1	TOWN OF NORTHPORT
2	PLANNING BOARD MEETING
3	JUNE 14, 2022
4	
5 6 7 8	Present: Planning Board Chairman Reeves Gilmore, Planning Board Vice Chair Jim Nealey, Planning Board Member Mike Parker, Planning Board Member Rich Coleman, Planning Board Secretary Patsy Littlefield, CEO Toupie Rooney, James Dorsky on behalf of Magnificent Seven Limited Partnership for Cove View Subdivision, Chris Maseychik, Drew Martens and Paul Overgaag
9 10 11	Meeting was opened at 6:01 p.m. by Chairman Reeves Gilmore. It was determined that a quorum is present. Reeves reports that Al Grimshaw would like to become an alternate if we find another regular member for the Board. There are presently two (2) alternate positions open.
12	OLD BUSINESS:
13 14 15	Sammis / Cove View Subdivision represented by James Dorsky of Gartley & Dorsky MAP U14 / LOT 1-1, 1-2, 1-3 Making a 3 lot subdivision into a 2 lot subdivision
16 17 18 19 20 21	Reeves Gilmore made the statement that in the last two (2) years we have been working on changes to the Subdivision Ordinance, so he had reviewed what the current Subdivision Ordinance is as that is what the Cove View Subdivision had originally applied under. Therefore, this is termed a minor subdivision as it is less than four (4) lots; it had three (3) lots but is now being changed to be only two (2) lots. As a minor subdivision, if it is considered that he has a complete application at this meeting, then we can go straight into the final application and approve all in one (1) meeting.
22 23 24 25 26 27	James Dorsky went over the Magnificent Seven Limited Partnership, LLC, subdivision which was originally approved as three (3) lots but is now being amended to only two (2) lots. Another change within the two (2) lots is the long driveway which had been required because there was no 600' of road frontage to allow for the original three (3) lots. Now there is enough road frontage to support the proposed two (2) lots and the long driveway is being eliminated. There has been no change in ownership with any of the lots.
28	FINDINGS OF FACT Subdivision Name: Cove View First Amended Subdivision
29 30 31	The Applicant proposes to amend Cove View Subdivision by reducing three (3) lots to two (2) lots. One lot is developed as previously approved in the original recorded subdivision. Said proposed amendment plan is hereinafter referred to as "The Project".
32	4.1. Pollution. MET.

The Board finds on motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Mike Parker that The Project, in fact, will lessen the possibility of any air or water pollution. Ultimate developed surface area will decrease, expected traffic volumes may decrease and density will decrease. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.

4.2. Sufficient Water Supply. **MET.**

The Board finds on motion made by Mike Parker and seconded by Jim Nealey that The Project has sufficient water for the foreseeable future. The Project will lessen onsite demand for water, and the lots are served by individual water wells. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.

4.3. Municipal Water Supply. **NOT APPLICABLE.**

The Board finds on motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman that this criterion is not applicable. The Project does not have access to a municipal water supply. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.

4.4. Erosion. **MET.**

The Board finds on motion made by Rich Coleman and seconded by Mike Parker that The Project will result in lessening potential erosion and will not affect the land's capacity to hold water. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.

4.5. Traffic. **MET.**

The Board finds on motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman that The Project will not increase but will, in fact, lessen the amount of potential traffic to the site with the reduction of the number of lots for development. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.

4.6. Sewage Disposal. **MET.**

The Board finds on motion made by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealey that The Project will rely on private individual sewage systems. The lots are appropriate in size. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.

4.7. Municipal Solid Waste. **MET.**

The Board finds on motion made by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealey that The Project will not adversely affect the town's ability to process solid waste at the Northport Transfer Facility. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.

4.8. Aesthetic, Cultural & Natural Vales. MET.

The Board finds on motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman that The Project will not adversely affect aesthetics of the site or place of scenic natural beauty. No historical sites or wildlife habitats have been designated. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.

- **4.9.** Conformity with Local Ordinances/Plans. **MET.**
- The Board finds on motion made by Mike Parker and seconded by Rich Coleman that upon final approval The Project will comply with the adopted Northport Subdivision Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- 69 **4.10.** Financial and Technical Capacity. **MET.**
- 70 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Mike Parker that The 71 Project will require no construction of common infrastructure to serve the lots. Applicant is the owner 72 of the entire tract to be subdivided. The Planning Board voted 4-0 **in favor** of this motion.
- 73 **4.11.** Surface Waters. **MET.**
- The Board finds on motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman that The Project is not within the watershed of any pond or lake or within 250 feet of a designated wetland. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- 77 **4.12.** Ground Water. **MET.**
- 78 **The Board finds on motion made** by Mike Parker and seconded by Rich Coleman that The 79 Project will lessen the demand for groundwater; therefore, there will be no adverse effect on the quality 80 or quantity of groundwater. The Planning Board voted 4-0 **in favor** of this motion.
- 81 **4.13.** Flood Areas. **MET.**

86

87

88

90

91 92

93

- The Board finds on motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman that The Project is not located within the FEMA designated flood plains per the adopted FIRM panels. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- 85 **4.14.** Freshwater Wetlands. **MET.**
 - The Board finds on motion made by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealey that the applicant has identified freshwater wetlands on the submitted plan. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- 89 **4.15.** River, Stream or Brook. **NOT APPLICABLE.**
 - **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealey that this criterion is not applicable. The Project does not encompass or is adjacent to any river, stream, or brook as defined by Maine Statute Title 38, Section 480-B, Subsection 9. The Planning Board voted 4-0 **in favor** of this motion.
- 94 **4.16.** Storm Water. **MET.**

- The Board finds on motion made by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealey that the infrastructure to manage storm water is in place. The Project requires no additional improvements. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- 98 **4.17.** Spaghetti Lots Prohibited. **MET.**
- The Board finds on motion made by Rich Coleman and seconded by Mike Parker that The Project does not propose any spaghetti lots. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- 101 **4.18.** Impact on Adjoining Municipality. **MET.**
- The Board finds on motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman that The Project does not cross any municipal boundaries. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- **4.19.** Lands Subject to Liquidation Harvesting. **MET.**
- The Board finds on motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman that The Project is not in violation on any rules regarding liquidation harvesting. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- 108 **4.20.** State Subdivision Law Criteria. **MET.**
- The Board finds on motion made by Mike Parker and seconded by Jim Nealey that upon final approval The Project will comply with the above criteria and State law. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- Motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman that the application as submitted is considered to be a complete application. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- 114 The Board finds on motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman to approve the
- amendment to the Cove View Subdivision as stated on the Findings of Fact with no conditions of
- approval. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion.
- 117 The Findings of Fact and all three (3) plats were signed by Reeves Gilmore, Jim Nealey, Rich Coleman and
- 118 Mike Parker.
- 119 **NEW BUSINESS:**
- 120 Site Plan Review for Drew Martens representing MCM Properties LLC
- 121 **207 Rocky Road**
- 122 Map R1 / Lot 55
- 123 **2** building 8 unit apartment complex
- Also in attendance were abutters Mark Dumas, Jean Cole, and Dana and Regina Kennedy.
- Drew Martens explains his project on Rocky Road. He will construct two (2) buildings containing four (4)
- apartment units in each. Each building will be 60' by 36'. Each apartment unit will be two (2) bedrooms

- and one (1) bathroom. Each building will house four (4) apartment units with two (2) units on the first
- 128 floor and two (2) units on the second floor. Each building will have a one (1) entrance/exit in the front
- and three (3) exits in the back. Each unit has its own washer and dryer hookups available.
- 130 Reeves Gilmore asked about surface water drainage. Drew Martens responded that the water flows to
- the back of the property away from Rocky Road. There will be a dumpster on site, placed at the bottom
- right of the building complex parking lot. There is a play area in the back of the building. A lawn will be
- planted. There will be a grassed area between the two (2) buildings
- Abutters voiced concerns over the lighting for the apartment complex, traffic, trash, septic, soil impact
- and surface runoff and noise from the number of tenants. Drew Martens addressed the issues. He
- stated there would not be any oversized lighting. He will install downward facing lights. There will be a
- 137 30' buffer to the roadway.
- Drew Martens stated there are two (2) septic designs for the property. This property is an 11 acre lot.
- 139 There are no wetlands on the property. He clarified that no pets will be allowed at the apartment
- complex. Drew states that there will be a 30' buffer on Mr. Kennedy's side of the property line.
- 141 Reeves Gilmore explained to the abutters that under the town's ordinances there are certain things that
- the Planning Board can do and certain things that they cannot do. The Town of Northport does not have
- a land use ordinance. We follow the guidelines and rules that are available to us to enforce on a Site
- 144 Plan Review.
- 145 The road commissioner will be looking at the driveway area. If any additional buildings are to be added
- in the future, that plan request would have to come back before the Planning Board for separate
- 147 approval.
- Reeves Gilmore called an end to the Drew Martens project discussion at this time as there were no
- 149 further questions.
- 150 Reeves Gilmore stated that a signature block needed to be added. There was nothing to be signed
- tonight. There are changes to make on the plan:
- 152 Show the dumpster location.
- 153 Show the proposed landscape and buffer area.
- 154 Show the location of signs, if any.
- 155 Show the location of exterior lighting.
- 156 Need to add an approval block.
- 157 Show the drainage flow.
- 158 Show driveway dimensions.
- Show utility pole location for property along Rocky Road.
- 160 Motion made by Mike Parker and seconded by Rich Coleman to table this application until the July 12th
- meeting. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion. Reeves Gilmore will prepare the
- 162 Findings of Fact on this application for that meeting.

163	Paul Overgaag
164	3 North Avenue
165	Map U5 / Lot 152
166	Remodel of existing home
167	Paul Overgaag states this is an older cottage with a small addition on the back. Above that addition is a
168	roof deck. He wishes to demolish the addition and roof deck. He then will rebuild on the same footprint
169	another one story addition with a deck on top. He will put a dormer the length of the side of the cottage
170	on the shore side. There will be 3 skylights on the southeast side of the house. He will add new siding
171	to the building. All of this will be done on the existing footprint.
172	CEO Toupie Rooney states he is at the Planning Board because this is a nonconforming lot and it is in the
173	shoreland zone.
174	Motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Mike Parker to approve the application of Paul Overgaag
175	for 3 North Street as presented with no expansion of square footage. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in
176	favor of this motion. The application was signed by Reeves Gilmore, Rich Coleman, Jim Nealey and Mike
177	Parker.
178	Christopher Maseychik
179	5 North Avenue
180	Map U4 / Lot 151
181	Remodel change of plans
182	Chris Maseychik wanted to resubmit his application as there are some changes to his original
183	application. He had reread the ZBA. The ground floor will remain as it is. The second floor will gain a
184	room at the rear. The third floor will gain two (2) rooms at the front. He will also put in a partial
185	foundation based on the drainage issue at the front of the cottage. The roof of the central portion of
186	the cottage will be pushed out on two (2) sides to gain some headroom inside the cottage. The height
187	will be maintained at 35'.
188	Motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman to approve the Chris Maseychik application
189	for 5 North Avenue as submitted with no approval conditions. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of
190	this motion. The application was signed by Reeves Gilmore, Rich Coleman, Jim Nealey and Mike Parker.
191	
192	ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION:
193	CEO Toupie Rooney wished to discuss Metric Motorcar, business of Ron Parkinson. He is adding on. He
194	wants to put in a full slab and build a lean-to (588 square feet) only on the length of the existing
195	building, not on the whole slab. Toupie is wondering if the concrete slab is considered part of the

structure. The consensus is it would be considered as a driveway, not part of the structure; and the

Planning Board would have no problem with it.

196

197

198 **MINUTES:** 199 Minutes of the May 10, 2022, meeting was reviewed. There were no corrections. 200 Motion made by Reeves Gilmore and seconded by Rich Coleman to approve the minutes of the May 10, 2022, meeting as presented. The Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion. 201 202 Motion made by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman to adjourn the meeting at 7:50 p.m. The 203 Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor of this motion. 204 Respectfully submitted, Patsy Littlefield 205 206 Secretary 207