

Town of Waldoboro, Maine  
Planning Board Meeting  
November 10, 2022  
Waldoboro Town Office

Roll Call

The Planning Board meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m. by chairman Brendan McGuirl. Jeff Erskine, Johnny Kosnow and Brendan McGuirl were present in person at the Town Office, while Barbara Boardman (until 7 p.m.), Sarah Rich and Mark Stults attended remotely. A quorum was present throughout. Planning and Development Director Max Johnstone was present in person, as were applicants Michael and Carrie Johnson. There was no audience.

1. Adjustments to the Agenda - none
2. Citizen Comments - none
3. Pre-Application: Single-Family Residence, 370 Hendrickson Lane, Johnson (Tax Map R11 Lot 31-5)

Michael and Carrie Johnson were present in person for pre-application review of their application to build a 24' x 32' cabin with loft and covered porch within the Shoreland Zone on Havener Pond at 370 Hendrickson Lane, a private road. The cabin is intended for use as a family camp, not to be rented for income. It will be set back 100' from the shoreline of the pond. The land is zoned Resource Protection. Sanitary waste is proposed to be handled by an innovative Enviro Loo waterless toilet system, in which solids are turned to ash and gray water goes into an underground leach field. The holding tank will be 24" above ground. The property includes an easement that would allow sanitary waste to go into a conventional septic system on adjacent property across the road. Code Enforcement Officer Stan Waltz has not yet reviewed the proposed Enviro Loo waste disposal system to determine whether it meets local ordinance requirements.

Stults asked about access to the property by the Fire Department and Emergency Management Services. Is the existing road adequate for use by emergency vehicles? Johnstone will consult local EMS to see whether they consider the road adequate to provide EMS service. If not, Stults suggested approaching the other property owners who use the road, to see if they are willing to bring the existing road up to private road standards. Johnstone will investigate whether the Planning Board has authority to require that the road be brought into compliance with private road standards. The subdivision was approved in the 1970s, and predates Waldoboro's current road standards for private roads. How do other home-owners access their camps? Is there an existing road association? If the existing road requires improvement, an erosion control plan may be needed, showing the direction of water runoff during construction. It will be important to prevent oil from vehicles using the road from getting into the lake. Material from Maine DEP is available online about how to address these problems.

4. Minutes of July 28 and October 13, 2022

Minutes of July 28, 2022

Boardman, Erskine, Kosnow and Rich were present at the July 28 meeting. There were no questions or comments about the minutes. On motion of Erskine/Rich, these four members voted to approve the July 28 minutes as distributed, with McGuirl and Stults abstaining.

Minutes of October 13, 2022

Boardman, Erskine, Kosnow, McGuirl and Stults were all present at the Oct. 13 meeting. In the first line under Roll Call at the top of p. 1, the name of the acting chairman was changed to Jeffrey Erskine. With this correction, on motion of Stults/Kosnow, Planning Board members voted unanimously to approve the October 13 minutes as amended, Rich abstaining.

## 5. Land Use Ordinance Revision

Starting at 6:40 p.m., Planning Board members went over a document summarizing recent proposed changes to the Land Use Ordinance, prepared by planner Johnstone and sent to the Board for input ahead of tonight's meeting.

### Article 3 Application Review

3.2.1 Code Enforcement Officer Review, line 1, change to read "Within 14 days of receiving an application, the Code Enforcement Officer shall..."

3.2.2 Town Planner/Code Enforcement Officer Review, line 1, change to read, "Within 14 days of receiving..." Add new last sentence to first paragraph: "The Town Planner is responsible for distributing a first class notice of the application to all property abutters as well as notifying the emergency service departments (Fire, Police, and Ambulance) and members of the Planning Board upon determining the application is complete and being satisfied with the site visit."

Johnstone suggests changing the language about providing notice of a proposed change of use to all abutting property owners, municipal service providers, and Planning Board members, to language allowing the Town Planner not to schedule a public hearing if abutters and municipal service providers do not think a public hearing is necessary. If a written request for a public hearing is received within 14 days of the notice being sent, then the Town Planner and Code Enforcement Office must submit the application to the Planning Board for review. The Town Planner and Code Officer may, at their discretion, have the application reviewed by the Planning Board if they find that the application would benefit from such public review.

Boardman asked what the term "change of use" means or includes. Johnstone said that he would first consult the LUO to see whether the use is allowed, e.g., changing from residential use to commercial at a particular location. He would also consider the nature of the proposed change of use. There are certain specific changes of use within a land use district that are allowed with approval of the Town Planner and/or Code Enforcement Officer, without requiring Planning Board review. The proposed new language would allow neighbors to be consulted, and give them the option to request Planning Board review if they have concerns about the proposed change of use.

## 10. 7 Campgrounds and Tenting Grounds - Small Campgrounds (subsection 10.7.1.1.1)

At 6:55 p.m. Boardman asked to give input about proposed changes to the LUO requirements for small campgrounds of up to 10 sites, because she has to leave the meeting at 7:00 p.m. She offered to send Johnstone a list of her suggested changes to the land use matrix. Boardman thinks that proposals for small campgrounds should be required to come before the Planning Board for review, the same as proposals for campgrounds with over 10 sites. She also questions reducing the required setback of small campgrounds from property lines, approved in 2021. Subsection 10.7.1.1.1 Small Campgrounds in the 2020 LUO reads, "A small campground shall have a minimum of two acres of land. All campsites or structures shall be located at least 50 feet from any property line and 100 feet from any residence on abutting property and have a maximum limit of 10 units or sites." Boardman questions reducing the minimum required setback of small campgrounds. The minimum required setback for campgrounds in the LUO adopted Nov. 3, 2020 is the same for both large and small campgrounds: that all camping sites or structures shall be located at least 50 feet from any property line and 100 feet from any residence on abutting property. Boardman left the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

### Article 3 Application Review

Under 3.3 General Requirements, Johnstone pointed out that obtaining municipal approval does not exempt the applicant from having to get approval from other regulatory bodies or participants in private agreements.

Under 3.4 Public Hearing Requirements, Johnstone said that if a landowner living on a private road is applying for a change of use on his or her property, all property owners served by that private road must be

notified, or the road association (if there is one) must be notified. The need for this became evident with regard to the proposed solar farm on Controversy Lane. There were no questions or comments from Planning Board members about adding to 3.4 the proposed new paragraph “For applicants that require using a private road to access the project site, a notice must be sent out to the relevant Road Association. If there is no established Road Association for the private road, a letter must be sent to each property owner/resident that benefits from the private road.”

### Article 6 Land Use Districts

Rich commented that on p. 6-5 in the handout, about review of changes to Article 6 Land Use Districts, she does not see any changes to the matrix. Johnstone said that he is not proposing changes to the matrix.

In 6.7.4 Change of Use (red text at the bottom of p. 6-5), Johnstone said that he is not clear about the meaning of the wording “only substantially” in line 1. Interior renovations to a building do not normally need review by the Planning Board. A change of use of a building might have to come before the Planning Board for approval. He asked if Planning Board members are OK with him inserting a specific number, e.g. 2000 s.f., in the blank at the start of line three in the red text at the bottom of page 6-5. The sentence would then end “...if there is no applicable development exceeding 2000 square feet of impervious area”.

Definition of ‘Impervious Area’: Johnstone read aloud the definition of “impervious area” on p. 15-15 of the 2020 LUO: “The total area of a parcel covered with a low-permeability material that is highly resistant to infiltration by water, such as asphalt, concrete, or rooftop, and areas such as gravel roads and unpaved parking areas that will be compacted through design or use to reduce their permeability. Common areas include, but are not limited to: rooftops, walkways, patios, driveways, parking lots or storage areas, concrete or asphalt paving, gravel roads, packed earthen materials, and macadam or other surface that similarly impede the natural infiltration of stormwater.”

6.7.2 The symbol “CP” indicates uses for which approval from both the Code Enforcement Office and the Town Planner is required.

6.7.4 In the first sentence of the text under 6.7.4 Change of Use, the figure 2000 was added, so that the full sentence reads: “In any instance where the proposed use shall only substantially alter the use of the building, the proposed use shall be subject to ‘CP’ approval if there is no exterior development exceeding 2,000 square feet of impervious area.” Rich questioned the meaning of the phrase “only substantially”. Does the sentence mean that if the only changes are to the interior of the building, not to the exterior, then approval from both the Code Enforcement Office and the Town Planner (“CP approval”) is required? A Planning Board member asked if the Land Use Ordinance defines the term “impervious area”. Johnstone said yes, on p. 15-15.

### p. 6-18 Table 6.8 Schedule of Dimensional Requirements

Johnstone said that Waldoboro has had the lot sizes and setbacks in Table 6.8 for 17 years. His recommended changes to the Schedule of Dimensional Requirements are shown in red on p. 6-18 of the handout being discussed tonight. The suggested changes are based on availability of public sewer and water in certain areas of town, and standards for the neighboring towns of Damariscotta and Warren. He asked for Planning Board input. No other town in the midcoast requires a setback of 75’ from the road for structures in the Rural and Residential districts. Side and rear setbacks of structures from property lines could be reduced to 20’. Other suggested changes to dimensional requirements are based on standards used in neighboring towns. What do Planning Board members think about the suggested changes? A Planning Board member asked whether Johnstone’s proposed changes to dimensional requirements are prompted by the State’s pushing for more development and higher-density development. Johnstone said that he has wanted to get approval for some of these proposed changes to the local Land Use Ordinance since before LD 2003 was passed. With the new legislature, LD 2003 might be repealed.

In the first line of the table, Johnstone proposes deleting the minimum lot size requirement in the Rural, Residential, and Route 1 Commercial A districts, which is currently 80,000 s.f. Many of the lots in these three zoning districts are served by municipal water and sewer, and do not need a large minimum lot size in

order to provide adequate separation of on-site waste disposal from drinking water well location. Some towns choose to keep a three-acre minimum lot size in the Rural District in order to have less-dense housing, preserve open space, and encourage farming. Waldoboro could decide to increase the minimum lot size in the Rural District to more than 80,000 s.f., for areas not served by municipal water and sewer. Rich asked at what point Waldoboro might want to re-zone parts of what is currently zoned Rural that are becoming more densely developed due to access to municipal water and sewer. Johnstone said that in such a case, the Planning Board might want to recommend to the Select Board that such a high-density Rural area be re-zoned, perhaps becoming a Rural Village Business District. Such re-zoning might have property tax implications.

In the revised 6.8 Schedule of Dimensional Requirements table (handout p. 6-18, changes shown in red), Johnstone suggests the changes listed below, but is open to suggestions from the Planning Board for other changes. We might decide not to put revisions to the Waldoboro LUO before the voters for approval in June 2023, but instead, wait to see whether LD 2003 is approved, and then review the Waldoboro LUO to confirm that our ordinance complies with LD 2003.

Preserving the historic feel of the Historic Village District: Several Planning Board members expressed concern that the LUO does not have more and stronger language to address preserving and protecting the historic character of the Historic Village District. The LUO has few dimensional requirements for structures and uses in the Historic Village District. There is no minimum lot size, and a very low figure for minimum required road frontage. The Land Use Ordinance should have language that can prevent someone from tearing down an old building in the Historic Village District and dividing the original lot into small strips for inappropriate development that ignores the historic character of the surrounding properties. What can be done to address this in the Ordinance?

Johnstone spoke about Section 7.4 Historic Village District, Architectural Standards, on p. 7-3 in the 2020 LUO. If a developer proposes to build a new structure or remodel a building in the Historic Village District, it is up to the municipal authorities to determine whether the new building or exterior remodeling of an existing building matches the historic character of the neighborhood. A proposal for re-use of the former A.D. Gray school building, which is in the Historic Village District, included construction of an additional storey on top of the existing structure. People were concerned about the appearance of the proposed remodeling/addition.

Johnstone said that the reason that the Historic Village District and Downtown Business District do not have minimum lot size requirements, building setback requirements, and road frontage requirements like those for other land use districts, is that the older buildings in the village were built long before there was a local Land Use Ordinance. This came up recently in connection with the church on the west side of Friendship Road that has recently been converted to secular use. The new owner wanted to divide the property, but was unable to do so because of setback issues.

Suggested revisions to Table 6.8 Schedule of Dimensional Requirements (p. 6-18 of 16-page handout to be reviewed at tonight's meeting):

line 1, delete the minimum lot size figure 80,000 s.f. in the Rural, Residential, and Rt. 1 Commercial A districts, and replace it with the word "none".

line 2, for properties served by public water and sewer, require a minimum lot size of 5,000 s.f. for lots in all districts except Historic Village, Downtown Business, and Industrial, which have no minimum lot size.

line 3, for properties served by public sewer only, minimum lot size 10,000 s.f. except in the Rural Village Business District, where the minimum lot size is 20,000 s.f.

line 4, for properties served by public water only, minimum lot size 20,000 s.f. except in the Rural Village Business District, where the minimum lot size is 40,000 s.f.

line 5, for properties with no public water or sewer: minimum lot size 80,000 s.f. in the Rural district; 40,000 in the Residential district; 80,000 s.f. in the Rural Village Business district; change to 80,000 s.f. in the Rt. 1 Commercial A district; 40,000 s.f. in the Village district; 40,000 s.f. in Route 1 Commercial A and Route 1 Commercial B.

Minutes, Waldoboro Planning Board Mtg. Nov. 10, 2022, p. 5

line 6 Road Frontage: delete figures for minimum road frontage in columns for Rural, Residential, Historic Village, and Route 1 Commercial A, and replace with word “none”. The only district in which there is a minimum road frontage requirement is Industrial, which remains at 200’.

line 7 Public Water & Sewer: add minimum road frontages: Rural 50’; Residential 50’; Historic Village 50’; Route 1 Commercial A 75’.

Line 8 Public Sewer only: add figures Rural 75; Residential 75; Route 1 Commercial 100.

Line 9 Public Water only: add figures Rural 100; Residential 100; Route 1 Commercial A 125.

Line 10 No Public Water or Sewer: add figures Rural 150; Residential 150; Route 1 Commercial A 300.

Line 11 Shore Frontage (ft.) no changes.

Line 12 Road Setback (ft.): Rural, 30; Residential, 30; Village 15; Historic Village 15; Route 1 Commercial A 50; Industrial 75.

Line 13 Side, Rear Setbacks (ft.): Rural 20; Residential, 20; Village, 5; Historic Village 5.

#### Changes to Article 7 General Performance Standards

Johnstone has made changes to correct the numbering of subsections in LUO Article 7 (version adopted by Town Meeting on Nov. 3, 2020). On p. 7-8 of that edition, the subheading 7.10.3.3.10 should be renumbered 7.10.3.3.9.1. Twelve re-numberings should be made on p. 7-8 of the 2020 edition of the LUO. The corrected subheadings are, consecutively: 7.10.3.3.9.1 (no subhead); 7.10.3.3.10 Handheld Signs; 7.10.3.3.11 Name Signs; 7.10.3.3.12 Rentals; 7.10.3.3.13 Creative Architectural Design & Public Art; 7.10. 3.3.13.1 (no subhead); 7.10.3.3.13.2 (no subhead); 7.10.3.3.1.13.3 (no subhead); 7.10.3.3.14 Sale of Real Estate; 7.10.3.3.14.1 (no subhead); 7.10.3.3.14.2 Site Plan Review Sales; 7.10.3.3.14.3 Architect/Contractor Sign.

#### Changes to Article 9 Roads, Parking, Driveways and Traffic Access

No changes were suggested at tonight’s meeting to subsections 9.2.14.6 Narrow Streets, 9.2.14.7 Arterial Street, or 9.2.14.8 Two Street Connections, on p. 9-8 of the 16-page handout being reviewed. On p. 9-9 of the handout, p. 9-9 of the LUO has proofreading correction to the Land Use Ordinance page following the table Subsection 9.2.14.9 Design Standards. The subsection numbers on page 9-9 should all be corrected, to read:

9.2.14.10 Grades, Intersections and Sight Distances

9.2.14.10.1 Conformance to Terrain

9.2.14.10.2 Vertical Curves

9.2.14.10.3 Sight Distances

9.2.14.10.4. Four-Cornered Intersections

9.2.14.11 Sidewalks

9.2.14.11.1 Bituminous Sidewalks

9.2.14.11.1.1 Gravel Aggregate Sub-Base

9.2.14.11.1.2 Crushed Aggregate Base

9.2.14.11.1.3 Bituminous Surface

9.2.14.11.2. Portland Cement Concrete Sidewalks

9.2.14.11.2.1 Sand Base

9.2.14.11.2.2 Concrete

9.2.14.12 Curbing

Erskine asked about whether the proposed change in building setback requirements would affect Janice Cormier-Hay, who runs a children’s gymnastics program in a building at 30 Manktown Road. She had to buy land from an abutter in order to get the required minimum setback of her proposed addition from the property line. Johnstone said that Maine Coast Gymnastics would not be affected by the proposed ordinance changes, because the property is in the Route 1 Commercial A land use district, where the minimum required setback of a building from the property line is 30’ under both the existing LUO and the proposed revision.

Rich asked how often setback issues come up, where people find that they are prohibited from doing the development they seek, and that Waldoboro’s Land Use Ordinance is not in line with those of nearby towns. Johnstone will consult Code Enforcement Officer Waltz to see if there are certain issues where he is having to say No to people frequently in cases where our LUO is different from that in nearby towns.

Minutes, Waldoboro Planning Board Mtg. Nov. 10, 2022, p. 6

Johnstone said that the above LUO changes are the major changes not previously discussed. The rest are changes already talked about at Planning Board meetings. On p. 7-8 of the 16-page handout for tonight's meeting, the changes are to correct the sequence of numbering (changes shown in red). For Section 7.12 Emergency Services, Johnstone is adding a new paragraph of text, at the request of Fire Chief Smeltzer.

On p. 9-8 of the 16-page handout, the street design standards are revised to include specifications for Major Private Street, to require a 60' minimum tangent between curves of reverse alignment; ¼"/ft roadway crown, and 15' minimum curb radii at intersections. These were previously marked "N/A" in the table.

Stults noted that in 9.2.14.9. Design Standards on p. 9-8 of the 16-page handout, the figures for Minimum Angle of Street Intersections should be expressed in degrees, not feet.

On p. 9-9 of the 16-page handout, the number for the section Grades, Intersections and Sight Distances should be 9.2.14.10. The next section, Sidewalks, should be numbered 9.2.14.11.

A Planning Board member asked the meaning of the word "bituminous" in 9.2.14.11. This refers to black-top or hot-top sidewalks or paving.

In subsection 9.2.14.10.3 Sight Distances on p. 9-9 of the handout, McGuirl asked Johnstone about the source of the numbers, which he said differ substantially from the numbers used by the State Dept. of Transportation. Johnstone thought that the Waldoboro sight distance numbers were intended to be the same as the State DOT figures; he will check on this.

Johnstone invited Board input on any of the figures for minimum number of required parking spaces for various uses, on p. 9-14 - 9.16. Kosnow noted that there is no separate category for "laundry" or "laundromat" in the table. Johnstone said "laundry/laundromat" is included under "other uses not listed" at the end of the table, on p. 9-16. He asked Planning Board members to review the parking standards section and think about whether they want to add or delete any specific uses, or change the recommended minimum parking requirements for a use, and give him input before the December 8 Planning Board meeting. The Board can address further changes at that meeting.

#### Changes to LUO Article 10 Specific Performance Standards – p. 10-29 through p. 10-46

These changes were discussed earlier in the year. They include language about shipping containers, and a new subsection 10.35 Renewable Energy Structures (Commercial), about large-scale solar farms, including language about decommissioning plans, performance guarantees, and construction. McGuirl asked about the source of the figure for the amount of the performance bond. Johnstone will check and confirm, but he believes the language comes from the Dept. of Environmental Protection.

McGuirl also had a question about subsection 10.35.2.1, which states that if the applicant or property owner is unable to satisfy the requirements of the performance bond or decommissioning bond upon closure of the site, the Town of Waldoboro will have the right to retain the funding for the purposes of removing the renewable energy structure, including, but not limited to, legal fees and rehabilitation of the site. He asked Johnstone to explain how that would work. Johnstone said the sentence should have read "decommissioning plan" rather than "decommissioning bond". The intent of the wording is to say that if the owner is unable or unwilling to satisfy the requirements of the performance bond and/or decommissioning plan, then the Town of Waldoboro has the right to retain the funds from the performance bond and use these funds to pay for removing the structures and rehabilitating the site.

Page 10-46 includes new Ordinance language about "tiny homes" (10.46), including specific standards. McGuirl questioned the language "residential in appearance" in subsection 10.36.2.5. Some tiny homes use galvanized steel siding on the exterior. That does not look "residential" to him. Johnstone said he was using standard State language here.

#### Article 11 Shoreland Zoning

Johnstone has added a new subsection 11.7.4.7 Photographic Record (p. 11-21 in the 16-page handout being discussed tonight). For projects within the Shoreland Zone, Maine DEP is encouraging towns to adopt a requirement for pre-construction and post-construction photographs of the site, the latter taken no later than 20 days after completion of the project.

Article 15 Definitions

Definitions are proposed to be added for Accessory Dwelling Unit, Large Campground, Small Campground, and Tiny Home. Johnstone will check to see what language other nearby towns are using for “tiny home”. The State’s definition of a “tiny home” is one built on a frame or chassis, of such dimensions as to be legally operable on a public way, but not a trailer, semi-trailer, recreational vehicle, or manufactured home, and not on a permanent foundation. An equivalent-sized residential structure on a permanent foundation would be considered an “accessory dwelling unit”. Johnstone said the local LUO does not have any minimum size limit for a residential structure.

Page 15-6 adds definitions of Campground, Large (more than 10 parties) and Campground, Small (up to 10 parties).

Page 15-30 adds a definition for Tiny Home. Johnstone will check what language other area towns are using for this. Erskine said that the term “camp trailer” in the last line of the definition for Tiny Home probably refers to a travel trailer. Johnstone thinks that the State requires that “tiny homes” must be allowed in any land use district that allows single-family dwelling units. He will confirm that.

Planning Board members asked about the effect of LD 2003 on local ordinances. Johnstone said that the legislature approved LD 2003 earlier this year. Most of its changes will go into effect in July 2023, so towns have time to make any desired changes to local ordinances to conform to the new law. One of the changes Johnstone wants to make to the Waldoboro LUO is to define an accessory structure as one no larger than 750 s.f. There is currently no minimum size limit for a stick-built home in the Waldoboro LUO.

Discussion of changes to the Land Use Ordinance ended at 8:05 p.m.

6. Discussion of Barrels vs. Jersey Barriers at Moody’s Seafood, 1540 Atlantic Hwy. (Tax Map U9 Lot 15)

The site plan for Moody’s Seafood shows use of barrels to control and guide automotive traffic within the lot. Instead of barrels, Scott Moody has installed big concrete “Jersey barriers”. Some people have asked whether this is allowed. Moody says that people like to drive through his parking lot, even with the barrels in place. He wants to be able to retain the Jersey barriers, but is willing to put barrels around the Jersey barriers if the Planning Board so requires. He knows that the barrels are on the approved site plan. If the Planning Board objects to the use of Jersey barriers, he would like to know that as soon as possible.

Erskine recalled that traffic barriers were the first thing the Planning Board talked about in discussing the Moody’s Seafood application. Someone suggested using barrels filled with flowers or seasonal greens. Moody may have presented several alternatives. Erskine thinks that the Planning Board expected that barrels would be used to guide on-site traffic. Johnstone said that there was no specific condition on approval of the site plan, but that the site plan shows “barrels”. Erskine has no strong feelings either way. Stults said that he did not participate in the July 28 Planning Board meeting, at which Moody’s Seafood was discussed. He has looked at the site plan drawings, which show circular barriers that appear to be barrels rather than Jersey barriers. He thinks that barrels filled with flowers, or greens in season, would be a nice touch. McGuirl also did not participate in the July 28 Planning Board meeting. If there was some specific type of traffic barrier that was approved at that meeting, he would like for whatever was approved to get implemented. Rich had no comment.

Johnstone summarized that the applicant wants to use Jersey barriers to control traffic inside the site, but is willing to put barrels outside the Jersey barriers if the Planning Board wants barrels. McGuirl said that placing barrels on-site is not going to solve the problem of vehicles using the site. Not all the people driving through the parking area are Moody’s Seafood customers. Some are just trying to find a way to turn right onto Route One. Johnstone will inform Moody that he should put some barrels around the Jersey barriers to help with the aesthetics. The barrels should be as high as the barriers.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Next regularly-scheduled Planning Board meeting: Thursday, Dec. 8, 6:00 p.m.

Johnstone said he has no applications as yet for the December meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan S. R. Alexander  
Recording Secretary

Action Items – Johnstone

p. 4: Has LD 2003 been passed? Bottom of p. 3 of the draft minutes suggests that it has been passed, but the second paragraph on p. 4 says...”wait to see if LD 2003 is approved”. The two statements don’t agree. Fix!

On p. 4 of the minutes, next to last paragraph, please verify the last sentence, that says that the new owner of the former church on the west side of Friendship Road “wanted to divide the property but was unable to do so because of setback issues.” Either correct the last sentence, or delete it if it is incorrect.

(p. 6) Check to verify whether Waldoboro sight distance numbers are the same as the numbers used by MDOT.

(p. 6) Changes to LUO Art. 10: Check the source of the figure for the amount of the performance bond.

(p. 6) Change wording to read “decommissioning **plan**” rather than “decommissioning bond”.

(p.7) Second line under Article 15 Definitions: Check to see what language other nearby towns are using for “tiny home”, for here and p. 15-30, definition of “tiny home”.

Confirm that the State requires that tiny homes must be allowed in any land use district that allows single-family dwellings.

Change the LUO to define an accessory structure as one no larger than 750 s.f.