

**RICHMOND PLANNING BOARD  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2010  
TOWN OFFICE MEETING ROOM  
6:00P.M.**

**MINUTES**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Present: Isaac Beck, Daniel Woodward, Tom Connolie, Laurie Dunbar, William Schellinger, Ed Mackenzie, Jessica Alexander, Tom Nugent, Russ Hughes, Alice Knapp, Andy Warlick, Mark Tuttle, Michael Grizkavitch, Dan Dunton, Laurisa Loon and Brian Morse. Absent: Jeff Severance and Michael Lane.

Tom Nugent called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

2.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2.1 Isaac Beck-Public Hearing of 674 Langdon Road-Commercial Use (Repair and service work of ATV's, Snowmobiles, etc.)

Tom designated Russ Hughes a voting member.

Jessica Alexander recused herself from this portion of the meeting.

Russ Hughes made a motion to move into public hearing, Ed Mackenzie seconded, motion passed (4-0-1). Jessica Alexander abstained from vote.

There being no public comment, Ed Mackenzie made a motion to come out of public hearing, Russ Hughes seconded, motion passed (4-0-1). Jessica Alexander abstained from vote.

The board moved into Article 8 Section C.

**APPROVAL STANDARDS AND CRITERIA**

1. Compliance with State Law and Richmond Ordinances. The Planning Board shall determine that the application meets each of the following criteria. In all instances the burden of proof shall be on the applicant and such burden shall include the project evidence sufficient to support a find that the proposed development.

**Finding:**

The proposal complies with ordinances.

Conclusion:

The project complies with State and Richmond Land Use Ordinances.

2. Shoreland District and Resource Protection District Permit Standards

FINDINGS:

N/A

CONCLUSION:

N/A

3. Special Exception Standards in the Resource Protection District

FINDINGS:

N/A

CONCLUSION:

N/A

4. Utilization of the Site

FINDINGS:

The proposed site reflects the natural capabilities to support the development.

CONCLUSION:

The board concludes that the proposed site reflects natural capabilities for use of the site. No environmentally sensitive areas were identified.

5. Access to the Site

FINDINGS:

Given the provided plan there is adequate provision for the circulation of traffic and parking.

CONCLUSION:

There is sufficient access to the site to support the development.

6. Access into the Site

FINDINGS:

Given the provided plan there is adequate provision for the circulation of traffic and parking.

CONCLUSION:

There is sufficient access to the site to support the development.

7. Access Design

FINDINGS:

Given the provided plan there is adequate provision for the circulation of traffic and parking.

CONCLUSION:

The board concludes that the access design is safe and convenient.

8. Accessway Location and Spacing

FINDINGS:

Given the provided plan there is adequate provision for the accessway, location, spacing and parking.

CONCLUSION:

Accessway location and spacing has been determined compliance with the ordinance and will provide safe and convenient access and spacing in the development.

9. Construction Materials/Paving

FINDINGS:

Construction materials/paving to be used are gravel.

CONCLUSION:

The board finds the materials sufficient for this specific development.

10. Internal Vehicular Circulation

FINDINGS:

Parking and traffic movement patterns are depicted on the plan.

CONCLUSION:

Internal parking is safe and convenient and complies with the ordinance.

11. Pedestrian Circulation

FINDINGS:

There is no proposed pedestrian circulation. Not Applicable

CONCLUSION:

The project does not change existing pedestrian circulation or traffic pattern. This is Not Applicable.

12. Stormwater Management

FINDINGS:

The project is relatively small size and the impervious surface does not appear to have any adverse affect on surrounding properties.

CONCLUSION:

The Site Plan shows sufficient management and impact on stormwater drainage.

13. Erosion Control

FINDINGS:

The site is already existing, limited construction. The site improvement for parking makes adequate provision for erosion control.

CONCLUSION:

The planning board finds the project adequately covers erosion control standards.

14. Water Supply

FINDINGS:

The site is existing and adequate provision for water supply to the site.

CONCLUSION:

The project must meet the standards of the State of Maine for drinking water.

15. Utilities

FINDINGS:

Existing site, the plans do not show that this project would use extraneous use of utilities due to the size and nature of the project there are no adverse impact on utilities.

CONCLUSION:

The site will be provided with adequate utility service.

16. Natural Features

FINDINGS:

The proposed site reflects the natural capabilities to support the development.

CONCLUSION:

The board concludes that the proposed site reflects natural capabilities for use of the site. No environmentally sensitive areas were identified.

17. Groundwater Protection

FINDINGS:

The scale or scope of the project would not adversely affect ground water protection.

CONCLUSION:

The project makes sufficient provision to protect the groundwater.

18. Water and Air Pollution

FINDINGS:

Nothing in the application would suggest water or air adversely effected.

CONCLUSION:

The board concludes that the proposed development will not result in any undue water or air pollution.

19. Exterior Lighting

FINDINGS:

The exterior lighting identified complies with the ordinance and makes for safe use of the property at night and not burden adjacent properties.

CONCLUSION:

The project will provide adequate exterior lighting.

20. Waste Disposal

FINDINGS:

A letter provided from McGee Construction stated they would accept waste fluids (used oil, waste gasoline, antifreeze) either used oil to burn or disposal thru a licensed environmental service contractor.

CONCLUSION:

Disposal of solid waste is adequate.

21. Landscaping

FINDINGS:

The Site Plan shows retention of green space and line of trees appears to provide adequate landscaping which complies with the general requirements of the ordinance.

CONCLUSION:

The project provides for adequate landscaping.

22. Shoreland Relationship

FINDINGS:

N/A

CONCLUSION:

N/A

23. Technical and Financial Capacity

FINDINGS:

The site is already existing and owned by the applicant there is no new construction.

CONCLUSION:

There is nothing that demonstrates there is no technical or financial capacity.

24. Buffering

FINDINGS:

The Plan and application depicts that buffering has been adequately addressed to meet the ordinance standards.

CONCLUSION:

The applicant has provided sufficient documentation providing adequate buffering.

25. Off-Street Parking

FINDINGS:

The Site Plan depicts 4 parking spaces on the site. There shall be no off-street parking.

CONCLUSION:

The project provides for adequate parking for the scale of the development.

26. Historic and Archaeological Resource.

FINDINGS:

There is nothing in the application that demonstrates that Historic and/or Archaeological resources would be impacted by the development

CONCLUSION:

There are no historic or archeological resources on site as defined.

William Schellinger made a motion to approve the application, Russ Hughes seconded, motion passed (4-0-1). Jessica Alexander abstained from vote.

3.0 NEW BUSINESS

3.1 Tom Connelie- Construct concrete foundation under existing cottage and retain present location.

William Schellinger made a motion that the application is complete and scheduled for public hearing on October 26, 2010 at 6:00p.m., Russ Hughes seconded, motion passed (5-0).

3.2 Andy Warlick-Pre-Application

Russ Hughes made a motion that the application is complete and scheduled for public hearing on October 26<sup>th</sup>, William Schellinger seconded, motion passed (5-0).

3.3 Mark Tuttle-Pre Application

The board reviewed the subdivision plan and found no notes or deed restrictions on the property. Russ Hughes stated there was a concern with an auto repair garage going in a subdivision but there being no restrictions stated on the plan, he sees no issue with the business in that location.

Jessica Alexander questioned the size of the sign. Brian will take a picture and provide at the next meeting. Jessica also questioned if he has the financial capacity? Mark Tuttle stated he is putting together a business plan with Brian Sullivan down in Bath. Mark Tuttle stated the approximate cost is around \$12,000.00. The board requested a letter either from him or his bank stating he has the financial capacity to construct the garage.

Russ Hughes made a motion that the application is complete pending the letter stating financial support and the photo of the business sign and scheduled the project for public hearing on October 26, 2010, William Schellinger seconded, motion passed (5-0).

4.0 CORRESPONDENCE-None

5.0 APPROVE MINUTES-SEPTEMBER 28, 2010

Jessica Alexander made a motion to approve the minutes, William Schellinger seconded, motion passed, (4-0-1). Tom Nugent abstained from vote.

6.0 ADJOURN

William Schellinger made a motion to adjourn, Ed Mackenzie seconded, motion passed (5-0).