



Town of Naples
Planning Board Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 17, 2023

6:00 PM

1. Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance- D. Bogdan called the meeting to order. Also present were Martina Witts, Robert Fogg, Marty Zartarian (Alternate), Jennifer Leeman (Alternate), Kate Matthews and Rany Thurston (Code Officers), Kathy Eddy (Assistant to Code Officers and Planning Board), Jason Rogers (Town Manager). M. Zartarian and J. Leeman were appointed as voting members.
2. Review of Meeting Minutes-- 8-1-23 M. Witts made a motion to approve. Seconded by M. Zartarian. Motion carried 4-0. The meeting notes from 9-19-23 were tabled members in attendance were not at the meeting from that meeting to vote.
3. Old Business—None
4. Tabled Business--None
5. New Business
 - a. Map U10/1-A Minor Subdivision Application for 4-Units of Residential Apartments at 374 Roosevelt Trail.

Sketch Plan submitted by D M Roma Consulting Engineers on behalf of Jarod Robie. Dustin Roma with DM Roma Consulting Engineering appeared on behalf of Jarod Robie. Property came in front of you as a site plan for a self-storage unit with the intention of future phase in the back of the property of the foot right of way that runs part of the property the applicant owns. When we submitted information to DEP, we did include the potential for additional building in the rear of the property with the driveway access to be built inside of the fifty foot right of way, parking area and the 5,000 square foot building in the rear. All the storm water management features do accommodate that future building. So rather than commercial use we are proposing two duplex residential buildings in the

rear. So, the plans have been revised to include one building having 2-three-bedroom units, the second building having 2-two-bedroom units. Would like to separate the lots so the storage and residential units will have their separate properties.

M.Zartarian- Can you show us where the lot line for the frontage is? The developer stated that a hundred feet through one area and a hundred feet in the other area. How much road frontage for the storage? The developer stated that the road frontage for that is about 250 feet or so. Does that meet the requirements for a commercial operation there? The developer believed that just a hundred feet of road frontage is required.

M.Witts.- What is the depth of one hundred feet? The developer stated that it is only one foot and the reason it is narrow is because at the time of the project requirements that you had to have a building within twenty feet or between 20-25 feet from the front setback.

M. Zartarian- Are these units intended for rental or are they going to be turning them into condominiums? The developer stated they are intended for rental units.

M.Witts- Can you tell us about the structures themselves and do they have garages? The developer stated there are no garages, which is why we have ten spaces out front.

M.Witts- You are reducing the bedrooms in one of the duplex units to two, the square footage is still going to be the same, what are you calling the extra space? The building that is closer to the self-storage unit is a smaller footprint. We had septic and plans for both building to be 3-bedrooms however it was tight, so we made for a better site to make one with a smaller footprint.

D.Bogdon- So the fire department turnaround, have we got anything from the fire chief that it would be sufficient for him to get a truck down in there with the ten cars in that parking lot to turn around or maneuver? The developer indicated that he would double check on that, that he did not get a letter.

M. Witts- Are there any wetlands on the property? The facts and findings say we have no wetlands however there is a stream. The developer stated we filled in wetlands on the land per DEP and Army Corps standards. There are no wetlands located within the project area.

Planner will need to change the fact of findings to indicate that on the property it does have wetlands on either side of the stream that will not be impacted with this build.

M.Witts- Can you talk to us about the landscaping that is planned for the site? The developer stated since it sits back from the road, we were proposing just planting grass

around the buildings. There will also be some foundation shrubs in the front. We are proposing minimal landscaping because we have the stormwater pond in the back, and it is situated so far from the road. What is the buffer between the buildings and the self-storage units? There is a rip wrap ditch for drainage and a guardrail that runs along the top. We are going to keep the rip wrap ditch in place for drainage and then plant some grass in front of it.

K.Matthews there is supposed to be a buffer between residential and commercial properties. You would be creating two separate lots and splitting them from commercial to residential. The setbacks should be twenty-five feet between properties.

M.Witts- Does anybody feel like we need to do a site visit for this plan? The developer two material piles are where the two units will be going, and anyone can go and drive up and look at all are welcome.

- b. Map U02/37-4 Request for planning board to expand current dock size and add a jet ski/PWC lifts.

Todd Norwood property owner requesting a change in his dock size. The first request regards the kayak launch that was added to the dock in 2018 and the overall square footage with the kayak dock. Back in 2017 we had Sebago Dock and Lift designed with what we needed with a rack and one of the little roller ramps that goes into the water. The homeowner stated that the designer was supposed to work with Renee Carter how would approve this as a boat launching device it could be exempted from the overall dock square footage. So, if the kayak dock is included in the dock space it is about 350 square feet down.

M.Zartarian- Can you walk us through with pictures, it is not clear as to what is there today for docks? The homeowner is all here today and so is the roller ramp that goes into the water for kayaking.

M.Zartarian- So the little outlet not included in your calculation then? The homeowner stated that no because that goes down into the water.

J.Leeman- So was the rollaway counted in the overall calculation? The homeowner stated that no that was not included in the calculation.

M.Zartarian- Having a tough time understanding the hardship conditions here. The homeowner stated that the hardship here might be that the whole dock is in a shallow cove, it could be positioned at a different place on our property and into deeper water. Where it sits it is out of the water way and Chute River.

J.Leeman- Sean Hebert (harbormaster) did you see any issues with where it is placed for the navigable waterways? S.Hebert where it is located right now, is a good spot property wise there are no restrictions to navigation and does not jut out into the channel or the marina areas either.

D.Bogdon we will take the two requests separately and vote on:

1. So the expansion to request for what he has existing as the first vote, motion by M.Witts to deny the request for addition of the jet ski PWC lifts; M.Zartarian seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0

2. The grandfathering the board should take no action on and put that and go through Sean to have that resubmit. D.Bogdon made a motion to take no part in grandfathering the existing dock that is already in the water and have the applicant work with the harbormaster to get a permit for the dock. M.Witts seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0

- c. Map U05/24-2 and Map U1/10 Major Site Plan Review for an extension of the Site Plan Approval for the ground-mount solar photovoltaic development.

John with WSP and I work closely with Drew who was not able to attend tonight's meeting. We are making a request for the solar project, and it was granted prior from 10-5-23. We understand that this would be the final extension under the revised ordinance in Naples. No adjustments to the plan that was previously approved.

M.Zartarian is there any outlook as to CMP's approval process at this point. The developer stated that it is moving forward and that they have other projects that are starting to go. There are other cluster projects that are bigger and starting in other areas. The project if he guesses could be another year or come back and resubmit a new plan. A good chance this project could get a green light on this within one year.

D.Bogdon- So we are looking at getting onto a three-phase line not just hooking up to a pole. The developer you can see driving around Maine that they are making progress with running a three-phase wire system. There is more to it that some of the substations can manage a three-phase lines going out, need bigger protection equipment and that is probably where some of the bigger holdups are with them doing the analysis that will prove that it can manage that load when it is sunny.

J.Leeman- looks like you are asking for a retro activity on this application. The developer with the increase to a two-year approval period in the ordinance that was made in June of twenty-two. The understanding that with the ordinance change that would allow for the approval to from the original to 10-5-23 which would be the two-year time. We are asking for the final approval that is allowed.

M.Witts made the motion to approve the request for a one-year extension through 10-5-2024. Second by R.Fogg. Motion carried 5-0.

6. Public Participation for Planning Board Matters

7. Other business

- a. Next meeting is to be on November 7, 2023
- b. Ordinance Discussion

M.Witts went to the select board meeting and they directed that the planning board and the ordinance review committee develop a list of ordinances that they thought the town should look at developing or amending. This is the list that was draft for discussion to be written and those written.

8. Adjourn—D.Bogdan made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by M. Zartarian. Motion carried 5-0.

Respectfully submitted.

Kathleen Eddy
Administrative Assistant