

Washington Planning Board

P. O. Box 408, Washington, Maine 04574

Tuesday August 13, 2013

The meeting opened at 7:00 pm.

Present were: Chairman, Mitchell Garnett; Members: Hank Aho, David Williams and David Studer; Alternate Reggie Burns; CEO, Bob Temple and Recording Secretary, Liane Chapman. Absent: Vice Chairman/Secretary, Jim Bowers and Alternate, Rich Bouchard. Mr. Garnett asked Mr. Burns to sit for Mr. Bowers. The minutes of June 4, 2013 were accepted with all in favor.

Old Business: There was none. Mr. Aho noted that only the index and left-hand pages in the March 29, 2013 Land Use Ordinance (LUO) stated the actual year of approval. He suggested that the pagination be made consistent so that all pages reflect the date of the current ordinance and the date of any current amendment. Mr. Studer said other ordinances indicated each date of approval. Mr. Garnett asked who would speak to those responsible for printing the LUO. Mr. Temple said he would do so. Mr. Aho stressed the importance of the correction.

New Business: Mr. Temple reported that he had received a request from the Wireless Communication company asking for a continuance of the pre application hearing for the proposed cell tower at 147 Liberty Road until the September meeting. He also reported that he had received a pre application request for a gravel pit on the Schroyer subdivision. The firm of Gartley & Dorskey had written on behalf of Cary Nash owner of lot 3 of the Frances Marr Schroyer subdivision on Route 105.. It would be categorized as a small minimum gravel extraction operation under the definitions in the Mining Ordinance. The property is part of Map11 lot 5 on the westerly side of the Marr cemetery. They had enclosed a copy of the subdivision map which depicted the possible zoning lines adjacent to drives and areas of interest. Mr. Temple said he had started putting together a finding of fact order. He had collected all information that would apply. He had prepared a review process that included all of the ordinance required for submission. It had boxes to be checked off and had sent it to the applicant electronically so that they would know what was needed. He would be able to tell them whether or not it was complete. He wanted to have an outline so that whenever they got something under the general standards or the site plan, there would be an outline.

Mr. Temple had made a similar order for the cell tower application. He noted a provision in that which said a cell tower could not be erected within 1,000 feet of a residence without a signed permission from the owner. At the meeting, Mr. Temple would give the Board a letter saying whether the application was complete. He noted that he was in the process of preparing a template to create outlines for all the different ordinances. He was working on one for the gravel pit application. He had included Title 38 in the finding of fact, but if the Board wished a separate document, he would prepare one so that the process would not be required twice. Where there were differences such as buffers for cemeteries, he would reference them. Mr. Garnett thought our ordinance did include something about buffers. Several members agreed.

Mr. Temple said he now had a good outline for the general standards ordinance, and for the site plan in that ordinance. Now he had one for the telecommunications ordinance as well. The same site plan review applies to the Mining Ordinance. Mr. Garnett asked whether the applicant had specifically said lot 3. He had. Mr. Temple expressed concern about what would happen if the mine extended from two to three or four acres. If it extended to five acres, the owner would need a license from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Mr. Garnett asked whether it would not have to be reclaimed after two acres. Mr. Temple said the DEP rule was not until it reached five acres, however the ordinance said there had to be a reclamation plan. Mr. Studer noted that this pit would be adjacent to several other pits. Mr. Temple reminded the Board that any non-residential use under the Mining Ordinance would require Planning Board review and might require a hydrogeological survey. Mr. Nash's representative would be Ken Lane.

Discussion followed as to how many meetings were required and when. Because of the lengthy requirement lists, Mr. Garnett felt the pre application meetings should be separate. Mr. Temple said he would let the Board know what he found out. Mr. Studer noted that if, at the pre application meeting, the Board agreed the application was complete, the Public Hearing could be set. Mr. Williams felt that it would not work. Mr. Temple said the paperwork would be brought to the meeting so it would be difficult to accomplish everything at one meeting. He had only just finished the material for the cell tower and had sent it to the applicant electronically. Because of size, he had separated the material for Mr. Nash into separate pieces for the Mining Ordinance and the site plan review. Two meetings in September were suggested, but the Board made no decision. At the least, the next meeting would take place on September 10.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Liane Chapman

Recording Secretary