ORDINANCE WORKSHOP

Present: Chairman Robert O'Neill, Vice Chair Bruce Sanford, Steve Linne, Greg Foster, and William Priest.

Absent: None

Staff: Stephanie Carver, Planning Consultant; Jim Seymour, Contract Planner, and Chris Hanson, Code Officer.

Other: Kevin Fay, Charles Leavitt, Barbara Lovell

1. Call to order: Chairman Robert O'Neill called the meeting to order at 7:03pm and a quorum was declared.

2. Approval of Minutes

   • October 23, 2013

MOTION: Bruce Sanford motioned to accept the minute; seconded by Steve Linne.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

   • October 30, 2013

MOTION: Greg Foster motioned to accept the minutes as amended; seconded by William Priest.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

3. Consideration of New Planning Board Member Application:
   • Benjamin Krauter

Mr. Krauter explained that he had grown up in Raymond and was a practicing lawyer out of
Windham. He said that he was familiar with local government because his father had been a former town manager.

MOTION: Bruce Sanford motioned to accept Benjamin Krauter's application for Selectmen consideration; seconded by Greg Foster.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

Workshop Meeting Items:

4. Proposed Ordinance Amendments

   a) Proposed Site Plan Review Standards (Article 10.B)

Mr. Seymour explained the difficulties for businesses in the Commercial District that the ordinance, as written, posed. He explained that the benefits of the proposed changes would be to expedite an application while upholding the same criteria. He reminded the Board that staff still had the ability to send applications to the Board if there were any concerns. Mr. Sanford stated that he was concerned with parking lot square footage versus the building square footage calculation, and Mr. Seymour explained that building square footage was considered part of the impervious and to create the thresholds he had worked backward from the DEP threshold of 20,000 square feet, which anything exceeding would required an environmental impact plan. Mr. Hanson explained the feasibility of the criteria in terms of altering existing impervious space and used the example of paving a gravel surface. Mr. Sanford agreed that the ordinance was self governing.

Chairman O'Neill asked how an application was tracked and documented, and Mr. Seymour explained that they would still documented in the same format. Chairman O'Neill elaborated that he was concerned that the Planning Board was becoming left out of the loop on applications and suggested making it as part of the Planner's Comments as part of the regular agenda, and Mr. Seymour agreed.

MOTION: Bruce Sanford motioned to accept language as modified for warrant; seconded by Greg Foster.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

   b) Zoning Map Amendments

Mr. Hanson explained that there were some discrepancies found by the DEP on the Land Use Regulation Map. Specifically, they identified that Panther Run was zoned as Steam Protection when it should be zoned as a river, which needed to be treated as a great pond.

Mr. Foster wanted to know why they could not go out 250' like the state standard, and Mr.
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Hanson explained that the Town standard was 600’ and they had to comply with that. Mr. Sanford was concerned with the accuracy of the map, and Mr. Hanson explained that the map was just a reference and the applicant had the responsibility to prove what was “on the ground.” Mr. Linne explained that he was concerned with cross zoning a lot, and Mr. Seymour explained that it was not unusual to have a lot split by a zone and there were mechanisms to deal with it.

MOTION: Bruce Sanford moved to accept the map as presented and move to warrant article; seconded by William Priest.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: MOTION CARRIED (4/1 [GF])

c) Growth Management Update

Mr. Hanson explained that the Town Attorney recommended that ordinance be repealed because there were other measures taken to control growth. The Board could still revisit the ordinance at a later date, and he intended to give an annual report of growth management numbers. The Board discussed several options for controlling growth including increasing the number of years including in the average and removing permitting limits. It was decided that they would not recommend that the language be removed from the ordinance but that they would amend it to use only the ten year average without scheduled reductions.

MOTION: William Priest motioned to move the changes to warrant with changes; seconded by Bruce Sanford.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

d) Revised Parking Standard Amendments for the Shoreland Zoning Provisions and Land Use Ordinances

Chairman O'Neill suggested reviewing the changes to the Land Use Ordinance first. Mr. Seymour explained that there was an Economic Development Task Force (EDTF) and addressed each of the concerns in the letter. He stated that most of the standards were in place because of the design guidelines and the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the new language would allow for compromise to retro fits and was concerned that the Town would lose the buffer if they moved to a zero foot setback.

There was concern for the word “unique” in the waiver criteria and he explained that it was to limit the number of people who asked for waivers. The Board continued to discuss green spacing and how the buffers could be maintained by the applicant.

Mr. Linne wanted to know if repaving would be considered a change, and Mr. Seymour responded that if it was just overlay it would not be unless there were changes to the drainage pattern. Mr. Seymour continued through the amendments that were recommended at the last
Chairman O’Neill asked what the most common issues were with parking, and Mr. Seymour explained that the most common item were restrictions imposed by setbacks because if it was included in the zoning standards and the Board could not waive the standard and applicant had to go to ZBA. This also gave the Board the ability to work with the applicant.

MOTION: Steve Linne motioned to accept the changes to the Commercial parking standards and to be made into a warrant; seconded by Bruce Sanford.

DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

Shoreland Zoning Ordinance Parking Standards

Mr. Seymour explained that the proposed language was not in response to any applications but lessons learned through the Site Plan Review process. He continued that the Board was not discussing whether parking was allowed within the Shoreland Zone and they had to consider all uses such as campgrounds and marinas. Chairman O’Neill added that any ordinance changes would not impact any current applications being considered and they could not remove or create any conditions that would make the existing applications nonconforming.

Mr. Seymour stated there has been a lot of concern raised about the size of parking lots, and he clarified that only 15% of the lot could be impervious, including buildings per the Shoreland Zoning Provisions.

Mr. Sanford asked if there were specific issues brought about by the pending applicant, how they could be addressed, and Chairman O’Neill responded that they would be added to the list of considerations for the next round of changes that they could begin discussing later in the spring.

Mr. Seymour read through his changes which were primarily in item G of the Shoreland Zoning Provisions. He added definitions, that were included in the last packet, that dealt with Off-Street and Off-Site Parking.

Mr. Linne was concerned with parking being across a road from the use, and Mr. Seymour read the standards that had been created with Item F regarding safety standards, including pedestrian traffic. Mr. Seymour reminded the Board that there were other aspects of the site plan that would address those concerns.

Chairman O’Neill asked about size limitations, and Mr. Seymour referenced Sections G.1.A., and explained that the limitations were also outlined in the Zoning as a maximum area of 15% and that each pod was roughly half an acre.

Kevin Fay, Spiller Hill Road, said that there was some language that had changed that he wanted clarified. He was concerned with allowing accessory parking to an accessory use. The
Board decided to remove “primary” and “accessory” use from the definition.

The Board discussed their concerns with not allowing independent parking facilities in the table of uses. Chairman O’Neill did not think that it was an issue because they were suggesting new parking definitions, two of the three would allow parking to be used to facilitate the primary use of an adjacent lot. Mr. Seymour recommended that the Board review the allowed use table at a later date.

Mr. Fay was concerned with allowing “cross road parking” versus adjacent. Mr. Sanford stated that the Board did not want to limit projects that had legitimate reasoning because of their circumstances to have off-site parking, Chairman O’Neill agreed because he felt that they did not want to completely eliminate the use.

Mr. Fay explained that he was also concerned with the podding model and felt that it would not be beneficial for some areas that involved residential areas. Mr. Seymour explained that it would help to break up the area and allowed for green spacing. Chairman O’Neill explained that parking was an allowed use and they were only trying to create or improve standards. Mr. Linne added that this design also worked to spread out buffering

MOTION: Steve Linne moved to accept changes to Shoreland Zoning Provisions and inclusion of definitions in paragraph 6 for inclusion in the warrant; seconded by Bruce Sanford.

DISCUSSION: None

VOTE: MOTION CARRIED (4/1 [GF])

5. Planner Communications

Mr. Seymour explained that the Board had a meeting the following week to review two applications and to consider the final draft of the warrants for the public hearing scheduled in January.

6. Adjournment

MOTION: Bruce Sanford motioned to adjourn; seconded by Greg Foster.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS APPROVAL (5/0)

Chairman Robert O'Neill adjourned the meeting at 9:02pm.

Danielle Loring
Recording Secretary
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