



**Raymond Planning Board
MINUTES*
Wednesday, September 14, 2011**

Present: Chairman Patrick Clark, Vice-chair Robert O'Neill, William Priest, Bruce Sanford, and Greg Foster.

Staff: Hugh Coxe, Contract Planner; Chris Hanson, Code Officer; and Danielle Loring, Recording Secretary.

Others: Mike Meyers, Meyer Realty Development (Applicant) and Thomas Greer, Pinkham & Greer (Agent).

1. Call to order: Chairman Patrick Clark called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm and quorum was declared.

2. Approval of Minutes:

a) August 17, 2011

CORRECTIONS:

- Page 3, last paragraph: Last delete duplicate "was"
- Page 2, Paragraph 1, last sentence: Should read "sign" not "sigh"
- Page 2, Next to last paragraph, middle sentence: should read "his" not "hi"

MOTION: Robert O'Neill motioned

3. Applications:

**a) PUBLIC HEARING
Map 053, Lot 004A
Commercial Zone
1263 Roosevelt Trail
Meyer Realty Investments, Inc.**

Contract Planner Hugh Coxe explained that this was an application for a site plan review and, because Town provisions had changed, it would appear that it falls into the "major site plan" category. He felt this was the case because of surface area for the current development and looking back at the previous

*Per the "Minutes Policy," reviewed and approved August 17, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, written minutes will only serve as a supplement or guide to the official record, which is the DVD. DVD's can be purchased for a nominal fee or borrowed at the Town Office

**Items taken out of order

three (3) years for any development done by the applicant. That meant that there was to be a site plan review, staff review and peer review.

Mr. Coxe felt that the decision, at that point, was whether to treat the meeting as a pre-application for the site plan review. There was no reason that the current meeting could not serve as the public hearing and if there were any other meetings than the abutters would be notified. He continued by explaining what would be peer reviewed and the Board could decide which portions were required and the criteria that they were responsible for evaluating. He explained that the only things that the applicant was missing was a narrative explaining how the project met the conditions of the Town's provisions; a letter sent to the Maine Historic Commission and evidence of how the development would affect traffic patterns. He also felt that there should be a performance guarantee.

In terms of Town departments, he explained that the Fire Department was okay with the project and that their initial concern had been whether the building was three stories, because then it would need to be sprinkled. However, the plans were for two stories and a daylight basement. Because they did not use public water, Public Works felt that they should stub out pipes to connect into it, since they were already doing work in that area to begin with.

MOTION: Bruce Sanford motioned that the Board move forward as a pre-application meeting, with the understanding that applicant will have to come back next month and count that as his second meeting, as long as he came with all the deficiencies fixed; seconded by Robert O'Neill

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

Mike Meyer, applicant, explained that he had worked with both Mr. Coxe and Mr. Hanson with the understanding that the project was a minor development. He felt that it still was a minor development because the threshold was 4800 square feet (sq ft) and they were only proposing 4500 sq ft. Mr. Clark explained that Mr. Coxe's memo outlined the project as having 19,0000 sq ft and Mr. Meyer explained that was because was because something in the plan was taken out of context.

Mr. Coxe explained that the legend showed that there was 19,000 sq ft, which included pavement over gravel. Mr. Meyer did not think that the calculation took into account development that had taken place in the past because that portion of the paving was preexisting. In terms of the narrative, he had not submitted one because he had gone by the provisions of the ordinance and felt that it was self explanatory.

The Board moved forward with the public hearing with the understanding that if there were any problems, they would have to schedule another one in the future.

The applicant and his agent proceeded to explain some of the features of the building, including the fact that the basement was not going to be leasable space but would be for storage and to house the furnace. Mr. Clark opened the hearing for public comment but there was none. They continued with the public

*Per the "Minutes Policy," reviewed and approved August 17, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, written minutes will only serve as a supplement or guide to the official record, which is the DVD. DVD's can be purchased for a nominal fee or borrowed at the Town Office

**Items taken out of order

hearing. Mr. Clark felt that the application was thorough and well prepared and he made the public aware that the applicant was considering installing a retaining wall. The exact design was not presented, only the concept at that time.

There was discussion about parking and whether there were specific parking spots for each business and Mr. Meyer explained that Danielle's Diner was deeded seven (7) spots. The next concern that the Board had was regarding water supply. They were concerned that the well would not be able to sustain the additional business and wanted to know why they were not considering public water supply, which was common for that area. Mr. Meyer explained that he had not wanted to interrupt Route 302 traffic and that the well was more than sufficient at this point. Mr. Clark said that he wanted the applicant to have State water quality testing and Mr. Hanson explained that it had already been completed because Danielle's Diner had been required to and that Public Works was already recommending that they stub out for it. Mr. Clark explained that he was concerned that if the applicant was going to go through the trouble of stubbing out for it, why they would not just hook into it at that time.

They moved on to discuss lighting and Mr. Clark pointed out that the applicant was proposing to use taller poles. Mr. Greer explained that this was because shorter poles meant that you had to have more of them with brighter bulbs to get the same surface area of light coverage. Mr. Sanford was concerned on the effects that taller lights would have on the natural aesthetics of the area.

Mr. Sanford wanted to know what the purpose of the letter of credit was. Mr. Coxe explained that it was required by ordinance. It was to show that the applicant had financial planning in place and to protect the Town in the event that they did not finish the project. In that case, the Town would at least be able to take measures to make the site safe. Mr. Sanford felt that the amount was a bit low and Mr. Clark agreed. Mr. Meyer explained that this was a low fill site and would require minimal excavation. Mr. Coxe agreed that it was adequate because it was only to stabilize the site, not to complete the project. Mr. Clark wanted to know about trucking and whether there would be enough room for delivers and Mr. Greer showed how he felt that parking would occur.

Mr. Clark asked if there were any public comments at that time and there were none.

There was discussion about whether there should be a peer review. This was the first site plan that had been conducted since the ordinance change and, even though the Board had the authority to waive the peer review, they did not want to set the precedence to do so when the ordinance required it. Their primary concern was with the well and whether it would be adequate, because it was a community well, and they wanted to see evidence of such. In general, they felt that a peer review would be necessary depending on the number of red flags that an application raises and how complete the application is at the pre-application meeting. They decided in this instance that the concerns were minor but they would reserve the right to ask for one in the future.

MOTION: Bruce Sanford moved to waive the peer review at that time pending resubmittal with corrections by the applicant on a corrected site review with the condition that the Board have the right to demand a peer review at a future time; seconded by Robert O'Neill.

*Per the "Minutes Policy," reviewed and approved August 17, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, written minutes will only serve as a supplement or guide to the official record, which is the DVD. DVD's can be purchased for a nominal fee or borrowed at the Town Office

**Items taken out of order

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

4. Planner Communications: None

5. Other business:

a) Discussion of application from Steve Linne as a potential Planning Board Member.

Steve Linne introduced himself and explained his background and interest in joining the Planning Board.

MOTION: Robert O'Neill moved to recommend Steve Linne for membership to the Planning Board and send to Board of Selectmen; seconded by Greg Foster.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

b) Discussion of Ordinance Revisions that need to be made for 2012 and scheduling workshops.

Mr Coxe explained that there were some revisions that had to be made to Shoreland Zoning to bring it into compliance with State regulations. He said that he was going to work with Forest Service to meet their requirements.

Mr. Clark said that he wanted to review backlot driveways to make sure that the standards were consolidated and cleaned up. He would also like them to revisit the sign ordinance to have it as an item that staff could approve. He thought that it should only go to the Planning Board as part of a site review or if staff felt that it was necessary.

6. Adjournment:

MOTION: Robert O'Neill motioned to adjourn; second by Bruce Sanford.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

Chairman Patrick Clark adjourned the meeting at 9:01 pm.

*Per the "Minutes Policy," reviewed and approved August 17, 2010 by the Board of Selectmen, written minutes will only serve as a supplement or guide to the official record, which is the DVD. DVD's can be purchased for a nominal fee or borrowed at the Town Office

**Items taken out of order