

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

October 1st, 2018

CASCO COMMUNITY CENTER

7:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ted Beckner, Ray Grant, Jim Macklin & Lynne Potter

MEMBERS ABSENT: Stan Buchanan & Edward Phipps

STAFF PRESENT: Alex Sirois, CEO; Jim Seymour, Town Planner (arrived 8:10) & Sandy Fredricks, Planning Assistant

PUBLIC PRESENT: See attached

Lynne calls the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Lynne states the first item on the Agenda is approval of the September 10, 2018 Minutes.

Ted moves to approve the September 10th, 2018 Minutes as written.

Jim seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain

Lynne informs everyone present that if they wish to speak, please come to the podium and state your name and the matter you wish to address for the record.

Lynne states the next item on the Agenda is D.M. Roma Consulting Engineers has filed a Site Plan Application on behalf of RJR, LLC to permit construction of four (4) additional buildings two (2) of which will be 40' x 150' and the remaining two (2) will be 30' x 15' for a total footprint of an additional 21,000 s.f. The four (4) new structures will be used as self-storage facilities. The property is commonly known as 299 Roosevelt Trail. The property is located in the Commercial District. This matter is continued from August 13, 2018.

Dustin Roma introduces himself to the Board stating he represents RJR, LLC regarding the proposed project. The project is for a 21,000 s.f. self-storage facility at 299 Roosevelt Trail and Brown Avenue. He continues, the last time they were before the Board there was discussion about landscaping being sparse; we filled in some spots near the baseball field and more plantings along Roosevelt Trail and Brown Avenue. He continues they have improved the fencing around the property and have added a mechanical gate for entering where the storage units are and have designated snow storage areas as well.

Dustin further states they are in the process with DEP for Stormwater Approval. He states they have heard back from DEP and submitted some minor changes back to them, mostly erosion control measures. He further states, he believes the deadline for DEP approval is October 22nd.

Additionally, Dustin states he reviewed Jim Seymour's Memo and they have added a few things to the Plan; 2.2 acres total of pavement, gravel and buildings equals about 59% impervious. He continues that there was a prior Site Plan which they are asking to amend which had previously designated "green space", now that we have come forward with a full plan we are looking for the Board to amend that green space. Dustin states that lighting will be wallpacks mounted about 9' on the storage buildings and positioned so the light won't spill out to the road. He goes on to state that per Jim Seymour's Memo, they can avoid placing lighting on the Brown Avenue ends of the units. He states that he had a discussion with Jim S. that they can either add this to the Plan or it can be a COA if the Board is comfortable.

Alex asks if we have determined this to be one lot. Dustin states, no, it is two lots. Dustin further states the 59% impervious is total lot coverage for both the lots. Alex inquires if they are opposed to combining the lots. Dustin states they prefer to keep it separate for the future. Alex states then all the stormwater is on the 2nd lot, correct. Dustin states yes. Alex states the Board needs to remember that. Dustin further states this property will always be looked at together as far as DEP is concerned, they look at it jointly. Alex states we need to know the impervious on that one lot. Dustin states that information can be a COA.

Lynne asks what the width of the driveway is; is it some 30' on the long sides of the buildings as it appears. Dustin states yes, it is 30'. Lynne asks if we have input from the Fire Chief and informed we do. Alex reads the following from the Chief's Memo "recommendations:

- If there is going to be power run to the units I would recommend a main disconnect box on the exterior of each building, located in the same manner so it would be easy for emergency personnel to locate and disconnect.
- I would echo the same concern about site lighting from the planning consultant and if there is power, the area should be lit for general safety.
- A Knox-box installed on the exterior of the existing building.
- A monitored fire alarm system capable of detecting heat and smoke for the quickest notification of a potential problem. Each building to have their own zone with the master panel located in the existing building (office).
- Each building be clearly marked i.e. Building 1, Building 2, Building 3, Building 4 (this will be required by the 9-1-1 addressing office).
- Signage to indicate no vehicles should be left unattended and fire lanes/do not block"

Lynne asks if they have addressed this; Dustin states they have responded to that in the September 10th submittal letter stating these items will all be incorporated into the design plans and completed as part of the building permit process.

Ray states he would like to see a note that all Stormwater is to be treated on the lot that creates it. Dustin states that per Jim Seymour's Memo, we can do Stormwater Easements to address that, which is not uncommon. He continues that with the appropriate easements it's no different that the shared driveway or utilities. He goes on stating that the lot on the North is burdened with the easement for the stormwater to be treated on site.

Ray inquires if it's two separate lots, how can we have one application. He would think we should have two separate applications. Dustin states the primary application is for the storage units; we went to DEP for stormwater permit, DEP states from their view it's one project. Ray states they should either combine the lots or come back with another Site Plan on the other lot.

Jim M. asks Alex if, in his experience, he has seen this before. Alex states that Stormwater is all on the other lot, but has been previously approved. He continues this could be an amendment to an approved subdivision but if you deemed it as two different site plan's the other one would only be for stormwater so it would be the same information. Alex continues that he is concerned because it only shows one tax id not two lots. He further states that there may be two deeds, but it was not recorded as two lots with the Town. Dustin states RJR, LLC owns one lot and Ron & Jim Willey own the other and they intend to keep them in separate ownership.

Lynne states that Jim Seymour's Memo suggested that the plantings be labeled as to species and size. Dustin states they culled out species and caliper but in the back just labeled as "evergreen trees". He continues that it will probably be spruce or hemlock and they will label it. Ted states no trees are shown on the one lot. Dustin states they aren't changing the front as it exists so we didn't put anything there. Ted asks if that shouldn't have been done when the office was built. Alex states that the Site Plan for the building wasn't completed yet; there are to be plantings and he reminded Jim Willey of that a few weeks ago.

Jim M. inquires if you have two entities and one is bringing this plan, what assures that the other owner agrees and will comply with the plan. Dustin states it is the same owners essentially and whatever conditions are put on this will run with the land. Jim M. states it isn't good to not have both owners on the plan. Dustin states that Ron and Jim could sign something for the file that they agree to RJR encumbering their property.

Ray restates that we need the lot coverage calculations on this Site Plan separate from the other lot.

Lynne states Jim S. also suggested the stabilizing mat pad; are you doing that. Dustin states they are doing that during construction.

Lynne opens the Public Hearing. There being no one wishing to speak, Lynne closes the Public Hearing.

Ray inquires as to the elevations of the buildings and if they are going to blast. Dustin states they are going to blast in the back to get the right elevation and it is also part of the stormwater plans and the elevations are shown on Sheet 4 of the Plans. Dustin continues that they have catch basins in the middle of the aisles and are keeping all of the runoff into the drains, treated and then get sent offsite through the culvert currently onsite. Ray inquires where the culvert is located. Dustin states it is just at the property line and goes a long way out.

Lynne asks Alex if he has anything to add. He states he does not other than he still has found nothing indicating it is two lots.

Lynne asks what the Board thinks. Ray states there is a lot of information we don't have yet. Lynne states okay and inquires what the Board wants to see them come back with. Ray states the questions regarding stormwater calculations, coverage calculations, if it is one or two lots, plantings on the left lot on 302. Lynne states we also need the DEP Permit number. Recapping, Lynne states we would like to figure out the lot situation and lot coverage as Ray said, possibly adding landscaping for the first lot perhaps the same as this new site plan.

Ray moves to table RJR LLC site plan application until questions are answered about lot coverage and plantings as well as a letter from Ron & Jim regarding encumbrance of property.

Jim seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain

Lynne states next is Re-Pete, LLC has filed an Application for a 4-Lot Minor Subdivision for property located at Roosevelt Trail and State Park Road. The property is known as Map 3, Lot 33 consisting of 40 acres. The property is located in a Commercial District.

Dustin Roma of D.M. Roma Consulting Engineers restates his name for the Board and advises he is here on behalf of Re-Pete, LLC.

He begins stating that Re-Pete, LLC has applied for a 4-lot subdivision on a 40-acre parcel and he was last before the Board regarding this matter as a Sketch Plan which was more or less the Plan you have before you showing the 4 new lots, no roadway design or stormwater. We do have roadway designs but no stormwater management for the lots now. He continues each are commercial lots but we don't know what the

development will be on those. Whoever develops these sites will come before either the CEO or the Board and will be developing stormwater plans at that time. Dustin goes on to state they focused in on building the road; it will be 24' wide pavement with 2' gravel shoulders and 4' grass shoulders for a total of 6' shoulders. He continues that they are aware that the Town has road standards for Commercial roads, but they are unsure as to when those standards apply. Additionally, he states they are very large standards for what they are proposing and perhaps the Board can have some discretion to see if the Commercial road standards must be met. Dustin states they are not looking to sell these lots as residential lots.

Dustin states he would like the Board to make a determination if this is a Major or Minor Subdivision. He continues we are proposing to sell the 4 lots and retain the larger lot understanding if we wish to develop that later, we need to come back at that time. He continues, per Jim Seymour's Memo, they are comfortable doing the requested test pits and we will make sure that well exclusion zones are mapped out.

Dustin states that regarding fire suppression, they have not heard from the Fire Chief as yet. He continues that they have done some preliminary clearing and do have DOT approved curbcut and have cleared the area where the driveway will be coming in.

Lynne asks Alex for input. Alex states we need to classify this as either a Major or Minor Subdivision. He continues that this was presented as a 4 lot subdivision with the remaining land retained; technically, this is 5 lots which would be a Major Subdivision. He further states they may be willing to go to 3 lots and retained land being the 4th which would be a Minor Subdivision. Dustin states if they want to keep it minor, they would combine 2 of the lots into 1.

Jim M. asks if the changes between Minor and Major is due to the road requirements. Dustin states no, they are just trying to keep it as a Minor Subdivision as we don't have anything out there yet. Alex explains that a Major Subdivision is a bit more involved and requires additional month or so to complete while a Minor Subdivision is a bit more cost effective. Dustin states they are trying to generate some interest in the lots before they develop or divide too much. Ray states he would be more comfortable making 3 lots and retained property. He further states he is not happy with the one lot any way because of the wetlands on it. Ted states he is concerned about setting precedence because it is really 5 lots. Alex states that combining those two and keeping it at 4 lots is cleaner. Lynne agrees.

Lynne moves to classify process by combining 1 & 2 into 1 lot and have 3 & 4 as separate lots making this a Minor Subdivision.

Jim seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain

Alex states the next item to discuss is the road. He continues that Commercial road standards require 40' wide road with 6' shoulders. He goes on that the construction requirements and road standards are pretty specific. Ray asks what we did on 302 with the birdhouses. He is advised it did not come to the Board. Also inquiries regarding Evergreen Electric are raised. Alex states we will be getting a Site Plan for that soon as they are looking to finish it; it is only a 50' R-O-W through there. Ted states he is concerned as it is obviously their intent to further divide and he would like to see a longer road coming out onto 302 rather than State Park Road. Ray states he would like to see it dead end there from that access; the only other way he could see is if they have the ROW, build 25' road then if it were to go through they would have the land there to bring the road up to that standard. Alex states so we would want a note on there that to develop further would have to be brought up to the road standards width. Dustin states they wouldn't be opposed to having a note on there reflecting that.

Alex asks if the underground utilities would be on the roadside. Dustin states they are going in the 6' ROW and explains how they would develop further.

Alex reiterates that if the Board does allow reduced road standards at this time, they would require a note on the plan that if future development takes place the road must be brought up to meet the Commercial Road standards. He continues or would you let it be okay if future development is done, that will have to come out onto State Park Road but wouldn't connect to the other road. Dustin states there is curbcut allowance from DOT onto State Park Road and he explains they designed it to have the roads connect. He continues that not knowing what the uses will be, we can't decide what we need to do and would like to see this a little open ended. Jim M. asks Alex to look for any past Commercial Road designs. Lynne states if it gets expanded we would need to follow the road standards; if it gets connected, we have to have the road meet standards. Jim M. asks if we have any 40' wide commercial roads. Alex states he will look into it. He continues that we are looking at it would be 80' with ROW but road will be built to 24' of pavement with 6' shoulders and a grade of 6%. The Board concurs.

Alex asks the Board about the actual construction standards; the ordinance calls for road base (Commercial) 20"/(Major) 14"; Upper base (Commercial) 6"/(Major) 6", Bituminous paving base coat (Commercial) 1-1/2"/(Major) 1-1/2", Surface Coat (Commercial) 1"/(Major) 1". Ray states he would think it would be to their favor to do the extra 6" thickness in case they want to go to major sometime. Dustin states they are not looking to have to rebuild the road from the bottom up again so they will do the 20" base and they want to do at least a 2" base course.

Lynne opens the Public Hearing. There being on one wishing to speak, she closed the Public Hearing.

Ray states he feels we need to know for future development it would have to be kept to standards; he continues what if a future Planning Board doesn't invoke the standards of the 40' width, but if we have it noted, they would have to adhere to it. Lynne states it should be worded so that if the new road connects to the existing road it is deemed

major development with the road standards as such, this would have to be upgraded to major development standards. Dustin states once they get a clearer view on how this project is progressing, they would do a traffic study and look at how traffic is utilizing the road; it would be an extension and upgrade at that time. He further states that the standards could change over time.

Dustin states the water quality treatment of the roadway should be deferred until such time as the owners of the lots come in for site plan review and stormwater management of those lots when the uses are known. He continues they can put a condition that the lots have to have a stormwater plan as part of their site plan. Alex asks about test pits and Jim Seymour's comments about water supply. Dustin states all the lots will have test pits and well exclusion areas on them. He continues that the HHE-200 would like this deferred to the Building Permit part of these plans. The Board concurs.

Alex asks if the Board would like to do a site walk or appoint someone to do a site walk or not have a site walk. The Board members discuss the options.

Lynne moves no site walk is needed.

Ted seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain

Jim M. moves to table this matter until additional submissions are received.

Ray seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain

Lynne states the last item is proposed language to amend the Section 215-2.1, Word Usage and Definitions of the Casco Code. Specifically to redefine "KENNEL". The Board may discuss and entertain other possible changes. A public hearing will be held on any proposed changes at a later date.

Jim M. states he would like to see us go with the State requirements largely the State has a bigger scope than the towns. He continues that Raymond and Windham talk about how much space is to the nearest neighbor and he would like to see something like that.

Lynne states we received an email from Jim Seymour stating "I would suggest that you add that with either option, language, that a Kennel License is necessary for the purposes set forth in section 3907, subsection 17 of the State Statute and the owner of such facility shall obtain a license from the Casco Town Clerk subject to rules adopted by the Town".

Jim M. states he would like to see the number increased from 3 to 5. Alex states we have Performance Standards for Animal Husbandry that it needs to be 100' from the neighboring property line. He reads the following from the Ordinance "Feed lots, fenced runs, pens and similar intensively used facilities for animal raising and care shall not be located within 100 feet of a neighboring property line, excluding pastures, or within 100 feet, measured horizontally, of any lake, pond, stream or wetland". He continues that the Commercial Zone is the only zone a Kennel is a permitted use; that 100' increases the buffer from 40'. Alex further explains how this kennel issue came about; there was a kennel operating in the Village and that is where we came up with Option B (see attached). Further, he states, at the last meeting when we addressed this you seemed to be more in favor of Option A and this doesn't change anything about being allowed in any other zones. Lynne states she thinks Option B covers it all, 5 or more dogs can be noisy whether for a fee or not. Alex states we could keep Option B and have a Public Hearing on this to see what we get from that.

Trevor Tidd states he lives in the Village and he would like to confirm this means some could have 4 dogs no problem. The State has a provision about one litter of puppies in a year doesn't constitute a kennel and that may be something you want to consider.

Ray states Trevor is right; could you put litters from existing dogs? Jim M. states it does address 1 litter; if we use the usual language we could remove "under 6 months". Ted states he would like to see it somewhere in between what we have and the State.

Alex states so let's hold off on the Public Hearing for now, come back with it next month and probably shoot it off to attorney for comment then we can decide on a Public Hearing.

Ray states another Zoning change he would like to see is filling; it is 40 c.y. which is low. The Town has violated it several times. Alex states it doesn't affect fill under a Building Permit. The Town has to fill in when the buildings are demolished.

Jim S. states you could do a volumetric or depth for filling.

Jim M. states he would like to know what other towns do. Jim S. states this usually falls under land disturbance. Alex states he is going to look at Raymond. Ray states if someone wants to resurface their road or has a low spot on their property they should be able to fill it and grade it. He continues he feels it should be around 300 c.y.

Lynne moves to adjourn.

Ted seconds.

Any discussion? None.

All in favor? 4 yes (Ted, Ray, Jim & Lynne) – 0 no – 0 abstain