

Shapleigh Planning Board

Minutes

Tuesday, April 9, 2024

Members in attendance: Steve Foglio (Chairman), Ann Harris (Vice Chairman), Maggie Moody, Norman Baker, and Thomas Clement. Code Enforcement Officer Mike Demers was also in attendance.

Minutes are not verbatim unless in quotes “” – If the name of a Citizen making a comment was not requested by the Planning Board Chairman, the reference to their name will be known as ‘Citizen’ or ‘Abutter’ depending on who is speaking.

The Public Hearing began at 6:30 pm.

Conditional Use Permit – Renew Mineral Extraction Permit / 3 Yrs. – Map 7, Lot 28 (Corner of Rte. 11 & Square Pond Rd) – Hissong Ready Mix & Aggregates LLC, Applicant; CJP Holdings LLC, Property Owner Steve Patch represented Hissong Ready Mix this evening.

Steve F. asked Mr. Patch to speak on behalf of Hissong, for the mineral extraction permit. Mr. Patch stated that he was before the board to renew the mineral extraction permit for 3 years. He stated that he did an inspection of the site, and the stumps had been removed, and some of them were chipped and used for erosion control.

Mr. Patch stated that the area to be excavated in total was 7 acres, but he did not believe they have reached 5 acres to date, as they did not begin to remove material until the latter part of last year. He said they were aware of the restrictions for the permit, such as not going by the school at certain hours, or not going down Great Hollow Road, Goose Pond Road, and Back Road.

Mr. Patch stated that the cost to reclaim per acre, according to the MDEP, has gone up. He stated that Chris Pizey (Property Owner), believed he has only developed 5 acres, but Mr. Patch said he could not tell walking around the property. Mr. Patch stated that the per acre rate has gone up to \$4500, and if they are only looking at 5 acres, the bond would come out almost to what they have now, but he noted that they will use whatever acreage the board wants them to use.

Mr. Patch stated that usually when you get to 10 acres, you have to go back to the MDEP for a variance to have a larger pit than 10 acres. He said this is when the MDEP makes sure there is funding for reclaiming the pit, but there is no 5 acre standard with the MDEP that he was aware of.

Mr. Patch asked if there were any questions? Selectman Thomas Small asked if this was the property by Square Pond Road and Route 11. Mr. Patch stated that it was, it was right at the intersection. Selectman Small asked how many acres it was? Mr. Patch stated that he believed there were 20 something acres, but only 7.7 acres are permitted by the MDEP as being a gravel pit. Mr. Patch also noted that there was a deed restriction for some of the property, because MDIFW wanted to make sure the stream on site was not impacted, so they have bermed that, and everything is internally draining.

Selectman Small asked if there was an aquifer in that location? Steve F. stated that they identified the seasonal high-water-mark, and they cannot get any closer than 5 feet to the aquifer. Mr. Patch agreed and also said MDIFW put a restriction on the stream. Selectman Small stated that the stream went to Square Pond and he had a personal interest in Square Pond.

Steve F. stated that the board reviewed the information well at the last meeting, and asked if there were any complaints regarding the gravel pit from the Code Officer? He said he has had none. Steve said that if the Select Board has not had any, then the Planning Board has no issues with renewing the permit.

Selectman Small asked what the hours of operation were? He said he sees lights on there early in the morning. Mr. Patch believed it was 7 am to 7 pm. Ann H. stated that it was 7 am to 5 pm on Saturday, and no Sunday operations or holidays. Selectman Small thanked Mr. Patch for his answers.

Steve F. stated that if there are no other questions or comments the public hearing for the gravel pit will be closed and brought back up at 7 o'clock.

Updated Floodplain Ordinance

Steve F. stated that the Floodplain Ordinance had been updated, per the State’s request, and the Code Enforcement Officer shall be designated as the local Floodplain Administrator. Changes were made in the ordinance to three pages, pages 3, 5 and 12, changing the administrator from the Planning Board to the Code Officer, as he is the permitting authority for buildings in Shapleigh’s Floodplain District.

Steve F. asked if there were any comments or questions? There were none.

Note: Copies of the Floodplain Ordinance can be obtained from the Land Use Secretary per request, and can be viewed at the Town Hall during normal business hours.

The public hearing was concluded at 6:45 pm.

- *The Planning Board meeting started at 7:00 pm.*
- *The Planning Board Chairman began the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance.*
- *Steve F. asked if there were any questions or changes to the minutes? The board members noted that Norman Baker was not in attendance at the last meeting. The minutes were approved as read.*

Conditional Use Permit – Renew Mineral Extraction Permit / 3 Yrs. – Map 7, Lot 28 (Corner of Rte. 11 & Square Pond Rd) – Hissong Ready Mix & Aggregates LLC, Applicant; CJP Holdings LLC, Property Owner

Steve Patch was representing Hissong Ready Mix this evening, he used to work for Sevee & Maher Engineers, which did the Reclamation Plan and the original application for the gravel pit. (Chris Pizey of Hissong emailed Barbara F. to state that Mr. Patch would be at the meeting this evening.)

Previously provided for the Mineral Extraction Permit were the following:

Provided to the Planning Board in 2009/2010 & 2012, for the original approval of the gravel pit were the following required documents:

- A copy of the letter from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission (MHPC), dated 7/27/09, which stated the project location could possibly contain one or more prehistoric archaeological sites so an archaeological survey was required prior to any ground disturbance.
- A copy of the Prehistoric Archaeological Investigation Report, dated October 2009, MHPC File No. 1310-98, prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. of Portland Maine, which concluded there were no prehistoric archaeological sites recorded within the Project area.

- A copy of the letter from the MHPC, dated 11/16/09 which stated they reviewed the report provided by Tetra Tech Inc. and found the report acceptable as written and they agreed with the conclusions in the report.
- A copy of the letter from the Maine Dept. of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW), dated 8/27/09, which stated the proposed location likely supported one or more endangered species. MDIFW offered three options for the development of the property. Note: Hissong chose the third option which required the western side of the stream be put into a permanent conservation easement or deed restriction, and that the area to be mined be allowed to revert back to a Pitch Pine Scrub Oak community once the mining project is completed. Furthermore, upon completion of the mining the entire parcel would be subject to the same conservation easement/deed restrictions above, the terms of which need to be reviewed and approved by MDIFW.
- A copy of the Declaration of Restrictions drafted to satisfy MDIFW's development plan option three of the above letter. Note: The Declaration of Restrictions was approved by MDIFW & the Planning Board.
- A copy of the approval for the mineral extraction plan by the Maine Dept. of Environmental Protection and a copy of the placard to be placed on site, issued 12/29/09, Permit No. L-724.
- A copy of the Driveway/Entrance Permit by the Maine Dept. of Transportation, dated 11/30/09.
- The Survey / Reclamation Plan, dated 1/13/2010, drafted by Stephen Stearns, PE #4437, of Pinkham & Greer, located in Springvale, Maine. The survey plan included in addition to the reclamation plan the following: The calculated net gravel pit volume of 343,200 cubic yards; hours of operation; location of access road and refueling pad; wetland area; setbacks to gravel pit from high water mark, roadway and side lots lines; site distance on Route 11; size of borrow pit (approx. 7.7 acres); plans for dust control and disposition of stumps, brush and boulders; the soils legend; and noted was the requirement to restrict truck travel past the Shapleigh Memorial School during school hours of pick-up and drop-off of the children.
- The Survey / Reclamation Plan amended by MDIFW, dated June 7, 2010, signed by Stephen Stearns, PE #4437, of Pinkham & Greer. The plan satisfies the requirements imposed by MDIFW as stated in the email from Judy Camuso, Wildlife Biologist, MDIFW, dated April 27, 2010 forwarded to the Planning Board on June 7, 2010. (This action satisfied condition #4 of the original conditional use permit approval letter dated 1/15/2010.)
- Reclamation Plan for Hissong Ready-Mix & Aggregates, LLC, drafted by Brian D. Pierce, PE #9609 of Sevee & Maher Engineers of Cumberland, Maine, dated 3/2021. Boundary & Topographic information was provided by Corner Post Land Surveying, Inc., of Springvale, Maine. Wetland boundaries were delineated and located by Joe Noel (Maine CCS #209), of South Berwick, Maine.

Information provided on the 3/2021 *Reclamation Plan*:

- Hours of Operation: 7 am to 10 pm, Monday thru Friday; 7 am to 5 pm Saturday; No Sunday or major holiday operation
- Disposition of stumps, brush and boulders: Stumps will be disposed of on site by temporarily stockpiling them to decompose naturally, burial on site in areas designated, or ground with grindings used for slope stabilization and erosion control. Brush chipped or burned. Boulders buried on site or hauled offsite for processing.
- Dust shall be controlled by watering on an as-needed basis.
- Within 75' of the edge of pavement of Route 11, grade of access road shall not exceed 3%.
- Reclamation: The total area of the borrow pit is 7.7± acres. Within 12 months following the completion of extraction operations, which operations shall be deemed complete when less than 100 cubic yards of minerals are removed in a consecutive twelve month period, ground levels and grades shall be established in accordance with this plan and the reclamation section of this sheet.
- There shall be no traveling past the Shapleigh Memorial School at the time of children drop-off in the morning or pick-up times.
- Site distance determination November 18, 2009: Looking left, Northwesterly, 772+ feet; Looking right, Southwesterly, 571 feet.
- *Reclamation Plan Notes*:
 1. Grade site to limits shown on plan.
 2. All debris, stumps and similar material shall be buried on site. Only materials generated on-site may be buried or covered on site.
 3. Slopes shall be graded at slopes on 2.5 horizontal to 1 vertical or flatter.

4. The top layer of soil is mainly comprised of the organic soil horizon and shall be retained to cover disturbed land areas to the greatest extent possible. Add mulch to disturbed areas in accordance with MEDEP Reclamation Best Management Practices.
 5. If within 1 year after complete reclamation:
 - a. Native vegetative cover has re-established over 90% of the reclaimed buffer area, no further plantings are recommended, as natural succession is allowed to take place.
 - b. Native vegetative cover has not re-established at least 90% of the reclaimed buffer area, plant with native herbaceous seed mix adapted to dry soils for the purpose of soil stabilization. Replant as necessary to achieve at least 90% vegetative cover.
 6. Remove the access road when no longer in use and reclaim in accordance with reclamation note 5(a). Remove bar gate and place 6-10 large boulders not less than 3 feet in smallest dimension, maintaining a minimum 2 feet clearance between boulders, across the reclaimed area and at least 5 feet inside the property line.
- The reclamation plan also depicted the lot area as 21.97 acres. An unnamed stream was shown, the location of the wetland interface and stream centerline as delineated by Joe Noel. A restricted buffer area was noted, the reclaimed buffer area and temporary stump stockpile area of 1 acre maximum. The location of the access road was on the plan, State Route 11, Square Pond Road and Great Hollow Road. Elevations for the entire site were noted, along with the elevation of the reclaimed buffer area. A cross section of the ‘Reclamation Section’ which depicts the grade and depth of soil, and organic soil horizon; and a Silt Fence depiction with a note stating, ‘Contractor’s option to use sediment barrier or silt fence for slope protection’.
 - Gravel Pit Volume: Total Volume - 349,300 CY;
 Less Topsoil & Grubbing - 6,200 CY;
 NET Volume - 343,200 CY

Provided on April 13, 2021 was the following information:

- Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MEDEP) Guide to the Performance Standards for Excavations and Quarries.
- Updated Reclamation Plan and revised “Declaration of Restrictions” to reflect current MEDEP requirements for gravel pit reclamation, Declaration dated April 5, 2021.
- Access to the gravel pit will be from Route 11. There will be no truck traffic on Great Hollow Road. Access to and from the site will be consistent with the facility’s MDOT Driveway/Entrance Permit. Sand and gravel from this pit will be used exclusively by Hissong and will be hauled to other facilities in Lyman, Kennebunkport, and Eliot, for processing.
- The MDOT entranceway to the gravel pit will include a stone entrance pad in accordance with MEDEP Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction activities.
- Pit operations will be in accordance with MEDEP Site Law Noise Standards:
 - 55 dBA between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM
 - 45 dBA between 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM
- Hours of operation:
 - 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM Monday through Friday
 - 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM Saturday
 - No Sunday or Holiday Operation
- Screening of aggregate may be performed within the limits of the gravel, as conditions warrant, but there will be no rock crushing performed on site; and
- There will be no permanent structures associated with the gravel pit operations. Temporary structures may include a porta-potty and Conex box for tools and equipment.

Provided with the renewal application, was an email dated March 7, 2024, between Chris Pizey, Hissong Ready Mix and Aggregates and Erich Kluck, MDEP – Gravel Pits. Chris Pizey requested an estimated cost of reclamation for gravel pits. Erich Kluck stated that the DEP is using \$4,500 per acre.

Provided with the renewal application, was a copy of the revised Reclamation Plan for Hissong Ready-Mix & Aggregates, LLC, drafted by Brian D. Pierce, PE #9609 of Sevee & Maher Engineers of Cumberland, Maine, dated 3/2021. Boundary & Topographic information was provided by Corner Post Land Surveying, Inc., of Springvale, Maine. *There were no changes from the plan that was presented 3 years ago.*

The detailed description of the project is as follows: *Mineral extraction – internally drained gravel pit.*

Steve F. stated the next item was for the extension of a gravel pit permit, located on Map 7, Lot 28, which is on the corner of Route 11 and Square Pond Road. He said the board just held a public hearing on the application. He asked Mr. Patch to briefly let the audience and board know once again what they intended to do.

Mr. Patch introduced himself, and said he had been working with Chris Pizey for a number of years, and he has given him the authority to speak on his behalf this evening. He stated that the gravel pit was permitted through the Town after they got the MDEP Notice to Comply three years ago. He said they didn't start using the pit until about a year ago, and they are actively hauling out material at this time. He said that after going to the site, he believes Mr. Pizey has done a good job laying out the gravel pit, there are berms in place and it is internally draining. He said he believed they were following the Town's conditions on what roads to go on, and when not to go by the school. He said the slopes are 2.5 to 1, and there is a reclamation plan and site map.

Steve F. said again there was a public hearing earlier on this project, this is the second meeting regarding this application, and the Code Officer has had no complaints, and there are none from the Select Board's office regarding the gravel pit. He said the only question left is the bond renewal, the amount, and looking at the conditions for the permit.

Steve F. stated they will review the current conditions of the permit, and amend as required. He said the board members can chime in if they have any issues with the conditions.

The conditions of the permit are as follows:

- 1) The gravel operation shall be conducted per the plan provided dated 3/2021, as well as the Declaration of Restrictions dated April 5, 2021.**
- 2) The hours of operation shall be 7:00 a.m. thru 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. thru 5:00 p.m. Saturday, no Sunday or Holiday operation, as written in Item 10 of the plan.**
- 3) There shall be no trucks traveling past the Shapleigh Memorial School at the time of children drop-off in the morning or during children pickup in the afternoon throughout school season operating hours, as written in Item 17 of the plan, as agreed upon between the applicant and Shapleigh Planning Board, for the health and safety of the children. (Drop-off and pick-up times shall be coordinated with Shapleigh Memorial School)**
- 4) It is the applicant's responsibility to make certain the entrance onto State Rte. 11 is clear of all sand and stone dust to prevent a hazardous situation. Entrance to be designed per MDEP Best Management Practices for construction activities.**
- 5) There shall be no trucks traveling on Great Hollow Road, Goose Pond Road and Back Road, per Optional Condition 4 – Routes for transporting material.**
- 6) A security bond or equivalent security to guaranty the reclamation plan required by the Town of Shapleigh and MDIFW is carried out. The surety bond must be submitted within 45 days of approval. The bond shall be based on the 7.7 acres, *in the amount of \$34,650, established by the amount suggested by the MDEP of \$4,500 per acre.* The bond shall be rendered within 90 days from the date of bond approval, or the application shall be null and void. There shall be no earth moving on site until an approved bond has been received.**

- 7) **This permit is valid until May 1, 2027. If the operation goes beyond this date, the applicant must come back before the Board for another 3 year renewal.**

Mr. Patch asked if they could work this week on the old bond. Steve F. stated that they could.

Steve F. asked if the board members had any additional comments or concerns? There were none. Steve stated he would entertain a motion.

Ann H. made the motion to approve the Conditional Use Permit to extend the mineral extraction permit for another three years, on Tax Map 7, Lot 28, with the stated conditions. Maggie M. seconded the motion. By a vote of 5 – 0, the motion to approve was unanimous.

Nothing more was discussed.

~~~~~

**The Findings of Fact**

1. The owners of Shapleigh Tax Map 7, Lot 28 is H.D.C. New England, Inc. located at 48 York Street, Suite 2, Kennebunk, 04043, per Warranty Deed, dated 11/24/2009, Book 15767, Page 261, registered at York County Registry of Deeds. (CJP Holdings LLC)
2. The property is located in the General Purpose District and according to the Assessor contains 21.53 acres. The survey plan dated 11/5/2009, drafted by Stephen Stearns LPE#4437, showed the acreage to be 21.97.
3. The applicants are before the Planning Board for a mineral extraction permit for three years for an internally drained gravel pit.
4. Provided to the Planning Board in 2009/2010 & 2012, for the original approval of the gravel pit were the following required documents:
  - A copy of the letter from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission (MHPC), dated 7/27/09, which stated the project location could possibly contain one or more prehistoric archaeological sites so an archaeological survey was required prior to any ground disturbance.
  - A copy of the Prehistoric Archaeological Investigation Report, dated October 2009, MHPC File No. 1310-98, prepared by Tetra Tech, Inc. of Portland Maine, which concluded there were no prehistoric archaeological sites recorded within the Project area.
  - A copy of the letter from the MHPC, dated 11/16/09 which stated they reviewed the report provided by Tetra Tech Inc. and found the report acceptable as written and they agreed with the conclusions in the report.
  - A copy of the letter from the Maine Dept. of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW), dated 8/27/09, which stated the proposed location likely supported one or more endangered species. MDIFW offered three options for the development of the property. Note: *Hissong chose the third option which required the western side of the stream be put into a permanent conservation easement or deed restriction, and that the area to be mined be allowed to revert back to a Pitch Pine Scrub Oak community once the mining project is completed. Furthermore, upon completion of the mining the entire parcel would be subject to the same conservation easement/deed restrictions above, the terms of which need to be reviewed and approved by MDIFW.*
  - A copy of the Declaration of Restrictions drafted to satisfy MDIFW’s development plan option three of the above letter. Note: The Declaration of Restrictions was approved by MDIFW & the Planning Board.
  - A copy of the approval for the mineral extraction plan by the Maine Dept. of Environmental Protection and a copy of the placard to be placed on site, issued 12/29/09, Permit No. L-724.
  - A copy of the Driveway/Entrance Permit by the Maine Dept. of Transportation, dated 11/30/09.
  - The Survey / Reclamation Plan, dated 1/13/2010, drafted by Stephen Stearns, PE #4437, of Pinkham & Greer, located in Springvale, Maine. The survey plan included in addition to the reclamation plan the following: The calculated net gravel pit volume of 343,200 cubic yards; hours of operation; location of

access road and refueling pad; wetland area; setbacks to gravel pit from high water mark, roadway and side lots lines; site distance on Route 11; size of borrow pit (approx. 7.7 acres); plans for dust control and disposition of stumps, brush and boulders; the soils legend; and noted was the requirement to restrict truck travel past the Shapleigh Memorial School during school hours of pick-up and drop-off of the children.

- The Survey / Reclamation Plan amended by MDIFW, dated June 7, 2010, signed by Stephen Stearns, PE #4437, of Pinkham & Greer. The plan satisfies the requirements imposed by MDIFW as stated in the email from Judy Camuso, Wildlife Biologist, MDIFW, dated April 27, 2010 forwarded to the Planning Board on June 7, 2010. (This action satisfied condition #4 of the original conditional use permit approval letter dated 1/15/2010.)

5. Provided along with the *renewal application* were the following:

- Provided with the renewal application, was an email dated March 7, 2024, between Chris Pizey, Hissong Ready Mix and Aggregates and Erich Kluck, MDEP – Gravel Pits. Chris Pizey requested an estimated cost of reclamation for gravel pits. Erich Kluck stated that the DEP is using \$4,500 per acre.
- Provided with the renewal application, was a copy of the revised Reclamation Plan\* for Hissong Ready-Mix & Aggregates, LLC, drafted by Brian D. Pierce, PE #9609 of Sevee & Maher Engineers of Cumberland, Maine, dated 3/2021. Boundary & Topographic information was provided by Corner Post Land Surveying, Inc., of Springvale, Maine. *There were no changes from the plan that was presented 3 years ago.*

\*Information provided on the *Reclamation Plan*:

- Hours of Operation: 7 am to 10 pm, Monday thru Friday; 7 am to 5 pm Saturday; No Sunday or major holiday operation
- Disposition of stumps, brush and boulders: Stumps will be disposed of on site by temporarily stockpiling them to decompose naturally, burial on site in areas designated, or ground with grindings used for slope stabilization and erosion control. Brush chipped or burned. Boulders buried on site or hauled offsite for processing.
- Dust shall be controlled by watering on an as-needed basis.
- Within 75' of the edge of pavement of Route 11, grade of access road shall not exceed 3%.
- Reclamation: The total area of the borrow pit is 7.7± acres. Within 12 months following the completion of extraction operations, which operations shall be deemed complete when less than 100 cubic yards of minerals are removed in a consecutive twelve month period, ground levels and grades shall be established in accordance with this plan and the reclamation section of this sheet.
- There shall be no traveling past the Shapleigh Memorial School at the time of children drop-off in the morning or pick-up times.
- Site distance determination November 18, 2009: Looking left, Northwesterly, 772+ feet; Looking right, Southwesterly, 571 feet.
- *Reclamation Plan Notes*:
  1. Grade site to limits shown on plan.
  2. All debris, stumps and similar material shall be buried on site. Only materials generated on-site may be buried or covered on site.
  3. Slopes shall be graded at slopes on 2.5 horizontal to 1 vertical or flatter.
  7. The top layer of soil is mainly comprised of the organic soil horizon and shall be retained to cover disturbed land areas to the greatest extent possible. Add mulch to disturbed areas in accordance with MEDEP Reclamation Best Management Practices.
  8. If within 1 year after complete reclamation:
    - c. Native vegetative cover has re-established over 90% of the reclaimed buffer area, no further plantings are recommended, as natural succession is allowed to take place.
    - d. Native vegetative cover has not re-established at least 90% of the reclaimed buffer area, plant with native herbaceous seed mix adapted to dry soils for the purpose of soil stabilization. Replant as necessary to achieve at least 90% vegetative cover.
  9. Remove the access road when no longer in use and reclaim in accordance with reclamation note 5(a). Remove bar gate and place 6-10 large boulders not less than 3 feet in smallest dimension, maintaining a minimum 2 feet clearance between boulders, across the reclaimed area and at least 5 feet inside the property line.

- The plan also depicted the lot area as 21.97 acres. An unnamed stream was shown, the location of the wetland interface and stream centerline as delineated by Joe Noel. A restricted buffer area was noted, the reclaimed buffer area and temporary stump stockpile area of 1 acre maximum. The location of the access road was on the plan, State Route 11, Square Pond Road and Great Hollow Road. Elevations for the entire site were noted, along with the elevation of the reclaimed buffer area. A cross section of the ‘Reclamation Section’ which depicts the grade and depth of soil, and organic soil horizon; and a Silt Fence depiction with a note stating, ‘Contractor’s option to use sediment barrier or silt fence for slope protection’.
- Gravel Pit Volume: Total Volume - 349,300 CY;  
                                           Less Topsoil  
                                           & Grubbing - 6,200 CY;  
                                           NET Volume - 343,200 CY

6. Provided on April 13, 2021 was the following information:

- Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MEDEP) Guide to the Performance Standards for Excavations and Quarries.
- Updated Reclamation Plan and revised “Declaration of Restrictions” to reflect current MEDEP requirements for gravel pit reclamation, Declaration dated April 5, 2021.
- Access to the gravel pit will be from Route 11. There will be no truck traffic on Great Hollow Road. Access to and from the site will be consistent with the facility’s MDOT Driveway/Entrance Permit. Sand and gravel from this pit will be used exclusively by Hissong and will be hauled to other facilities in Lyman, Kennebunkport, and Eliot, for processing.
- The MDOT entranceway to the gravel pit will include a stone entrance pad in accordance with MEDEP Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction activities.
- Pit operations will be in accordance with MEDEP Site Law Noise Standards:  
                                           55 dBA between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM  
                                           45 dBA between 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM  
                                           No Sunday or Holiday Operation
- Hours of operation:  
                                           7:00 AM and 7:00 PM Monday through Friday  
                                           7:00 AM and 5:00 PM Saturday
- Screening of aggregate may be performed within the limits of the gravel, as conditions warrant, but there will be no rock crushing performed on site; and
- There will be no permanent structures associated with the gravel pit operations. Temporary structures may include a porta-potty and Conex box for tools and equipment.

7. The application, plan and supporting documentation met the criteria in Article V. Basic Performance Standards.

8. §105-61. Mineral exploration and extraction, processing, and removal, including sand and gravel was reviewed in its entirety and the application, plan and supporting documentation provided, met the performance standards in the ordinance with conditions. The following optional conditions of permit were applied:

- (1) Methods of removal or processing. ***Per the plan and documentation provided; there shall be no rock crushing on site, gravel screening only.***
- (2) Days and hours of operation. ***Hours of operation are 7:00 a.m. thru 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, 7 a.m. thru 5:00 p.m. on Saturday. No Sunday or Holiday operations. In addition, there are restricted hours of transport noted on the plan Note #17 regarding school drop-off and pick-up times so as not to interfere with bus traffic, parents dropping off children and overall safety of the children.***
- (3) Type and location of temporary structures. ***Temporary structures may include a porta-potty and Conex box for tools and equipment, placed so as not to be seen from Rte. 11 or neighboring properties.***
- (4) Routes for transporting material. ***State Route 11 to Route 109. No trucks shall use Great Hollow Road per the applicant; Goose Pond Road per the agreement between Chris Pizey and the Planning Board due to the weight limit on the bridge, narrow road width in area, as well as pedestrians using the road, or Back Road which is currently posted for large trucks.***



- (5) Area and depth of excavations. *This information is provided on Reclamation Plan, C-101 and approved by the Planning Board.*
- (6) Provision of temporary or permanent drainage. *None is needed for the borrow pit, it is created per the plan to be internally draining and the stream is being protected per the plan provided which was approved by MDIFW.*
- (7) Cleaning, repair and/or resurfacing of streets used in removal activities which have been adversely affected by said activity. *The applicant shall make certain Route 11 is clear of all sand and stone dust to prevent a hazardous condition, it shall be done in part by using a stone apron in accordance with MDEP Best Management Practices. Repair & resurfacing of Route 11 will be a matter between the applicant and the State of Maine, as this is a State road.*
- (8) The need for written approval of soil and erosion and sedimentation plan by a State of Maine licensed civil engineer selected by the applicant for the Planning Board. *A State of Maine licensed engineer provided the plan; Brian D. Pierce, LPE #9609 of Sevee & Maher Engineers, Plan C-101, entitled 'Reclamation Plan – Hissong Ready-Mix & Aggregates, LLC, 48 York St., Suite 2, Kennebunk, ME 04043 – Great Hollow Sand & Gravel, Shapleigh, ME – Tax Map 7, Lot 28', dated 3/2021.*

D. Surety and terms of permit.

- 1) No permit shall be issued without a surety bond or other equivalent security to ensure compliance with such conditions as the Planning Board may impose. The bond or surety shall be in an amount recommended by the Code Enforcement Officer and approved by the Planning Board, as sufficient to guarantee conformity with the conditions of approval, taking inflation into account. **The bond shall be based on the 7.7 acres, in the amount of \$34,650, established on the amount suggested by the MDEP of \$4,500 per acre.**

9. §105-73.G 'Standards applicable to conditional uses was reviewed in its entirety, the application, plan and supporting documentation provided met the performance standards in the ordinance with conditions. Standards are as follows:

- 1) The use will not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, birds or other wildlife habitat. *It will not per the Reclamation Plan provided and by following Option 3 as written in the letter from MDIFW, dated 8/27/09, and as written in the Declaration of Restrictions (Restricted Buffer Area and Reclaimed Area, No Disturbance) dated April 5, 2021.*
- 2) The use will conserve shore cover and visual, as well as actual, access to water bodies. *N/A*
- 3) The use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. *It is, the Comprehensive Plan encourages businesses along Rte. 11.*
- 4) Traffic access to the site is safe. *The entrance to this location has been approved by the MDOT, permit #9703, dated 11/30/09, and site distances are met in both directions, therefore it is safe.*
- 5) The site design is in conformance with all municipal flood hazard protection regulations. *It is, the site is not in a flood zone recognized on the Flood Hazard Maps for Shapleigh.*
- 6) Adequate provision for the disposal of all wastewater and solid waste has been made. *There is no wastewater being produced, all rocks and tree stumps shall be kept on site. Stumps may be ground up to be converted to mulch either on site or at applicant's Lyman facility.*
- 7) Adequate provision for the transportation, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials has been made. *N/A - There shall be no hazardous materials stored on site.*
- 8) A stormwater drainage system capable of handling twenty-five-year storm without adverse impact on adjacent properties has been designed. *A State of Maine licensed engineer provided the plan; Brian D. Pierce, LPE #9609 of Sevee & Maher Engineers, Plan C-101, entitled 'Reclamation Plan – Hissong Ready-Mix & Aggregates, LLC, 48 York St., Suite 2, Kennebunk, ME 04043 – Great Hollow Sand & Gravel, Shapleigh, ME – Tax Map 7, Lot 28', dated 3/2021. All stormwater will drain into the borrow pit.*
- 9) Adequate provisions to control soil erosion and sedimentation have been made. *A State of Maine licensed engineer provided the plan; Brian D. Pierce, LPE #9609 of Sevee & Maher Engineers, Plan C-101, entitled 'Reclamation Plan – Hissong Ready-Mix & Aggregates, LLC, 48 York St., Suite 2, Kennebunk, ME 04043 – Great Hollow Sand & Gravel, Shapleigh, ME – Tax Map 7, Lot 28', dated*

*3/2021. Erosion control measures are noted on the plan and MDEP Best Management Practices for borrow pits shall be followed.*

- 10) There is adequate water supply to meet the demands of the proposed use and for fire protection purposes. *There are provisions to access water not far from this location but there should not be any need for fire protection based on the operations on site.*
- 11) The provisions for buffer strips and on-site landscaping provide adequate protection to neighboring properties from detrimental features of the development, such as noise, glare, fumes, dust, odors and the like. *The existing vegetation shall be kept in place within 100 feet of all property lines; there is no noise allowed between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. seven days a week; there shall be no glare, fumes, or odors created by this business. Any stone dust or gravel on Rte. 11 shall be removed by the applicant to prevent a hazardous condition.*
- 12) All performance standards in this chapter applicable to the proposed use will be met. *They shall with the conditions imposed.*

10. A notice was mailed to all abutters within 500 feet of the property, on March 27, 2024, and a Public Hearing was held on Tuesday, April 9, 2024. Meetings were held on Tuesday, March 26, 2024 and Tuesday, April 9, 2024.

11. The Planning Board unanimously agreed to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a gravel extraction operation for private use only on Map 7, Lot 28, per the plans, the Town and State approvals provided, and as discussed, with seven conditions.

12. **The conditions of the permit are as follows:**

- 1) **The gravel operation shall be conducted per the plan provided dated 3/2021, as well as the Declaration of Restrictions dated April 5, 2021.**
- 2) **The hours of operation shall be 7:00 a.m. thru 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. thru 5:00 p.m. Saturday, no Sunday or Holiday operation, as written in Item 10 of the plan.**
- 3) **There shall be no trucks traveling past the Shapleigh Memorial School at the time of children drop-off in the morning or during children pickup in the afternoon throughout school season operating hours, as written in Item 17 of the plan, as agreed upon between the applicant and Shapleigh Planning Board, for the health and safety of the children. (Drop-off and pick-up times shall be coordinated with Shapleigh Memorial School)**
- 4) **It is the applicant’s responsibility to make certain the entrance onto State Rte. 11 is clear of all sand and stone dust to prevent a hazardous situation. Entrance to be designed per MDEP Best Management Practices for construction activities.**
- 5) **There shall be no trucks traveling on Great Hollow Road, Goose Pond Road and Back Road, per Optional Condition 4 – Routes for transporting material.**
- 6) **A security bond or equivalent security to guaranty the reclamation plan required by the Town of Shapleigh and MDIFW is carried out. The surety bond must be submitted within 45 days of approval. The bond shall be based on the 7.7 acres, in the amount of \$34,650, established by the amount suggested by the MDEP of \$4,500 per acre. The bond shall be rendered within 90 days from the date of bond approval, or the application shall be null and void. There shall be no earth moving on site until an approved bond has been received.**
- 7) **This permit is valid until May 1, 2027. If the operation goes beyond this date, the applicant must come back before the Board for another 3 year renewal.**

**Decision:**

**The Conditional Use Permit for a gravel extraction operation, for private use only, on Map 7, Lot 28, per the plans provided, Town and State approvals, and as discussed, with the stated seven conditions, valid until May 1, 2027, was approved.**

-----

**Conditional Use Permit – Municipal Multi-use Building – 50’ x 70’ – Map 5, Lot 28A (Back Road) – Town of Shapleigh, Applicant & Property Owner**

Selectman Scott Cudworth and Selectman Thomas Small were in attendance, along with Town Administrator Michelle Rumney, for the review of the application. Jo-Ann Cavanaugh of J.C. Cavanaugh Architecture LLC, was also present for the review, as she did the Site Plan and designed the Community Center.

Provided along with the application, was a copy of the Subsurface Wastewater Disposal System Application, drafted by Kenneth Gardner, SE #73, dated 12/9/2022 for a Community Center for up to 130 people. An updated location plan was provided, drafted by Kenneth Gardner, dated 3/25/2024, using the location of the Community Building on Site Plan B.

Provided was a copy of the Construction Permit No. 29932, from the Maine State Fire Marshal’s Office, Department of Public Safety, for the Shapleigh Community Center, located on Back Road, Shapleigh Maine; Occupancy Type: Assembly Class less than 300; No Sprinkler System; No Fire Alarm System; New Building – 1 Story – Wood Frame, permit dated 1/3/2024, expiration 7/2/2024.

Provided was a copy of the Site Plan ‘A’ and ‘B’, and it was stated that Sheet S1, Site Plan ‘B’ would be the one used, due to the ledge found on site. The site plan, Titled: ‘Alternate #2 Site Plan ‘B’, New Community Center, Town of Shapleigh, Back Road, Shapleigh Maine’, was drafted by Jo-Ann Marie C. Cavanaugh, LA #1818, dated revised 3/20/2024. The plan depicts the proposed 50’ x 70’ Community Center; Existing Parking Spaces, showing a total of 29 spaces and travel lane; the Proposed Parking area(s), depicting a total of 21 parking spaces, which includes 2 handicap spaces; sidewalks 5 feet in width from the proposed community center to the parking areas; Erosion Control; Proposed Septic Location and Alternate Septic Location, Design to be adjusted for new location; Proposed location(s) of the HVAC Compressor on Conc. Slab w/Bollards, Generator on Conc. Slab w/Bollards, and Propane Tank; signage; shrubs; and Drainage/Possible Stream. The plan depicted the ‘Typical Sidewalk Section’; ‘Typical Pavement Detail’; ‘Steel Bollard Detail’; ‘Typical Trench Detail’; and the ‘Deciduous & Evergreen Shrub’ planting details. Additionally, there are notations on the plan for: Sitework; Location Map; Erosion Control General Notes; Permanent Erosion Control Measures; Construction Sequence; Inspections and Final Acceptance; Long Term Maintenance; types of grass seed to be used and mulch. Also depicted on the plan was the adjacent lot owned by the Town of Shapleigh, with the Town Hall and existing parking area for the Town Hall depicted, and the location of the well. Abutter(s) Thomas E. & Patricia E. Clement, Map 5, Lot 28, were noted on the plan, as they are directly adjacent to the Lot 28A and closest to the project area.

Plan Notes for the Site Plan B are as follows:

- 1) Existing gravel parking area and proposed new parking area and sidewalks to be paved per current MDOT standard specifications, Alternate No. 4.
- 2) New septic tank and field per design by Kenneth Gardner for the Town of Shapleigh for new Community Center.
- 3) Provide water service to new Community Center by connecting to existing well. Provide new pump and pump controls for new Community Center. Replace existing pump servicing the existing Town Hall.
- 4) Coordinate with Center Maine Power on connection of new electrical service to pole for the Community Center.
- 5) Ledge is present on the site within the proposed building area. Excavate and remove rock by either mechanical or explosive methods as needed for the building site. Conform to applicable code for explosive disintegration of rock and to NFPA 495 for handling explosive material and obtain all necessary permits.

Provided was a copy Sheet A1, Titled: ‘Code Review, First Floor Plan, Finish Sched., Wall Types’, drafted by Jo-Ann Marie C. Cavanaugh, LA #1818, dated revised 1/5/2024. The plan depicts the Floor Plan. The Floor Plan depicts 2 Vestibule(s); Foyer; Function Hall for up to 279 Occupants Max; Kitchen; Storage; Janitor closet; Fire Proof Storage; Mechanical Room; Shower; Woman & Men’s Bathroom; & Family Bathroom. Materials to be used in the construction, along with the ‘Code Review’ were noted on the plan.

Provided was a copy of Sheet A2, Titled: ‘Front, Left & Rear Elevations’, drafted by Jo-Ann Marie C. Cavanaugh, LA #1818, dated 1/2/2024. The plan depicts the Left Side Elevation; Front Elevation; and Rear Elevation, showing the design for each side of the building.

Provided was a copy of Sheet A2.1, Titled: ‘Right Elevation, Window Schedule, Kit/Bath Int. Elevs.’, drafted by Jo-Ann Marie C. Cavanaugh, LA #1818, dated revised 1/2/2024. The plan depicts the Right Side Elevation; along with details for the kitchen, baths, windows and signage. Plans Notes are as follows: 1) All plumbing fixtures must be mounted according to ANSUI 101. Handicapped code requirements. 2) See specification for bathroom accessories. 3) All GYP, BD in bathrooms to be moisture resistant. 4) Accessory heights as follows: Sink – Top of rim at 33” AFF; Toilet Grab Bars – Top of bars 33” to 36” AFF. All grab bars and towel bars shall be able to support 250 lbs. for 5 minutes. Flush control located on open side of toilet. Bottom of mirror reflective surface at 40” AFF. Toilet paper dispenser 22” AFF, 7” to 9” in front of toilet. All switches between 36” and 54” AFF. 5) FRP = Fiberglass reinforced plastic panels, 4’ x 8’. Accessories: Mirror, Toilet Paper Dispenser, Coat Hook, 42” Grab Bar, 36” Grab Bar, Paper Towel Dispenser, and Soap Dispenser.

Provided was a copy of Sheet A3, Titled: ‘Sections A & B, General Notes’, drafted by Jo-Ann Marie C. Cavanaugh, LA #1818, dated revised 3/20/2024. The plan depicts Building Section A; Building Section B; Eave Detail; Vestibule Section C; and Window Details. Specification are noted on the plan for the construction of each section, and General Notes pertain to the Air Seal of all joints, window and door jams, framing, showers & tubes, sills, cracks and crevices, etc. Also, Typical Flashing for Window Installation is noted.

Provided was a copy of Sheet A4, Titled: ‘Foundation Plan, Fndn Details, Fndn Notes’, drafted by Jo-Ann Marie C. Cavanaugh, LA #1818, dated revised 3/20/2024. The plan depicts the Foundation Plan. Foundation Notes: 1) Foundation shall be 3000 psi concrete, 6% air entrainment. All concrete work shall conform to Building Code requirements for structural concrete by American Concrete Institute. 2) All concrete reinforcing to be Grade 60 New Deformed Bars, 6x6, 10x10 WWM is strongly suggested in all slabs. 3) Structural fill within 8 inches of floor slabs and adjacent to foundations should be clean granular material. Compact fill to 95% of maximum dry density. 4) Minimum 4’ Frost Cover with Reinforcement as shown on drawings. All footings shall bear on undisturbed soil. 5) Anchor bolts shall be ½” x 12”, A307 Steel, spaced 6’ O.C. and within 1’ of corners. 6) If ledge is encountered in building area, remove loose material to provide a sound and unshattered base for foundation. The Foundation Detail was depicted on the plan as well.

Provided was a copy of Sheet A5, Titled: ‘Roof Framing Plan Structural Notes’, drafted by Jo-Ann Marie C. Cavanaugh, LA #1818, dated 1/2/2024. The plan depicts the Roof Framing Plan, and Operable Partition Detail ‘A’;. There are Structure Notes on the plan for General Framing, Carpentry Framing, Lumber Material, Blocking, Plywood Provision, Rafter Tie Downs, Engineered Wood, and Ground Snow Load = 80 PSF.

Provided was a copy of Sheet A6, Titled: ‘Electrical Layout, Reflected Ceiling Plan’, drafted by Jo-Ann Marie C. Cavanaugh, LA #1818, dated revised 3/18/2024. The plan depicts the Electrical/Plumbing Plan;

Reflected Ceiling Plan; Fixture Schedule; and Plumbing Fixture Schedule. General Notes are included for Load Balance; Switches; Minimum Wire Size; Homeruns to Panel; Outlets or Junction Boxes; Fire Rated Backer & Sealant Requirement(s); all general electrical fixture locations, and bathroom requirements.

The application detailed description is as follows: *Municipal multi-use building, 3,500 sf, stick built, 50' x 70'. Function/Meeting Hall, Storm Shelter, Elections.*

Steve F. stated that the next application was for the Town of Shapleigh, for a municipal building, and he asked who would like to speak about the project. Selectman Cudworth stated that they brought their architect to the meeting, JoAnne Cavanaugh, and she would address the board.

Mrs. Cavanaugh stated that the Town wants to build a Community Center, on the adjacent property to the Town Hall. She stated the facility originally was able to hold 125 people, but she was able to get, with tables and chairs, just under 300 people in the building. She noted that greater than 300 people would require a sprinkler system. She said there would be a kitchen, so there could be events in the building, and they want to be able to use the building as a warming center, if power is lost in the town; people will be able to come and get warm meals, use the bathroom and take a shower. She stated that a generator is proposed, and meetings could be held at the facility.

Steve F. stated that the original plan that was presented to the board was different than the current plan. Mrs. Cavanaugh stated that was correct. Steve stated that the board is to look at Site Plan 'B', and he wanted to be sure this was correct. Mrs. Cavanaugh stated that was correct, because after the property was cleared, they saw the amount of ledge on site, so they moved the building to make it more feasible. Selectman Cudworth stated that if they kept it in the original location, the blasting for the ledge was going to be \$150,000; so they tried to move the structure away from the ledge.

Steve F. stated that the Town is before the board because under Zoning Ordinance §105-17, it states that any municipal building in the General Purpose District requires a Conditional Use Permit. He said this is the first review of the application, so the board will review the application and the next time there will be a public hearing so people can come ask questions and speak on it.

**Steve F. began the review of the Zoning Ordinance as it pertained to the application as follows:**

- 105-20** – Applicability of standards; prohibited uses. *Steve read part of this section. Section B did not apply as there will be no obnoxious injurious odors, dust, smoke, refuse matter, fumes, noise, vibration or waste material or be dangerous to the health and safety of the community.*
- 105-21** – Traffic. *Steve stated this applied, access to the site was safe, this location has an existing curb cut that was previously approved on the original CUP for the gravel parking area, so this has already been taken care of. Site distances can be met in both directions. There is no change to the existing entrance or exit for this new building from what was approved.*
- 105-22** – Noise. *Steve stated this talks about excessive noise at unreasonable hours. Steve asked if there would be anything at this building that would be noisy? Selectman Cudworth stated it would not be noisy.*
- 105-23** – Dust, fumes, vapors and gases. *Steve asked if they would pave the existing parking lot at the same time as the new parking area? Mrs. Cavanaugh stated that is what they intended to do. Steve said his only thought was a gravel parking area could produce dust.*

Dust, fumes, vapors and gases. *There is no dust, fumes, vapors or gases, generated by this activity.*

- 105-24** – Odors. *Steve stated that there can be no harmful or offensive odors beyond the lot lines.*

- 105-25 – Glare. *Steve F. stated that part of this has already been addressed because the existing parking area has been approved by the Planning Board. (Lighting was approved to be on the pole in the parking lot, shooting toward the parking lot, away from the road.)*
- 105-26 – Stormwater runoff. **Steve F. asked if there had already been a stormwater runoff study done? Mrs. Cavanaugh stated they had not done a study.** Steve read from the ordinance as follows: *Surface water runoff shall be minimized and shall be detained on-site if possible and practicable. If it is not possible to detain water on-site, downstream improvements to the channel may be required of the developer to prevent flooding caused by this project. The natural state of watercourses, swales, berms, terraces, wooded areas and floodways or rights-of-way shall be maintained as nearly as possible. The design period is the 100-year storm (the largest storm which would be likely to occur during a 100-year period). Stormwater runoff control systems shall be maintained as necessary to ensure proper functioning. Steve stated this is something the board will look at, and he noted there were some wetlands on the property. Tom C. stated the water on site was seasonal. Steve said they will discuss this further. (During the original review in 2023, the Select Board were asked for a stormwater plan, due the size of the structure and existing amount of water on site.)*
- 105-27 – Erosion control. *Steve stated erosion of soil and sedimentation shall be minimized on the lot, using best management practices.*
- 105-28 – Setbacks and screening. *Steve said this speaks to any exposed storage areas, exposed machinery installations, sand and gravel extraction operations, which are not applicable. He read that all such plantings shall be maintained as an effective visual screen; plants which die shall be replaced within one growing season. He said they could talk about this again, and asked if there were any shrubs being planted? Mrs. Cavanaugh stated there were a couple of shrubs shown on the plan in the front of the building. She said the rest of the area will be grass. She said they were concerned about the cost, so any other vegetation would be in the future.*
- 105-29 – Explosive materials. *Steve asked if they would be storing any explosive materials on site? He asked if there would be propane on site? Mrs. Cavanaugh stated there would be a propane tank on site for the generator. Steve said that was not an issue, they just would have to comply with NFPA 58, Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code, and that was up to the gas company. Steve read from the ordinance as follows: All other highly flammable or explosive liquids, solids or gases shall be stored in bulk above ground, unless they are located in anchored tanks at least 75 feet from any lot line, Town way or interior roadway, or 40 feet from a lot line for underground tanks.*
- 105-30 – Water quality. *There is no waste or hazardous material generated by this activity and no outdoor storage of fuel or chemicals to affect water quality. There will be a new well on site.*
- 105-31 – Preservation of landscape; landscaping of parking and storage areas
- 105-32 - Relation of proposed building to the environment.
- 105-33 – Refuse disposal. *Steve asked if there would be a dumpster on site? Town Administrator Rumney stated that the trash will be taken to the mini-dumpster at the Town Hall.*
- 105-34 – Access Control to Route 109 and 11. N/A
- 105-43 – Off-street parking and loading. *Steve stated this speaks about the parking area. He asked which schedule they used to calculate the parking lot? Mrs. Cavanaugh stated they used 1 parking space for every 4 people. Steve stated that the ordinance calls for one space for each three seats (Section B(1)(g)). Steve reviewed Sections B(1) (a) thru (h), and it was agreed (g) applied which read as follows: One space for each three seats, permanent or otherwise, for patron use for restaurants and other places serving food or beverage and for theaters, auditoriums and other places of amusement or assembly. Steve said that is what the board felt was applicable. Steve stated that landscaping is brought up again in this section of the ordinance under D. Landscaping. He read it as follows: Required parking and loading spaces*

*for residential uses, where not enclosed within a building, may need to be effectively screened from view by a continuous landscaped area not less than eight feet in width containing evergreen shrubs, trees, fences, walls, berms, or any combination thereof forming a visual barrier not less than six feet in height along exterior lot lines adjoining all residential properties, except that driveways shall be kept open to provide visibility for vehicles entering and leaving.*

**105-46** – Sanitary provisions. *Steve said there is a septic design from Ken Gardner provided.*

**Steve then reviewed §105-73.G ‘Standards applicable to conditional uses’ as follows:**

- 1) The use will not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, birds or other wildlife habitat.
- 2) The use will conserve shore cover and visual, as well as actual, access to water bodies.
- 3) The use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- 4) Traffic access to the site is safe.
- 5) The site design is in conformance with all municipal flood hazard protection regulations.
- 6) Adequate provision for the disposal of all wastewater and solid waste has been made.
- 7) Adequate provision for the transportation, storage and disposal of any hazardous materials has been made.
- 8) A stormwater drainage system capable of handling a fifty-year storm without adverse impact on adjacent properties has been designed. *Steve noted there was a conflict where there was the 100 year storm under §105-26 and 50 year here.*
- 9) Adequate provisions to control soil erosion and sedimentation have been made.
- 10) There is adequate water supply to meet the demands of the proposed use and for fire protection purposes.
- 11) The provisions for buffer strips and on-site landscaping provide adequate protection to neighboring properties from detrimental features of the development, such as noise, glare, fumes, dust, odors and the like.
- 12) All performance standards in this chapter applicable to the proposed use will be met.

Steve F. believed the board had the majority of what they needed. He said his only questions were regarding landscaping and stormwater drainage. Ann H. also asked if there were enough parking spots? Steve said some of them were shown, and they could delineate the rest as required.

**Steve F. stated a notice to abutters will be mailed and a Public Hearing will be held prior to the next meeting on Tuesday, April 23rd at 6:30 pm.**

Ann H. asked if the board wants them to have the stormwater plan, showing where the runoff will go by the next meeting? Steve said the question is does the board want 50 year or 100 year? Steve chose to go with the 50 year stormwater management plan. He said there also needs to be a landscaping plan showing some screening for neighboring properties. Mrs. Cavanaugh thought they were going to depend on what is currently there. Steve said if there is adequate screening, just put it on the plan. Ann said it would be a good idea to be sure there were no trees blocking the vision of someone pulling out.

Steve F. asked CEO Demers if he had anything to add? CEO Demers said he was going to mention, that the vegetative buffer was already in place, with a good chunk of woods in place already. He thought the vegetation plan should focus on what is not getting paved and what kind of vegetation is there, and what will go in as far as grasses and bushes. He said he agreed the direction of where the runoff is going should be shown.

Steve F. said both the Road Commissioner and Fire Chief were present, he asked if they had any comments? Road Commissioner Darren Rogers stated that this would be Jeff Goodwin’s end of town. He said he believed there was an adequate culvert that goes across by Tom Clements house. Tom agreed. Steve said they are looking at this because a fair amount of impervious surface is going to be created, so we do not want to create a future problem.

Steve F. asked the Fire Chief if he wanted to comment. Fire Chief Steve Guillemette stated that he realized they are not going to have a sprinkler system, but as long as they will have the appropriate fire alarm system and a Knox box on the building, he would be fine with the plan. Norman B. asked the Fire Chief if he saw the Fire Marshal’s permit, where it states ‘No Fire Alarm System’? Chief Guillemette stated he did not see it. Mrs. Cavanaugh stated that it is not required, but there will be an alarm system. Fire Chief Guillemette stated that if they are going to have cooking inside the building, they should have some type of an alarm system. Mrs. Cavanaugh stated the building was not always occupied, but they wanted to be safe. CEO Demers made note of the hydrants located at the Commons.

Steve F. asked if there were any other comments. There were none.

Nothing further was discussed.

**Proposed Private Way – Map 11, Lot 23 (Newfield Road) – Joe Stanley, LinePro Land Surveying, Applicant; Bruce Wakita, Property Owner**

Mr. Stanley and Bruce & Penny Wakita were present to review the application.

Provided along with the application, was a Letter of Authorization that stated Bruce & Penny Wakita grants permission to Joe Stanley of LinePro Land Surveying to act as their agent in all aspects in order to obtain any and all permitting necessary from the Town of Shapleigh for their property located at 522 Newfield Road, Map 11, Lot 23, letter dated 3/15/2024.

Provided was a SAMPLE Road & Drainage Maintenance Agreement.

Provided was the Maine Department of Transportation, Driveway/Entrance Permit for Bruce & Penny Wakita, Permit Number 39226 – Entrance ID: 1, dated March 27, 2024. The approved width is 22 feet, located 1459 feet East from Granny Kent Pond Road; GP S Coordinates: 43.614808N, -70.829142W, for a multi-family 5 or less. Also provided was a copy of the State of Maine, Department of Transportation, Entrance / Driveway Details.

Provided was a plan entitled, ‘Plan Showing a Proposed Private Way Made for Bruce Wakita, 486 Newfield Road, Shapleigh, Maine 04076 of Property Located on Newfield Road in Shapleigh, Maine’ drafted by Joseph L. Stanley, PLS #2453, dated April 2, 2024. The plan depicts the location of Newfield Road; the Proposed Private Way to Access 2 New Family Lots & Grantor’s Remaining Land; Proposed Lot A, containing 2.04± Acres; Proposed Lot B, containing 2.22± Acres; and the Proposed Remaining Land of Bruce & Penny Wakita, Tax Map 11, Lot 23. Abutting properties were on the plan, those being Joshua Givens & Autumn Hackett, Tax Map 12, Lot 41; Quality Properties, Tax Map 12, Lot 40; James & Pauline Gorman, Tax Map 11, Lot 23K; Wakita Living Trust, Tax Map 11, Lot 23P; Catrina, Joshua, James & Brianna Merrill, Tax Map 11, Lot 23M; Eric & Logan Colburn, Tax Map 11, Lot 23-9; and Thom Lakin, Tax Map 12, Lot 34B. A Road & Ditch Section was on the plan, along with a Sample of Typical Ditch Turnout & Level Spreader. Notes included: 1) Deed References; 2) Plan References; 3) Basis of Bearings; 4) Underground Utilities; 5) Road Records – Newfield Rd; 6) Zoning Information – General Purpose; 7) Private Way Note: *The proposed Private Way shown hereon is to remain a private*



*road, and will be subject to a Road Maintenance Agreement. The Town of Shapleigh will not be responsible for the maintenance, repair, plowing or similar services for the private way, as shown hereon, and further lot divisions utilizing the private way is prohibited without prior approval of the Shapleigh Planning Board.; and 8) Subdivision Definition. The Site Map, not to scale, was on the plan as well.*

The application detailed description is as follows: *Construction of a new private way.*

Steve F. said the next item is for a Private Way, Joe Stanley is presenting Bruce Wakita, Map 11, Lot 23.

Mr. Stanley provided a large version of the plan, so it would be easier for everyone to view. Mr. Stanley introduced himself and stated he was representing the Wakita family. He said they were doing a small project off of Newfield Road. He said the property is a large forested piece, sitting behind where the Wakita Electric shop is located and behind where once was a store that is now closed.

Mr. Stanley stated they were proposing a Private Way for a family division. He said the Wakita's are creating two lots for their children at the end of the proposed private way. He said this will be a standard private way, 50 foot right-of-way, and it will have a 16 foot travel width, with ditches along the edge as needed. He said they recently received an entrance permit from the MDOT that is required for the entrance. He provided a copy for the board. He believed it is straight forward, the lots are just over 2 acres in size.

Steve F. asked if there was a brook that crossed the road? Mr. Stanley showed the board where the brook was located and it did not impact this project. Ann H. asked about a turn-around for emergency vehicles. Mr. Stanley stated that what she was speaking about was not required, but there was a level of slope that is required going from the new road toward the main road. He said they have to create a dip in the new road, so the water coming off of the private way gets trapped in a low area, before the rise to the main road. Road Commissioner Rogers stated there was a culvert in that area that should handle any water going toward the road.

**Steve F. reviewed 105-60.1 Private Ways as follows:**

The Planning Board shall approve the use of a fifty (50) foot wide private right-of-way to provide frontage and access to individual lots of land in accordance with the following provisions:

- A. A plan showing the private way shall be prepared by a registered land surveyor or licensed engineer. The plan shall be labeled "Plan of Private Way" and shall provide an approval block for the signatures of the Planning Board members. The plan shall delineate the proposed way and each of the lots to be served by the private way. *Steve stated this is met.*
- B. A street plan, cross section, and drainage plan shall be submitted for each private way. *Mr. Stanley said details are on the plan.*
- C. The plan shall bear notes that the Town of Shapleigh will not be responsible for the maintenance, repair, or plowing of the private way and that further lot divisions utilizing the private way are prohibited without prior approval of the Shapleigh Planning Board. *Mr. Stanley stated it was on the plan as Note 7.*
- D. If the private way is to provide access to two (2) or more lots, a maintenance agreement shall be required by the Planning Board and recorded in the York County Registry of Deeds. The maintenance agreement shall specify the rights and responsibilities of each lot owner with respect to the maintenance, repair and plowing of the private way. *Steve said a sample maintenance agreement was provided. He asked Mr. Wakita if this is what they would use. Mr. Wakita said, yes.*

- E. The construction of private ways shall meet the following minimum standards:  
*Steve stated this would be for 2 lots, and the entire road is 16 feet, so a turnout is not required.*

|                                                    | Number of Lots Served |                  |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|                                                    | 1                     | 2 or more        |
| Minimum Roadway Width                              | 12'                   | 16'              |
| Minimum Subbase (Heavy Road Gravel – max. size 4") | 12"                   | 15"              |
| Wearing Surface (Crushed Gravel)                   | 2"                    | 2"               |
| Maximum Length of Dead End                         | 1500'                 | 1500'            |
| Maximum Grade                                      | 10%                   | 8%               |
| Minimum Grade                                      | 0.5%                  | 0.5%             |
| Turn Around at Dead End                            | Hammer Head or T      | Hammer Head or T |

- (1) One turnout to provide space for 2 vehicles to pass shall be provided for every 500 feet of private way.
  - (2) The Hammerhead or T shall have a useable surface area that is a minimum of 24 feet deep and 24 feet wide. *Mr. Stanley said what this is saying is to build out 24 feet of actual gravel, so a vehicle can turnaround. He said he did not mind adding language that reinforces this, for the next meeting.*
- F. The plan shall be recorded in the York County Registry of Deeds within ninety (90) days of the date of the Planning Board approval. If the plan is not recorded within this time period, the approval of the Planning Board shall be null and void.
- G. When the private way permit has been secured under the provisions of this chapter by vote of the Planning Board, the applicant has one year to begin the project and two years to complete the private way; otherwise, the permit becomes null and void. *Steve noted this was important and asked Mr. Wakita if it fit his time frame? Mr. Wakita stated that it did.*
- H. After a private way has been approved by the Planning Board to provide access to a lot or lots, no further lots shall be created which are to be provided access by means of the private way without the prior approval of the use of the private way for access to such lots by the Planning Board. *Steve said two lots are all that can be created, otherwise they must come back.*
- I. The applicant shall pay a Private Way Application fee of \$100, payable to the Town of Shapleigh, prior to review of the Private Way application by the Planning Board. *Steve stated he assumed the applicant has paid the fee or they would not be here.*

Steve asked if there were any further questions? There were none.

**Steve F. stated a notice to abutters will be mailed, a public hearing will be held prior to the next meeting, on Tuesday, April 23<sup>rd</sup>.**

Steve asked if anyone wanted to do a site inspection? Mr. Stanley said there was a wooden stake at the entrance. He noted there was a lot of scrub brush there, but he would walk with them if the board wants to see it. He said they would need a decent amount of time. Steve said members could go on their own if they want to.

Nothing further was discussed.

**Conditional Use Permit – Storage Building Attached to Existing Structure for Business – Map 11, Lot 23J (522 Newfield Road) – Wakita Electric / Bruce Wakita, Applicant & Property Owner**

Bruce and Penny Wakita were present for the review of the application.

Provided along with the application was a copy of the Subsurface Wastewater Disposal System Application, drafted by Kenneth Gardner, SE #73, dated 10/5/2022, for a 3 bedroom single family dwelling.

Provided was the Maine Department of Transportation, Driveway/Entrance Permit for Bruce Wakita, Permit Number 30827 – Entrance ID: 1, dated March 14, 2022. The approved width is 22 feet, located at a point 805 feet North from Pine Springs Road; GP S Coordinates: 43.613767N, -70.826482W, for a Driveway to a Home Business, Storage, Commercial/Industrial.

Provided was part of a survey plan, which depicts the location of part of Newfield Road, the existing ‘Shop Building’, 40’ x 80’ Proposed addition to the shop; and some penciled notations that state the new building is 56’ to the road, and 95’ to the side lot line. Also penciled in is the location of the leachfield and septic tank, distances were not noted on the plan from the septic location to the structure or lot lines.

The application detailed description is as follows: *Cold Storage to replace existing portable building – same footprint (3200 sq. ft.) attached to existing structure.*

Steve F. stated that the next item up was for a storage building for Bruce Wakita, and it is a modification of an existing conditional use. Steve asked CEO Demers if he had any complaints with the existing conditional use for Wakita Electric? CEO Demers stated that he did not.

Steve F. stated that Mr. Wakita is going to remove the debris from his 40’ x 80’ tent garage and build a real building.

Steve F. asked if while the board was doing a site visit for the private way, would it be ok for the board to pull in to this site and have a brief look at the area? Mr. Wakita had no issue. Steve stated this was a State road, so the entrance permit was per the State.

Steve F. stated that the edge of the building was 95 feet from the side lot line. Steve asked Mr. Wakita what was between the building location and the lot line, was it adequately screened, naturally vegetated? Mr. Wakita stated that it was a huge hill, noting that the entire area was a gravel pit at one time. He said that everything is sitting in a dip.

Mr. Wakita said that the tent was there at an angle, and they will build the new building flush with the existing building, putting it straight and it will be pushed back a little more from the road. He said that he discussed with CEO Demers, the fact it was a bit close to the road, but more than the 50 foot setback. He said putting it straight with the building, it will be pushed back further from the road to meet the setbacks to the road. Steve asked if it met the setback to the road? Mr. Wakita stated that it did, he measured it. Steve was concerned, and strongly encouraged Mr. Wakita to have a stake set at the setback, by a surveyor, to make sure he won’t build this building too close to the road. He said it would be worth spending some time and money, to have the stake set. He said if that isn’t done, and it isn’t correct, there is no fix and it gets very expensive from there. He noted that it was not 50 feet from the edge of the pavement. Mr. Wakita understood that it was from the right-of-way. Steve said if he is confident, he has no issue, but he wanted him to be certain. Mr. Wakita said they built the original building in 2002, and it was close and they are further back than that. He said he was confident it is within the setbacks, but he could do the stake. Steve said again that he would encourage it, as they have run into setback issues in the

past, and there is no fix, you go to the Zoning Board of Appeals, and since you created the problem there is no fix.

Steve F. said this is an amendment to a conditional use, because there is a substantial change in the business. He asked Mr. Wakita if his house was attached to the proposed structure? Mr. Wakita said it was. Steve asked Mr. Wakita to show that on the plan for the next meeting.

Steve F. asked the board if there was any other issue with the plan? Ann H. stated that there were no dimensions to the boundaries from what is on the plan. Mr. Wakita asked if she was speaking about the existing structures? Ann said there was something different done with the entrance. Mr. Wakita agreed, stating that the DOT moved the driveway down the road. Ann asked if there would be another driveway to get to the new structure? Mr. Wakita said, no. He said the building is going back in the general area of what was there. Ann said that she saw that the other building had collapsed. Steve asked if the DOT 2022 entrance permit was the current permit? Mr. Wakita stated that it was, and it was a better location than the previous one.

Steve F. stated that what applies to this permit is §105-73 ‘Standards applicable to conditional uses’. He stated that traffic access to the site was safe. Steve said that what might apply as well is stormwater due the change on site, and he asked Mr. Wakita if he was going to pave any additional areas? Mr. Wakita said it was already there. Steve said the board could probably accept a letter from someone stating that the water flow being created by the project stays on site. Steve said that Mr. Wakita could speak with Barbara F. or Joe Stanley to get further information.

Steve F. asked if there were any other questions or concerns? Steve said there is screening and access currently. Ann H. said the board needs to know the figure from the building to the front lot line. Steve said that any type of mortgage loan inspection plan is suggested for the front, and the measurement is from the overhang of the building, not the foundation. Ann noted that there was one person recently that was only 1 foot off and that was a disaster. Steve said it only has be an inch off.

**Steve said a public hearing will be held in 2 weeks, on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, a notice to abutters will be mailed as well. A site inspection will be done by members on their own.**

Nothing further was discussed.

**Other:**

Barbara F. asked if the board members still wanted to hold a workshop prior to the next meeting for possible zoning amendments? Steve F. stated that he had some ideas to speak about as well. Barbara said that the board members had a tentative schedule for a workshop to be held at 5:30 prior to the next meeting. Steve said it worked for him. The other members agreed they could attend.

Steve F. said he was struggling with the Comprehensive Plan, after the Zoom meeting, that he didn’t want the board members to put in a lot of effort if the townspeople were not going to accept it. CEO Demers agreed it was a lot of work. Ann H. thought the board could start with their perspective and go from there. Ann thought the townspeople don’t all understand what it is about. Steve said that at the meeting we will look at the existing zoning and any conflicts we see, such as this evening we noted there was a discrepancy between the 50 year and 100 year storm requirement for stormwater. Barbara F. said that the board also has to look at the new zoning book when it comes in, because we haven’t gotten a new one in two years and changes have been made. She felt the board needed a new one every year. The members

and CEO agreed, and noted that past changes, that are not in the current book are not always brought up. Barbara said if it is about cost, perhaps we can add it to next year's budget, to be sure members receive the books they need.

Ann H. asked when the board will speak about incomplete applications? Steve F. said it will go on the agenda for the next meeting. He said that he found a fun thing on line, for the Town of Orono, it is a flow chart, which could be helpful for board members and the applicant. He said when someone walks into CEO Demers office, he could arm them with as much information as the board has, a flow chart could be created as a good aid in that process. He thought that items that the board sees all the time, could have a flow chart for the process. Norman B. asked about what the process was now? Steve stated it was verbal between the applicant and the CEO or Barbara. CEO Demers said there was a checklist now, but a flow chart could be a graphical representation of what to do.

Steve F. said that along with the flow chart will be a new application that doesn't give you the option to put N/A. He said the board will decide if it is N/A, and he said when the application comes to Barbara and it is not complete, it will not get on the agenda. Norman B. noted that the biggest omission on the application is typically the street address of the project, it is often left blank. Steve said he stole Acton's stormwater mitigation application, which Shapleigh does not have, when you look at it, it is a lot clearer. Steve also added that perhaps there should also be a nice plan example as part of the application, that the board would like to have. The board agreed to update the applications and speak about it at the next meeting. Ann H. was hoping they could come up with a plan to decrease the arguing at the meeting, when the board needs further information.

Steve F. brought up another issue, unpermitted structures, noting there may be a step the board is missing. Steve did not know whose responsibility it is, he didn't think it was the boards?

Ann H. said another issue is when they only have sand on site. She felt they could do something other than just keep sand for stormwater protection. Maggie M. noted that they sometimes only have pine spills, which her yard has as well, and with a heavy rain it drives the dirt down to the lake. She said the pine spills just open up. Ann said the board was told about rain gardens, but nobody does them.

Steve F. asked where does that come in (the unpermitted structure)? CEO Demers said that typically it comes in thru a signed complaint form. Steve said he was not speaking about when it comes to the board without a complaint; when the CEO goes into the file and there is no permit for the structure, because there are plenty of places on the lake that have an old shoreline septic registration form and that is all that is on file. CEO Demers said the Planning Board can ask the Codes Department any question they want, and one of those questions can be are all those structures permitted, do you have evidence of this? He said that he would ask that if the Planning Board has a question, that you give him a heads up ahead of time, so he can research and get the information. Steve said he wanted to know what procedure the board should use, should the applications go to Barbara and that gets checked off before it gets to the Planning Board. Ann H. asked how it gets on the agenda? Steve said he did not know. Barbara stated that the applicant goes to CEO Demers with what they want to do, then he tells them what application they are to use. She said that they fill out the application, and then they go back to CEO Demers before the board gets it, so that he can make sure they did it correctly, and if they have any questions he can answer them. Ann asked what happens next, after it is filled out completely. Barbara said, then it comes to her, along with the application fee and it gets added to the agenda. Ann said this makes sense, they can ask the CEO what they have to do before it gets to the board. CEO Demers said, yes, so with the Wakita application, he came in and I gave him the information. He said with the private way, I worked with Mr. Stanley, which he prefers rather than working with the homeowner. He said with the homeowner you have to spoon feed them. Ann said that they shouldn't get to the meeting if the application isn't filled out. CEO Demers said

that the Planning Board has two meetings, the first one you have to say if the application is complete. Ann said the board is looking to get rid of having to say the application is not complete. CEO Demers said it was part of the process, and said he could miss something during his review. He felt the Planning Board was the permitting authority, so they have to answer the question. Barbara agreed with CEO Demers, in that the Planning Board reviews the application to say whether or not it meets what the board is looking for, and if the answer is no, you table it, and send them home to gather the required information. Barbara said that CEO Demers is to guide the applicants, tell them what the process is and what is required, and answer any questions they may have. CEO Demers also tells the applicants what the ordinance requires, how to interpret the ordinance. She said the Planning Board reviews the application to determine if they have all the material they need to determine whether or not it meets the ordinance. She said if they do not, the board sends them home. Ann asked if when they receive the application in the mail, and notice something is missing, what can they do? Barbara said they can only make the decision as a board. Barbara said that if it is incomplete, it may only require one more meeting to supply the information. Barbara noted that if they reviewed the application and did not ask CEO Demers questions, if they are confused, and additional information requires additional time, then it does. She said there is no rule that says the application will only take 2 meetings. Barbara said that she always told applicants that it would be 2 meetings minimum, not 2 meetings only. CEO Demers agreed. Ann said that the board needs to stick together, and if the applicant doesn't have all the board asked for, they need to ask them to go get it.

Steve F. said he wanted to discuss again, non-permitted structures. He asked if there is something the board can check to make sure it doesn't happen. CEO Demers said it is a big thing for me to come to some sort of determination as to whether a structure is legally existing or not. He said that obviously if he witnesses it wasn't there last week, and it there today, then it's easy. He said if something has been there 10 or 15 years it is harder. Barbara F. said what if the Assessor has been to the site, and said there were no other structures seen on site. CEO Demers said that he had a shed today, someone wanted to replace it, and he said there was no documentation that there was a shed dating back to 1983. He said the contractor that was proposing the tear down / rebuild, said he put it there in 1976. CEO Demers said he had no record of it. Steve asked if it was in Assessing? CEO Demers said it wasn't in the Assessors notes. Steve said they were not being taxed on it? CEO Demers said they were not. Steve asked then how they know? CEO Demers said if they have an old photograph of a shed, then he agrees it was there. Steve said he didn't want to get into the weeds on it. CEO Demers disagreed. Steve said that he wanted to know that everyone was playing by the same rules. CEO Demers said the only way he wouldn't let someone tear down a structure was to absolutely be able to prove it was an illegal structure. Barbara did not see how if it didn't have a permit, it was a legal structure, unless it was pre-1980's. Steve said it should be a part of the process that the board looks at, and that it is ok'd by someone.

CEO Demers asked if there was a process to check on the status of structures currently, as far as the Planning Board goes, illegal structures? Steve F. said the burden has to be in there somewhere, is it a legally existing structure. CEO Demers asked if it was more of a complaint thing, where someone says something has to be done about it? CEO Demers agreed there were illegal structures out there, he said he could not get them all. Barbara F. said the board would never ask him to, but if something is before the board, she felt due diligence is to ask if the structures on site are legal, to look to see there is a permit. CEO Demers said they can ask the question at a meeting, but he needs a heads-up that they want to know the information. Steve said if the board is going to ask it, it should be in the ordinance. Steve said he didn't want to have to ask the CEO, he wanted to have it in the record. CEO Demers said again, that making a determination as to whether or not a structure is legally existing or not is not a small thing. Barbara thought he could have the information within 2 weeks for the following meeting. Steve said this has to land with the Code Officer with enough time, so the board can see the information at the meeting. Ann said that if the board requires it for the next meeting, and if there isn't enough time, it could be pushed out another 2 weeks. CEO Demers said he would speak with Jeff Kalinich (DEP) and see what the legal

ramifications are. He said he might have a better protocol. Steve said after the last application, when it came up, it could easily have gone through without knowing there were illegal structures, and it would have gotten approved. He said maybe the board won't see this again, and we don't care? He wanted to know if there was something that should be put into the process, where this gets looked at. CEO Demers thought maybe the homeowner should sign off there are no illegal structures. Barbara did not think they would know that, or know how to find out. Ann was concerned with the legal ramification if the board did not do due diligence, it could create a lawsuit.

The board did not come to a conclusion. This will continue to be explored at future workshops.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Growth Permits**

**There are growth permits available.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**The Planning Board meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.**

The Planning Board meets the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of each month at 7:00 pm, unless it falls on a holiday or Election Day. Should there be a cancellation due to a storm event, holiday, or Election, the meeting will typically be held the following Wednesday, also at 7:00 p.m. Public hearings are held at 6:30 pm, just prior to the meeting.

Please contact the Land Use Secretary if there is a question in scheduling, 207-636-2839, x4.

Also visit [www.Shapleigh.net](http://www.Shapleigh.net), there is a calendar of events, and you will find Planning Board information there, including schedules, the agenda, and minutes of the meetings.

Respectfully submitted,  
Barbara Felong  
Land Use Secretary  
Town of Shapleigh