

1 **TOWN OF NORTHPORT**

2 **PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

3 **April 9, 2024**

4 **Present:** Planning Board Chair Reeves Gilmore; Planning Board Vice-Chair Mike
5 Parker; Planning Board Member Jim Nealey; Planning Board Member Rich
6 Coleman; Planning Board Member Dana Kennedy and CEO Toupie Rooney.

7
8 The meeting was opened at 6:14 pm by Chair Reeves Gilmore. It was determined
9 that a voting quorum was present.

10 **Old Business:**

11 Chair Reeves Gilmore presented a Planning Board Order to be filed with the Waldo
12 County Registry of Deeds regarding the Board's action in the November 14, 2023
13 approval of the proposed Point Lookout Condominiums. Northport's attorney
14 William Kelly reviewed, modified, and approved the submitted order. Motion made
15 by Jim Nealey seconded by Dana Kennedy to accept the order and authorize the
16 Chair to execute it on behalf of the Board. The Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this
17 motion.

18 **New Business:**

19 RMS Northport, LLC /Eric Simon (Midcoast Fence).

20 U02/4

21 Eric Simon presented a plan to build a 40'x 60' steel building, to be used as a
22 workshop/storage space at his business, Midcoast Fence. The building will be built
23 on a slab with electrical service, no plans for plumbing.

24 Mike Parker asked if any changes to access to the lot/business from the road. Mr.
25 Simon responded there would not be. Reeves Gilmore asked about access and
26 delivery – specifically are materials delivered by tractor trailer and do they back in
27 or drive in? Mr. Simon said some material does get delivered by that means, and
28 they usually back in but could access either way. Gilmore indicated he had observed
29 a truck stuck at the entrance at one point which could pose a danger due to the
30 speed at which cars approach with limited visibility on the hill.

31 Neighbor Chris Maseychik was in attendance and asked about wetlands. Mr. Simon
32 responded it is wet at the rear of the property but not where he intends to build.

33 **Findings of Fact**

34 Section 9: Approval Standards and Criteria

35 9.1: Utilization of Site: **MET**

36 **The Board finds on motion made** by Jim Nealey and seconded by Dana Kennedy
37 that the Applicant proposes an additional structure (“The Project”) on the site being
38 a 60’ x 40’ steel building on a cement slab. The site at 20+ acres is large enough to
39 accommodate The Project. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

40 9.2 Adequacy of Road System: **MET**

41 **The Board finds on motion made** by Jim Nealey and seconded by Dana Kennedy
42 that The Project will be adequately served by US Route 1. The Project is not open
43 to the public. Only a few employees and occasional delivery trucks will visit the
44 site. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

45 9.3 Access into Site: **MET**

46 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Dana Kennedy
47 that the Applicant has a driveway permit for two access drives from the Maine
48 Department of Transportation. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this
49 motion.

50 9.4 Access-way Location and Spacing: **MET**

51 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Dana Kennedy
52 that The Project’s access way locations and spacing meet the required distances in
53 the Northport Site Plan Review Ordinance and no changes are planned. The
54 Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

55 9.5 Internal Vehicular Circulation: **MET**

56 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Dana Kennedy
57 that The Project’s existing parking lot design provides for adequate internal

58 circulation for emergency vehicles, employee vehicles, and the occasional delivery
59 vehicle. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

60 9.6 Parking Lot Layout and Design: **MET**

61 **The Board finds on motion made** by Jim Nealey and seconded by Rich Coleman
62 that The Project's parking lot layout allows for adequate turning and backing
63 movements. The parking lot consisting of four (4) spaces is intended for use by
64 employees only. No additional employees anticipated. The Planning Board voted
65 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

66 9.7 Pedestrian Circulation: **MET**

67 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealy that
68 pedestrian circulation requirements are minimal. The Project is located in a rural
69 setting and is not open to the public. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this
70 motion.

71 9.8 Stormwater Management: **MET**

72 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealy that
73 The project should not adversely affect the stormwater pattern. The surface water
74 flows westerly to the back of the property. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor**
75 of this motion.

76 9.9 Erosion Control: **MET**

77 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealy that
78 the actual site for construction is relatively flat. No special erosion controls are
79 anticipated. Vegetation will remain except for that which must be removed to
80 construct The Project. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

81 9.10 Water Supply: **MET**

82 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Dana Kennedy
83 that the Applicant states that no known water supply exists, and none is planned
84 or necessary for The Project. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

85 9.11 Sewage Disposal: **MET**

86 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealy that
87 the Applicant states that no known sewer system exists, and none is planned or
88 necessary for The Project. Portable toilet facilities are currently in use at the site.
89 Applicant stated in previous submittal soils test indicates viable sites for a future
90 subsurface septic system if desired. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this
91 motion.

92 9.12 Utilities: **MET**

93 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Dana Kennedy
94 that The Project has access to electrical service from power poles adjacent to US
95 Route 1. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

96 9.13 Natural Features: **MET**

97 **The Board finds on motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Dana Kennedy
98 that the removal of vegetation on the site will be limited to that necessary for
99 construction of The Project. The remainder of the acreage will be preserved in its
100 current natural state. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

101 9.14 Groundwater Protection: **MET**

102 **The Board finds on motion made** by Dana Kennedy and seconded by Rich Coleman
103 that The Project will not negatively affect the quality or quantity of groundwater
104 available to abutting properties. No water well or subsurface septic system is
105 proposed. The Planning board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

106 9.15 Water Quality Protection: **MET**

107 **The Board finds upon motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Dana
108 Kennedy that the materials stored and used at The Project site primarily consist of
109 wood, metal, and plastic. The Project will not cause the discharge of any liquid,
110 gaseous, or solid materials that could contaminate or pollute. The Planning Board
111 voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

112 9.16 Hazardous, Special & Radioactive Materials: **NOT APPLICABLE**

113 The Board finds upon motion made by Rich Coleman and seconded by Dana
114 Kennedy that this criterion is not applicable. The Project does not use or store
115 hazardous, special, or radioactive materials. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor**
116 of this motion.

117 9.17 Shoreland Relationship: **NOT APPLICABLE**

118 **The Board finds upon motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealy
119 that this criterion is not applicable. The Project is not located adjacent to any body
120 of water. The Planning Board voted 5-0 in favor of this motion.

121 9.18 Technical and Financial Capacity: **MET**

122 **The Board finds upon motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealy
123 that the Applicant has been in business at this location for 3 years and has a proven
124 track record in the area. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

125 9.19 Solid Waste Disposal: **MET**

126 **The Board finds upon motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealy
127 that the Applicant states that offsite disposal of materials is provided. The Planning
128 Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

129 9.20 Historic and Archaeological Resources: **NOT APPLICABLE**

130 The Board finds upon motion made by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealy
131 that this criterion is not applicable. No historical or archaeological sites have been
132 identified on The Project's site. The Planning board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this
133 motion.

134 9.21 Floodplain Management: **NOT APPLICABLE**

135 **The Board finds upon motion made** by Rich Coleman and seconded by Jim Nealy
136 that this criterion is not applicable. No portion of The Project is located within the
137 FEMA designated floodplain per the adopted FIRM panels. The Planning Board
138 voted 5-0 **in favor** of this motion.

139

140 Having considered all the facts and issued their findings upon motion of Jim Nealy
141 and seconded by Mike Parker The Planning Board approved The Project by a 5-0
142 vote **in favor**.

143 There being no further business, Jim Nealey motioned to adjourn the meeting at
144 7:07pm, seconded by Rich Coleman. The Planning Board voted 5-0 **in favor** of this
145 motion.

146 Respectfully

147 *Mike Parker and Reeves Gilmore*

148 Mike Parker and Reeves Gilmore

149

150

151 Accepted: _____

152