



**Norridgewock Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
October 14, 2021
6:00 PM
Conference Room, Norridgewock Town Office**

APPROVED
12/09/2021

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Ames, Chair
Mike Shute, Vice Chair
Charlotte Curtis
Matt Keister
Margaret O'Connell

STAFF PRESENT

Richard LaBelle, Town Manager

Also present for all or parts of the meeting were Tim Lyman and Brian Rhea.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 PM by Mr. Ames.

2. Public Hearing on Final Plan Review for Maine Woods and Waters, LLC—Red Barn Road Subdivision (portion of Map 3, Lot 14)

Mr. Ames opened the public hearing at 6:02 PM. There were no questions or comments by those attending the meetings. Mr. Ames closed the public hearing at 6:04 PM.

3. Final Plan Review for Maine Woods and Waters, LLC—Red Barn Road Subdivision (portion of Map 3, Lot 14)

The subdivision now contains six (6) lots. Covenant #5 has been revised showing the addition of a line on the map at 75'. There is a foundation on Lot #2 has been designated as Historic.

The Board reviewed the Findings of Facts document, which is affixed hereto. Note: The attached copy includes notes regarding Board action on each.

Ms. Curtis made a MOTION to accept and approve the covenants as proposed, to comply with the Boards' request for the re-wording of #5. Seconded by Mr. Shute. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

Ms. Curtis made a MOTION to approve the application. Seconded by Mr. Shute. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

Ms. Curtis made a MOTION for the Board to sign the plans, which need to be registered at the Somerset County Registry of Deeds by the Applicant. Seconded by Mr. Keister. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

4. Discussion/Action on September 14, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Shute made a MOTION to approve the September 14, 2021 meeting minutes. Seconded by Mr. Keister. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

5. New Business

None.

6. Other Business

Mr. Ames inquired as to the status regarding electronic signboard. The Board has 30 more days before the survey window closes, at which time the Board will review the results. This will be scheduled for the next regular meeting.

There has been no application formally submitted for the proposed subdivision on Bigelow Hill Road, for which a Sketch Plan Review was conducted in August.

The next regularly scheduled meeting falls on Veterans Day. Mr. Ames made a MOTION to schedule the next regular meeting for Wednesday, November 10, 2021. Seconded by Mr. Keister. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

7. Adjournment

Mr. Shute made a MOTION to adjourn the meeting at 6:41 PM. Seconded by Mr. Keister. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).



Town of Norridgewock Planning Board

FINDINGS OF FACT

We, the Norridgewock Planning Board, make the following findings regarding an application for a proposed Subdivision submitted by **Maine Woods & Waters, LLC** for a proposed project located at **Ward Hill and Red Barn Roads**, in Norridgewock, Maine. (a portion of Map **3 Lot 14**). The following findings are enumerated to align with criteria in the 2006 Norridgewock Subdivision Ordinance, Section 3.

1) The application is complete and application and application fees have been paid.

Finding: In compliance

On August 27, 2021, the Applicant paid the application fee in full. The Planning Board conducted a review of completeness and, together with the recommendation of the Code Enforcement Officer, deemed the plan application to be complete on September 14, 2021.

Ms. Curtis made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Mr. Shute seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

2) The proposed subdivision will not result in undue water or air pollution.

Finding: Not relevant

The proposed subdivision does not include any build-out of structures or disturbance of land. The proposed subdivision is only for lot split; therefore, this item is not relevant.

Ms. Curtis made a MOTION to deem this requirement not relevant; Mr. Keister seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

3) The proposed subdivision has sufficient water available for the reasonable needs of the subdivision.

Finding: In compliance

Exhibit 12 of the Preliminary Plan application supported compliance with the requirements of the Ordinance. At the request of the Planning Board, additional supporting documentation was sought from a qualified well driller, which was provided from Chad Grignon,

President/Licensed Well Driver of Pine State Drilling, Inc., as a part of the Final Plan submission.

Mr. Shute made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Ms. Curtis seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 4) The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing municipal or private water supply, if one is to be used.**

Finding: In compliance

The proposed subdivision permitting does not include the permitting of any structures; however, documentation from Pine State Drilling, Inc. has been provided to support compliance.

Mr. Shute made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Mr. Keister seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 5) The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results.**

Finding: Not relevant

The proposed subdivision does not include any proposed structures. Any development under this section would be considered when a building application is submitted. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control note has been provided on the Plan.

Mr. Shute made a MOTION to deem this requirement not relevant; Mr. Keister seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 6) The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of highways or public roads existing or proposed.**

Finding: In compliance

The addition of six lots to the area is not going to cause unreasonable congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of public roads. There are no additional public roads planned as a part of this proposal.

Mr. Shute made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Mr. Keister seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 7) **The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal and will not cause an unreasonable burden on municipal services, if Town services are used.**

Finding: Not relevant

This project does not require Town services.

Mr. Shute made a MOTION to deem this requirement not relevant; Mr. Keister seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 8) **The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on the Town's ability to dispose of solid waste, if Town services are used.**

Finding: Not relevant

This project does not require Town services. Solid waste disposal is the responsibility of the landowner, who will have access to Waste Management's residential transfer station.

Mr. Keister made a MOTION to deem this requirement not relevant; Ms. Curtis seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 9) **The proposed subdivision will not have an undue, adverse effect on historic sites, archeological sites, or significant wildlife habitat, as identified by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife.**

Finding: In compliance

There is no adverse impact on significant wildlife habitat in the proposed subdivision. As provided in the Final Plan submission, a communication from Maine Historical Preservation Commission indicates that a cellar hole of what is believed to be the Reverend J. Longley House site was identified close to Red Barn Road in the vicinity of Lots 1 and 2. This cellar is well-preserved. In accordance with the Commission's recommendations, a 25-foot buffer around the believed cellar hole has been incorporated into the subdivision plans.

Mr. Keister made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Ms. Curtis seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

10) The proposed subdivision conforms with all applicable standards and requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance, the comprehensive plan, and other local ordinances.

Finding: In compliance

The proposed subdivision is in compliance with all other municipal ordinances. The most recent comprehensive plan adopted in February 1997, notes that the Town still has ample land area to develop along existing roads, but that in the long-term, problems may arise from a lack of access to rear land areas. The proposed subdivision does not landlock any parcels and maintains access to all areas of the property. The portion of the total parcel proposed for subdivision does not leave any undeveloped rear land, as cautioned by the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Keister made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Mr. Ames seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

11) The subdivider has adequate financial and technical capacity to meet all the review criteria, standards, and requirements contained in the Subdivision Ordinance.

Finding: In compliance

A letter from Gorham Savings Bank (Exhibit 13) in the Preliminary Plan submission states compliance with this requirement.

Ms. Curtis made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Mr. Ames seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

12) Whenever situated entirely or partially within the watershed of any pond or lake, or within 250 feet of any wetland, great pond, or river, as defined in Title 38, Chapter 3, Subchapter 1, Article 2-B, the proposed subdivision will not adversely affect the quality of that body of water or unreasonably affect the shoreline of that body of water.

Finding: Not relevant

The entirety of the proposed subdivision is outside of a watershed of any pond or lake and setbacks will be observed in proximity of wetlands, in accordance with the plan submitted. A portion of lots 3 and 4 contain wetlands; the lots remain buildable. Future building application for these lots will require compliance with wetland regulations.

Ms. Curtis made a MOTION to deem this requirement not relevant; Mr. Keister seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 13) The proposed subdivision will not, alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of groundwater.**

Finding: In compliance

As presented in Exhibit 12 of the Preliminary Plan submittal and in the statement presented in the Final Plan submittal from Pine State Drilling, Inc., the proposed subdivision will not adversely affect the quality or quantity of groundwater.

Mr. Keister made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Mr. Shute seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 14) Based on Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), information is presented as to whether the subdivision is in a flood-prone area. If the subdivision, or any part of it, is in such an area, the plan shall require that principal structures in the subdivision will be constructed with the lowest floor, including the basement, at least one foot above the 100-year flood elevation.**

Finding: In compliance

The proposed subdivision is entirely located within Zone X, as laid out on the NFIP FIRM Map, most recently revised May 6, 1996. Zone X is determined to be outside the 500-year flood.

Mr. Ames made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Ms. Curtis seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 15) All freshwater wetlands within the proposed subdivision must be identified on any maps submitted as part of the application. All wetlands shall be preserved to the greatest extent practicable.**

Finding: In compliance

A portion of lots 3 and 4 contain wetlands; the lots remain buildable. Future building application for these lots will require compliance with wetland regulations.

Mr. Keister made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Mr. Ames seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 16) All rivers, streams, or brooks within or abutting the proposed subdivision has been identified; all rivers, stream, or brooks shall be protected from any adverse development impacts.**

Finding: In compliance.

All rivers, streams, and/or brooks have been identified. There being no proposed development at this time, and only lot splits, these resources are protected.

Mr. Ames made a MOTION to find the Applicant is in compliance; Mr. Shute seconded. MOTION PASSED, 4-0-1 (Ames, Shute, Curtis in favor; none opposed; O'Connell non-vote).

- 17) The proposed subdivision provides for adequate stormwater management.**

Finding: Not relevant

There is no proposed development associated with this subdivision application.

Mr. Keister made a MOTION to deem this requirement not relevant; Mr. Ames seconded. MOTION PASSED 4-0-1, (Ames, Shute, Curtis, Keister in favor, none opposed; O'Connell a non-vote.)

- 18) If any lots in the subdivision have frontage on a river, stream, brook, great pond, or wetland, none of the lots created within the subdivision shall have a lot depth to shore frontage ratio greater than 5 to 1.**

Finding: Not relevant

The proposed subdivision does not have any lots with frontage on a river, stream, brook, great pond, or wetland.

Ms. Curtis made a MOTION to deem this requirement not relevant; Mr. Keister seconded. MOTION PASSED 4-0-1, (Ames, Shute, Curtis, Keister in favor, none opposed; O'Connell a non-vote.)

- 19) The long-term cumulative effects of the proposed subdivision will not unreasonably increase a great pond's phosphorus concentration during the construction phase and life of the proposed subdivision.**

Finding: Not relevant

There is no construction associated with this proposed subdivision. Future development applications will be responsible, should this consideration become applicable.

Mr. Keister made a MOTION to deem this requirement not relevant; Mr. Shute seconded. MOTION PASSED 4-0-1, (Ames, Shute, Curtis, Keister in favor, none opposed; O'Connell a non-vote.)

20) For any subdivision that crosses municipal boundaries, the proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable traffic congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of existing public ways in an adjoining municipality in which part of the subdivision is located.

Finding: Not relevant

This subdivision is wholly contained within the boundaries of the Town of Norridgewock.

Ms. Curtis made a MOTION to deem this requirement not relevant; Mr. Ames seconded. MOTION PASSED 4-0-1, (Ames, Shute, Curtis, Keister in favor, none opposed; O'Connell a non-vote.)

Based on the findings above, the Norridgewock Planning Board voted to approve the application.

Done and dated this 14th day of October, 2021

By:

/s/ John Ames, Chair

/s/ Michael Shute, Vice Chair

/s/ Charlotte Curtis, Member

/s/ Matthew Keister, Member

Margaret O'Connell, Member