachment 7** in the application binder submitted. However, the Applicant has not provided documentation or calculations to state that appropriate traffic sight distance is achieved.

6. Conformance to Shoreland Zoning:

Comment: Please see the enclosed Section III for how the proposed project relates to all applicable Shoreland Zoning standards.

7. Easements for Natural Drainage Ways:

Comment: The Applicant has provided sufficient drainage easement areas on the plans for areas reserved for stormwater management and drainage.

8. Net Residential Density:

Comment: Please see previous comment regarding net residential density.

9. Lots:

Comment: The ratio of lot length to width shall not be more than three to one (3:1). All subsurface waste disposal system areas are shown on the plans, with their respective well-exclusion zones also shown.

10. Utilities:

Comment: As previously stated within the *Land Use Ordinance – Article 13 Open Space Subdivision General Requirements*, the proposed open space subdivision will utilize private, individual wells to supply each residential lot with sufficient water supply, and uses on-site, individual subsurface disposal systems for septage. The Applicant has submitted a soils map from the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), but has not submitted documentation or test pit logs to provide evidence that the soils present on each lot are able to support the proposed method of waste disposal. Further, the Applicant has stated that electrical service will be accomplished by extending power underground into the proposed subdivision for each lot.

11. Additional Requirements:

Comment: Not applicable.

12. Required Improvements:

Comment: The Applicant should specify if any landscaping is proposed under the scope of this application. Other improvements like water supply through individual wells and subsurface waste disposal systems are included.

13. Impact on Ground Water:

Comment: A hydrogeologic assessment has not been submitted with this project. The Applicant should provide a statement or evidence that the proposed project will not have an adverse impact on the overall quality or quantity of available groundwater.

14. Phosphorous Control:

Comment: The Applicant has not stated the total amount of developed or impervious surface area. If a Stormwater Management Law permit is needed from the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP), the Applicant should submit all calculations, plans, and other materials to the Town for

review. The Applicant should also submit evidence on what natural resources, if any, may be impacted by phosphorous export as a result of the proposed project. We recommend that the Applicant submit a hydrogeologic assessment for nitrate plumes and overall groundwater impacts.

III. §350-6 SHORELAND ZONING ORDINANCE – Land Use Standards:

1. Compliance Required; Additional Standards:

Comment: The proposed open space subdivision is residential in nature, and is a permitted use within the Shoreland Zoning and Resource Protection districts.

2. Minimum Lot Standards & Setbacks:

Comment: The minimum lot size requirement for properties within the LRR2 zone is three (3) acres. However, given that this project is an open space subdivision, the minimum lot size is permitted to be reduced to one and one-half (1.5) acres in size. The setbacks shown on the plans also conform to the standards listed in this Section.

3. Principal & Accessory Structures:

Comment: No footprints of residences are shown on the plans submitted. The Applicant should be aware that any new principal and accessory structures shall be setback at least one hundred (100) ft. from the upland edge of any wetlands on-site.

4. Piers, Docks, Wharves, Bridges, and Other Structures & Uses Extending Over or Below Normal High-Water Line of Water Bodies or Within Wetlands:

Comment: No piers, docks, wharves, bridges, or other structures extending over or below the normal high-water line of water bodies or wetlands are proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable.

5. Campgrounds:

Comment: No campgrounds are proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable.

6. Personal Campsites:

Comment: No personal campsites are proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable.

7. Commercial & Industrial Uses:

Comment: No commercial or industrial uses are proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable

8. Parking Areas:

Comment: Given the nature of this project, parking areas are not proposed. The Applicant should refer to the Fire Department’s review memorandum, as they will likely require the posting of “No Parking” signage within the cul-de-sac.

9. Roads & Driveways:

Comment: This Section of the ordinance requires that all roads and driveways shall be setback at least one hundred (100) ft. from the upland edge of a wetland unless no other reasonable alternative exists. It is the responsibility of the Applicant to provide evidence that no other practical alternatives exist. If granted by the Planning Board, the road and driveway setback requirements may be reduced to no less than fifty (50) ft. upon the Applicant submitting evidence that appropriate techniques will be used to prevent sedimentation of the water body or wetland.

10. Signage:

Comment: No signage is proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable.

11. Stormwater Runoff & Flood Protection:

Comment: The Applicant has submitted a *Stormwater Management Report* with supporting documentation including drainage plans and pre-development/post-development drainage conditions.

12. Septic Waste Disposal:

Comment: The Applicant has shown areas on the plans reserved for septic system locations, with sufficient buffers for a well-exclusion zone. However, no supporting documentation has been provided to show evidence that the soils present on-site will support individual septic systems for each lot.

13. Essential Services:

Comment: All portions of the property under the Resource Protection (RP) zoning district are located within the area reserved for open space. Thus, this standard is met, as no essential services, roads, or utilities are proposed within the RP area of the site.

14. Mineral Exploration & Extraction:

Comment: No mineral exploration or extraction uses are proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable.

15. Agriculture:

Comment: No agricultural uses or manure stockpiles are proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable.

16. Beach Construction:

Comment: No beach construction is proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable.

17. Reserved:

Comment: None.

18. Clearing or Removal of Vegetation for Activities Other Than Timber Harvesting:

Comment: The Applicant should state how much land clearing is anticipated for the construction of the proposed open space subdivision.

19. Hazard Trees, Storm-Damaged Trees, & Dead Tree Removal:

Comment: The Applicant has not stated whether any hazardous trees, storm-damaged trees, or dead trees will be removed under the scope of the clearing of the lot and construction of the private road.

20. Exemptions to Clearing & Vegetation Removal Requirements:

Comment: The Applicant should show calculations for the proposed amounts of land clearing needed to accomplish the proposed open space subdivision.

21. Revegetation Requirements:

Comment: The Applicant does not have open violations related to the vegetation standards of the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance; thus, this standard is not applicable.

22. Erosion & Sedimentation Control:

Comment: The Applicant has submitted erosion control details on Sheet 6 within the Plan Set submitted that satisfy the requirements of this Section.

23. Soils:

Comment: As previously stated, the Applicant shall submit evidence that the soils present on-site are sufficient to support the proposed individual septic systems for each lot. Additionally, test pit locations, if performed, are not shown on the plans submitted.

24. Water Quality:

Comment: The proposed residential open space subdivision is not anticipated to generate adverse impacts to overall water quality. The Applicant should state, or add a note on the plans that, “No activity shall store, deposit on or into the ground, discharge or permit the discharge into the waters of the state of any treated, untreated or inadequately treated liquid, gaseous, solid material or pollutant of such nature, quantity, obnoxiousness, toxicity or temperature such that, by itself or in combination with other activities or substances, it will run off, seep, percolate or wash into surface or ground waters so as to contaminate, pollute, harm or impair designated uses or the water classification of such water

bodies, tributary stream or wetland, or cause nuisance, such as objectionable shore deposits, floating or submerged debris, oil or scum, color, odor, taste or unsightliness or be harmful to human, animal, plant or aquatic life.”, in accordance with the requirements of this Section.

25. Archaeological Sites:

Comment: There are not any locations adjacent to the subject property that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

26. Public Boat Launch Facility & Associated Parking Areas:

Comment: No public boat launch facilities are proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable.

27. Accessory Dwelling Units:

Comment: No accessory dwelling units are proposed under the scope of this application; thus, this standard is not applicable. Any future accessory dwelling units will be required to seek the necessary approvals from the Town at the time of their respective construction.

IV. STREET ORDINANCE – §5.5 Street Design Standards:

Standard Type	Required	Proposed
Minimum Right-Of-Way Width:	50 ft.	50 ft.
Minimum Travel Way Width:	18 ft.	18 ft.
Minimum Grade:	0.5%	1.81%
Maximum Grade:	10%	6.0%
Roadway Crown:	1/4"/ft.	1/2" /ft.
Minimum Angle of Street Intersection:	75°	76°
Minimum Curb Radii at Intersections:	15 ft.	20 ft.
Minimum ROW Radii at Intersections:	10 ft.	20 ft.
Minimum Width of Shoulders (each side):	3 ft.	3 ft.

Comment: The *Gravel Private Way* detail calls out a proposed roadway crown of ½”, however, the required roadway crown standard for private streets is ¼”.

V. ADDITIONAL PLANNING & ENGINEERING COMMENTS:

- 1. Easement Documentation:** The Applicant should provide evidence of a homeowner’s association to be created for maintenance of the private road, as well as supporting easement documentation for the drainage ways, maintenance of open space, and recreation or trails on the open space if any is to be implemented.
- 2. Sheets 3 & 4:** Stone check dams are to be spaced at every two (2) ft. of elevations instead of four (4) ft. elevations.

3. **Sheets 3 & 4:** The profile view calls out a proposed eighteen (18) inch storm drain at approximately station 0+51, but not on the plan view. If this is proposed, it should be shown in the plan view or removed from the profile view.
4. **Sheets 3 & 4:** There appears to be an additional line shown where the stormwater enters Soil Filter C that is not a proposed contour. Please specify what this line is, or remove from the plans if necessary.
5. **Sheets 3 & 4:** Please label all proposed contours.
6. **Stormwater:** The proposed Pre-Development plan should be labeled as Sheet “A” instead of Sheet “1”.
7. **Stormwater:** The *Stormwater Treatment Summary* areas on pg. 5 do not match the *Linear Treatment Summary* areas. Please specify which areas and percentages are correct and update as necessary.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Upon our review of the information provided and the plans submitted, we feel that the Applicant can resolve the comments herein with updated information. These recommendations are not a final determination, but merely offer guidance to the Board. As always, all approvals, if appropriate, are left with the discretion of the Planning Board.

Sincerely,
SEBAGO TECHNICS, INC.



Brett Wiemken
Planning Consultant



James R. Seymour, P.E.
Engineering Consultant