

Town of Searsmont
Planning Board Meeting Minutes
February 6, 2024
6:30 PM

1. Call to order: The meeting of the Planning Board convened at 6:32 pm. These minutes are a summary of the Board's discussions. A recording of this meeting is available at the Town office.

2. Roll Call - Members Present:

Christian Halsted, Chair
Sarah Crosby
Jon Robbins
John Lightner
Jack DeGraff

Others:

Gail Cox

Patricia Chapman, Clerk (on Teams)

3. Applications:

a. Section 1102.4 Site Plan Review Application Requirements for The Rage Release on the New England Road:

- i. Applicant has a check to make the payment - \$400 fee
- ii. Major vs minor site plan – this is a minor development, less than 5,000 square feet of new construction
- iii. Clerk needs to notify Road Commissioner & public safety officials before the final review

iv. General Info

1. We have a complete, signed application with a boundary survey attached.
2. Owner and applicant information is included.
3. Name of development – The Rage Release
4. List of abutters – neighboring abutters are noted on the survey but the board will need the list for abutters across the street.
5. Sketch map – not included but the board is comfortable that they know the location of the property.
6. Boundaries of contiguous properties owned by applicant
7. Tax map and lot numbers were noted. Map 007, Lot 016
8. A copy of the Deed is included
9. Name, reg number, seal of surveyor or professional preparing the plan – that information is on the plan but partially cut off on the copy.

v. Existing Conditions

1. Zoning classifications – are not identified in the packet. C. Halsted reviewed the town map and confirmed the property is in a rural zone but partially in a shoreland zone. Requested that they include the zoning information for the final review.
2. Bearings and distances of property lines – these are not on the existing survey; the board previously agreed they didn't need a new survey but

- they would like the bearings and distances added to the existing survey based on information in the deed.
3. Existing sewer and water mains, culverts, etc. There are no public water or sewer systems to identify. There is a culvert but no indication of the direction of drainage.
 - a. There are no changes to the land area of the property – do they need additional details about drainage for this application? The board would like to see arrows indicating drainage direction and contour lines (they can use data provided by the state).
 - b. Will there be trash or debris that would be affected by or interfere with drainage?
 - i. There are a variety of objects to destroy – glasses, small appliances, vases, bottles; paint bombs, old car (from Totman's, stripped of anything salvageable, or hazardous such as gasoline, etc)
 - ii. There will be a dumpster on the property.
 - c. There will be three rooms with varying capacity: 1-8 people.
 - i. One is dedicated to children under 10 years old that will not have any glass.
 - ii. One room will include a car to destroy.
 - iii. There will be a protected observation area.
 4. Location, names, width of existing streets within or adjacent to property – there is enough detail on the survey for this (scale details)
 5. Location and dimensions of all buildings – these details need to be added.
 6. Location and dimensions of existing driveways, streets, parking and loading areas – the locations are there but not the dimensions. No additional parking is needed. Small groups or individuals at a time, not full classes. The board would like notations about the size and length of the driveway to show how much parking is currently available.
 - a. The development will be in the garage. The house will be rented out.
 7. Location of intersecting roads or driveways within 200 feet – this information has been provided.
 8. Location of open drainage, trees, important natural features – there is no outdoor sitework and zoning map will provide many of these details.
 9. Direction of existing surface water drainage – this was addressed in #3 in this section above.
 10. General location of existing signs – no existing signs. They plan to paint their “sign” on the front wall of the garage; graffiti style writing painted on the building. This will still need to meet the requirements in the sign ordinance.
 11. General description of soils in the area – there is no earthwork involved in the proposal so the board does not feel this information is necessary.
 12. Location and dimensions of easements, covenants, etc – there aren't any to include.

13. Delineation of elevation of any area in the 100-year flood plain – the property is not in the flood plain area.
14. Description of wastewater disposal system from licensed plumbing inspector – the existing septic system has not been inspected. They are planning to drill a new well.
 - a. The board recommends they have someone look at the system.
 - b. There will not be a bathroom in the business area (just in the house being rented). They need to check with the LPI about whether a long-term porta potty is a legal option for the business.

vi. Proposed Development Activity

1. The location, dimensions and ground floor elevations of all proposed buildings and structures on the site – we have the dimensions and they are not changing. We don't have ground floor elevations but the board doesn't feel these are necessary in this instance.
2. The location of all existing and proposed setback dimensions and buffers required by this ordinance – we have dimensions and could calculate setbacks and buffers. Since there will not be any changes to the location or footprint of existing buildings, this is not an issue.
3. The location and dimensions of proposed driveways, parking and loading areas, and walkways – they are going to add more details about the existing driveway and parking areas (see notes above). There are no plans to add parking.
4. The type of water supply to be used, the location and dimensions of all provisions for water supply. There is no plan to have water in the business unless they need to add a bathroom. An outdoor spigot at the house could be used if water is needed at the Rage building. If people are washing off paint outside, that would create concerns about contamination.
5. The size, location, direction, and intensity of illumination and method of installation of all major outdoor lighting apparatus and signs. There is an outside light on the garage and they are not planning to add any additional lighting. But there is currently no electricity so they are not sure how bright it is, etc.
6. The type, size, and location of all incineration devices. There are not any incineration devices in this proposal.
7. The type, size and location of all machinery likely to generate appreciable noise at the lot lines. There is no machinery. How loud will the destruction be? Will neighbors hear it? No noisier than anyone else doing building projects in their garage.
8. A report from a licensed site evaluator describing any proposed subsurface sewage disposal systems. This report shall identify the parameters for any proposed systems as well as a replacement area. There are currently no proposed plans but the applicant will be looking into this per above notes about whether a bathroom is required.

9. The amount and type of any raw, finished, or waste materials to be stored outside of roofed buildings, including their physical and chemical properties, if appropriate.
 - a. There will be a dumpster.
 - b. Any paint would be safe, washable (Tempera). They do not expect to have any toxic materials.
 - c. Will appliances still have electrical boards in them? They will need to address whether the items contain hazardous waste like TV tubes, electronics, etc. and how they will dispose of them in the final proposal. They generally use the Belfast and Rockland dumps.
 10. Proposed landscaping and buffering. None proposed.
 11. Copies of applicable State approvals and permits. There are no required permits. The business will be DBA under the owner's SSN.
 12. Schedule of construction – this needs to be added to the final application. They expect it will start late spring and end near the end of the summer.
- vii. C. Halsted made a motion that this application is not complete tonight, seconded by J. Robbins. Motion passed 5 in favor, 0 opposed. C. Halsted advised applicant to pay the application fee and then work with W. Wetmore to get their application completed.
 - viii. There was some discussion about the max occupancy allowed without the Fire Marshall's approval. No one present knows the requirement.
 - ix. The applicant chose not to do the pre-application to save the fee but they were advised that it could make the application more likely not to be approved.
 - x. The board discussed how different parts of the review process are more important for some projects than others.
 1. Site Plan Reviews give the board flexibility to determine which items are relevant but Subdivision reviews don't allow the same flexibility.
 2. There are building code requirements that are not covered by the LUO and not part of the Planning Board's review. Sprinkler Systems, for example. There are likely rules about when and where sprinkler systems are required for businesses but it's not part of the LUO so the Planning Board does not need to get into that issue.
 3. The CEO should be able to guide the applicant through additional non-LUO requirements (building codes) they need to be aware of. CEO should be at Planning Board meetings so he can add non-LUO items to the applicants list of things they need to follow up on
- b. .The Planning Board has some questions about the Thresher's project and whether they have cleared up all the issues they were told about in the past. These questions should be addressed to the CEO.

4. Approval of Minutes:

- a. J. DeGraff moved to accept the January 2nd minutes as written. J. Robbins seconded. Motion passed with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

5. Treasurer's report:

- a. C. Halsted has not been asked for input on the budget yet.
 - i. Were the legal reserves absorbed into the town's legal reserves?
 - ii. Projector has been a big help.

6. Communications:

- a. Do we need to review our stance on marijuana before the town meeting? It is not addressed in the current LUO. We are still waiting for the state to come up with their guidelines.
- b. We have a draft of the LD2003 changes ready to create the warrant for the town meeting but we need to wait until Thursday's public hearing to determine if additional edits need to be made.
 - i. C. Halsted has talked to J. Moulton and determined all the LUO changes should be one warrant article. It is all related to LD2003 so it needs to be either all approved or all rejected.
 - ii. Public Notices were put up for Thursday's public hearing but we only got in the paper once (2/2) instead of two times. It was posted in the town office, Fraternity Village Store and the post office by the deadline.
- c. W. Wetmore has officially taken over the building permit application process and will send them to C. Halsted when approved so they can be added to the spreadsheet. We can go back to once per month meetings as we do not need to review permit requests.
- d. C. Halsted has copied W. Wetmore and R. Hoey on all email communications with potential applicants in the past month.
 - i. A woman on Appleton Ridge wants to open a campground / glamping with yurts and huts, etc. but no plumbing. R. Hoey needs to weigh in on that.
 - ii. The farm stand we have talked about in the past want to make changes to what they originally talked about.
 - iii. The Casburns on Magog Road near the corner of Buck Road are talking about opening a farm stand.
 - iv. Shannon Smith has an old camp on Quantabacook off Pond Road and it's in the flood zone and below the waterline most of the year and he wants to fix that. Not the same couple who talked to C. Halsted about a similar situation recently.
 - v. Someone talked to C. Halsted about purchasing a large plot of land and use part of it for a solar farm (on New England Road?). He doesn't have any additional details right now.
 - vi. We talked about the variance on Woodsman's Mill about building a garage but it was too close to the road. They have not reached out again but C. Halsted passed that information on to W. Wetmore.
 - vii. The neighbors (Murphy's) of the Fire House project are concerned about the work happening at the Fire House. They tried to talk to the owner (Jake) but he hasn't responded. They wanted C. Halsted to come out but he is passing on their request to the CEO, W. Wetmore.
 - viii. Other residents have also expressed concerns about the Fire House project.
 - ix. The work on the island that was previously discussed seems to have shut down for the winter so no site visit has taken place.

- e. C. Halsted has started some talking points for the public hearing and A. Philson has suggested edits and plans to create some slides. He is trying to keep a positive spin on the information and make it as clear as possible.
- f. E. deFrees, J. Thurston, and C. Halsted's Planning Board positions are up for election this year.

7. Committee Reports: None.

8. Old Business: None.

9. New Business: None.

10. Adjournment: J. DeGraff made a motion to adjourn, seconded by J. Robbins. Motion passed by a vote of 5 in favor, 0 opposed and the meeting was adjourned at 7:51 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Patricia Chapman, Planning Board Clerk

J. DeGraff made a motion at the March 5th meeting to accept the February 6th minutes with one edit correct the landowner's name on line 211 from Hasburn to Casburn. C. Halsted seconded. Motion passed with 5 in favor, 2 abstained (E. deFrees, J. Thurston) 0 opposed