

Final Signing Copy, with PW changes incorporated.

Minutes  
Town of Waldoboro  
Planning Board Meeting  
September 9, 2009

Contents

1. Minutes of August 26, 2009
2. Citizen Comments on Items not on the Agenda
3. Site Plan Review, Addition to Waldoboro Family Medicine Office, 27 Mill St. (Map U10 Lot 24)
4. Approval of One-Lot Subdivision, Carey, 31 Friendship St. (Map U4 Lot 8)
5. Subdivision Review, 10-Lot Subdivision, MacFarlane, Genthner Road (Map R3 Lot 34)
6. Approval of Amendment to Sunset Ridge Subdivision, Brown (Map R-16, Lots 55-1, 55-2, 55-3, 55-4)
7. Letter about Stormwater Management from Owner of Skyview Ridge Mobile Home Park
8. Handling Public Input at Public Hearings
9. Next Meetings: Ordinance Revision Meeting and Public Hearing Thursday Sept. 10, 7:00 p.m.; Next Regular Planning Board Meeting Wednesday, October 14, 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by chairman Chuck Campbell at 7:00 p.m in the meeting room at the Municipal Building. Other members present were Carlo Bianchi, Chuck Flint, Ed Karkow, JoAnn Myers, Jody P, and Abden Simmons. (Karkow and Simmons left before the end of the meeting, but a quorum was present throughout.) Code Enforcement Officer Patrick Wright was present. The audience included Charles Brock, Wayne Brown, Joe Carey, Tom Catalano, Michael Hogan, Gerry Lupien, Tyler Lupien, Mike Martunas, John H. Mathieson, Douglas McGee, Ted Mohlie (until 7:55 p.m.), David A. Starr, Jr., and Waite Weston.

1. Minutes of August 26, 2009

On motion of Myers/Karkow, the Board voted 6 - 0 – 1, Simmons abstaining, to approve the minutes of August 26 with two corrections on p. 4. In the fourth paragraph, “a man” was changed to “Ron Miller”. At the start of the next paragraph, Dick Mogel’s last name was misspelled.

2. Citizen Comments on Items not on the Agenda – none

3. Site Plan Review, Addition to Waldoboro Family Medicine, 27 Mill St. (Map U10 Lot 24)

Tom Catalano of Catalano’s Construction, Inc., of Thomaston and Dr. Ted Mohlie of Waldoboro Family Medicine were present to review plans for an addition to the medical office building. A 896 s.f. addition is planned on the back of the building and 530 s.f. of the existing space will be renovated. The project will provide a second bathroom, conference room, administrative offices and secure storage of medical records.

Catalano said the project must be reviewed by the State Fire Marshal’s office and obtain a permit. Local approval is prerequisite to approval by the State Fire Marshal’s office. The application

includes several waiver requests. The applicant requests waiver of certain elements of a full site plan (such as drainage and soils) because the proposed project is small and simple. CEO Wright read into the record the text of Article 6 Site Plan and Subdivision Review Section B. 4. Waivers on p. 6-3 of the June 2009 revision of the Land Use Ordinance. "In cases where development or expansion will not significantly change the nature or intensity of the use... or have no discernable impact on adjoining property or the environment or public infrastructure, the Planning Board may waive the review procedure and all or portions of the submission requirements...if the information is not required to determine compliance with the standards of this Ordinance."

CEO's oral report: Wright has visited the site and confirms that the location of the proposed addition is relatively flat and level, that minimal grading will be necessary for the slab foundation, and that there is already more parking than required under the Ordinance. Wright finds that if the Planning Board agrees to the requested waivers, the application appears to meet ordinance requirements.

### Waiver Requests

The application includes a four-page statement addressing all the requirements of Land Use Ordinance Article 4 General Performance Standards, Article 5 Specific Performance Standards, and Article 6 Site Plan and Subdivision Review. The last page of this statement lists and explains the waiver requests. The item numbers are taken from the Site Plan Submission Checklist. Waiver requests are as follows:

#### Existing Conditions Plan

- c) existing contours – request waiver because the site is flat and earth disturbance during construction will be minimal
- f) existing utilities – request waiver

#### Proposed Conditions Plan

- c) contours at 2-foot intervals – request waiver. There will be no change in contours after construction. Wright said that the Planning Board submission checklist lists two-foot contours after construction as "SD\*", meaning "occasionally needed for subdivisions". Two-foot post-construction contours are not indicated on the checklist as required for site plans.
- l) utility plan – request waiver: not necessary because the project will tie in to existing utilities
- m) landscaping plan including buffering and screening – waiver request because existing tree screen will remain and is adequate.
- n) professional certification: Catalano's written explanation, also given orally at the meeting, is that professional certification is required by the State Fire Marshal's office. He said the final approval drawings will be stamped. The drawings presented at tonight's meeting are not the final drawings and are not stamped. If the Planning Board approves the un-stamped plans, they will be stamped and sent to the Fire Marshal's Office. Catalano requested that the Planning Board approve the plans with a note that approval is contingent upon approval from the State Fire Marshal's office.

Campbell said he has a problem with approving plans that are not final and that lack professional certification.

#### 6. Written Documentation

- h) hydrological ground water assessment: Waiver is requested because there is no reason to believe that the project is located in a problem area.

- r) storm water management plan in compliance with Art. 4 Section R: Waiver is requested for the same reason that applicant requested waiver of the requirement to show existing contours and proposed post-construction contours. Construction sheet AO shows water flowing away from the existing building and proposed addition into swales. Catalano's written submission (p. 2, third and fourth lines from top of page) states that the proposed addition "will not increase the stormwater runoff in any way". A Planning Board member pointed out that the amount of impervious area will increase after construction, which may increase velocity of runoff.
- t) traffic impact analysis is requested to be waived because the increase in traffic will be fewer than two cars per hour. The Planning Board ruled this item not applicable.
- w) Construction schedule: The Planning Board agreed that the construction schedule contained in 6 w is sufficient. No waiver is required.
- x) Estimated volumes of water and sewerage: The Planning Board agreed to waive this, because no more people are expected to use the building after the addition is complete. No increase in volume of water or sewerage is expected. The facility is served by public water and sewer.
- y) Statement from the public utility that it has the capacity to accommodate the project: Not necessary, because the volumes of water and sewerage are not expected to increase. See x) above.

Waiver of the storm water management plan was approved, without discussion, by a separate vote on motion of Myers/Karkow and a vote of 6 – 1, Campbell opposed.

On motion of Bianchi/Karkow, the Board voted 6 – 1, Campbell opposed, to grant the waivers listed: existing contours, existing utilities, post-construction two-foot contours, post-construction storm water management plan, post-construction utility plan, landscaping including buffering and screening, professional certification (will be on final plans), hydrological ground water assessment, storm water management plan in conformance with Section 4. R, traffic impact analysis, estimated volumes of water and sewerage, and statement from utility providing water or sewer services. The requested waiver for construction schedule was deemed unnecessary, as the statement in the waiver request was accepted as a construction schedule (start in September with a 3 – 4 month completion).

Discussion: Campbell was unhappy about the lack of professional certification on the plans the Planning Board is asked to approve. He also felt that the site plan is inadequate. He would have liked to have the property boundaries shown on the site plan. For these reasons, he voted against granting the waivers requested. Flint asked whether the existing tree screening will completely screen the proposed addition from adjacent residences. Dr. Mohlie said existing trees would not completely screen the addition from adjacent residences.

#### Determination of Completeness of Application

Catalano said there are a few changes made on the full-size site plan that are not included on the reduced set of plans sent to Planning Board members. There are two changes on p. 1, addition of an approval block, and on p. A-3 addition of a wall in one place in order to turn a 64 s.f. alcove into a separate lockable room for secure storage of computerized medical records. This latter requirement is a federal requirement discovered during a recent federal inspection of Penobscot Bay Medical Center. Waldoboro Family Medicine is a department of Penobscot Bay Medical Center.

Campbell and the Planning Board then went through the Site Plan Submission Checklist noting whether applicable items have been received, or subject to waiver request, or not applicable. The project is an expansion of an existing non-residential building. 12 copies of the plan and application have been received. The fee has been paid. A locus map and location map have been submitted, but not a boundary survey.

4. Existing conditions plan:

The following elements were waived: c) existing contours; f) existing utilities; m) name, registration number of professional who prepared plan (this will be on the final site plan prepared for Board signature). The following elements were found not applicable: g) significant features; h) wetland delineation by a professional wetlands delineator; k) easements. All other items have been received.

5. Proposed conditions plan:

The following items were waived: c) contours at two-foot intervals; i) storm water management plan (waived by separate vote, 6 – 1, Campbell opposed); l) utility plan; m) landscaping plan including buffering and screening; n) professional certification (will be on final approval drawings). All other applicable items have been received.

6. Written documentation:

The following items were waived: r) storm water management plan; x) estimated volumes of water and sewerage; y) statement that the utility providing water or sewer services has capacity to accommodate the project. All other applicable items have been received, with one exception: v) evidence of financial capacity to construct the project. A letter from a bank will be provided. Approval of the project is conditional on the applicant providing a letter on financial capacity satisfactory to the Code Enforcement Officer.

On motion of Bianchi/Myers, the Board voted 7 – 0 to find that all application elements for the Waldoboro Family Medicine expansion project have either been received, are not applicable, or have been waived, with the exception of evidence of financial capability and a permit from the State Fire Marshal's Office.

Determination Regarding Public Hearing

Chairman Campbell asked whether anyone in the audience wished to speak for or against the proposed project. No one spoke. Campbell determined that a public hearing is not necessary.

Worksheet for Planning Board Review

Campbell and the Planning Board then went through the Site Plan Worksheet for Planning Board Review, determining for each listed performance standard whether it is applicable and conforming, applicable and not conforming, inapplicable, or waived.

Article 4 General Performance Standards

The following general performance standards were found applicable and conforming: A) air emissions; C) construction standards (it was noted that the EMS Director made a comment about stretcher accessibility); D) electrical disturbances; G) lighting and glare; H) net developable acreage calculation; I) noise; J) parking and loading; L) refuse disposal; M) sanitary provisions; O) soils; P) soil erosion and sedimentation control; S) street access and driveways. The following were waived: B) buffer areas; R) storm water management. The following were found not applicable: E) Historic Village District architectural standards; F) hydrogeologic assessment of groundwater impacts; K) phosphorus control; N) signs; Q) storage of materials; T) street/road standards; U) traffic impact analysis; V) water quality impacts.

Vote: On motion of Myers/Bianchi, the Board voted 7 – 0 that all general performance standards are either applicable and conforming, not applicable, or waived.

Article 5 Specific Performance Standards: On motion of Myers/Bianchi, the Board voted 7 – 0 that none of the specific performance standards are applicable.

#### Article 6 Planning Board Approval Criteria for Site Plan Review

The following approval criteria were found applicable and conforming: 1) pollution; 2) sufficient water (on public water supply); 3) soil erosion and sediment control; 4) highway or public road congestion; 5) solid waste and sewerage waste disposal; 6) aesthetic, cultural and natural values; 7) conformity with Town ordinances and plans; 10) ground water; 18) access to direct sunlight; 19) exterior lighting; 21) noise; 23) landscaping; 24) buffering of residential uses; 25) location of off-street parking.

The following item was found applicable but not conforming: 8) financial and technical capability – approval will be conditional on receipt of a satisfactory letter on financial capability.

The following items were waived: 14) storm water; 20) buffering of adjacent uses.

The following were found not applicable: 9) shoreland zoning; 11) flood areas; 12) freshwater wetlands; 13) river, stream or brook; 15) spaghetti lots; 16) lake phosphorus concentration; 17) impact on adjoining municipality; 22) storage of materials; 26) hazardous waste.

Vote: On motion of Myers/Bianchi the Board voted 7 – 0 that all approval criteria in Article 6 are either applicable and conforming, not applicable, or waived, with the exception of proof of financial capability. A letter on this is needed from a financial institution.

Vote: On motion of Bianchi/Myers, the Board voted 6 – 1, Campbell opposed, to approve granting a permit for the expansion and renovation of the office of Waldoboro Family Medicine, subject to receipt of a permit from the State Fire Marshal's Office and proof of financial capability satisfactory to the Code Enforcement Officer.

This agenda item ended at 8:05 p.m.

#### 4. Approval of One-Lot Subdivision, Carey, 31 Friendship St. (Map U4 Lot 8)

Owner Joe Carey and David Starr, Jr., of J. & D. Engineering & Surveying were present for review of Carey's plans to create a separate lot at 31 Friendship St. in order to be able to build a third unit within five years, thus triggering subdivision review. Carey said he has nothing specific in mind for a building. If it is a residential unit, it need not come before the Planning Board for a building permit, but a commercial use would require Planning Board review, Wright said.

The lot is located next to the driveway down to Storer Lumber, behind the Carey apartment building and the Weston Building. The proposed new lot would have access over a deeded right-of-way over the existing driveway. Wright has visited the site, which is fairly steep. The general area has some stormwater issues. Carey has asked for waiver of the requirement to show contours. Wright said his only concern is stormwater management. There is evidence of channel formation now.

#### List of waiver requests

Existing conditions plan:

existing contours: because creation of a separate lot will not alter the existing contours

existing surface water drainage: because creation of a separate lot will not alter the existing drainage on the property

Proposed conditions plan

two-foot contours: Applicant requests a waiver from the requirement to show two-foot contours because the proposed activities on the lot will not alter the existing contours. A Planning Board member pointed out that we don't know the nature of future development of the proposed lot.

Soil erosion and sedimentation control plan: Applicant requests waiver because no change of use of the lot is proposed at this time.

Storm water management plan: Applicant requests waiver because no construction or change of use is being requested at this time.

Street/road standards: Applicant requests waiver because the lot is accessible by existing roads, driveway and right-of-way.

Vote: On motion of Bianchi/Myers, the Board voted 6 – 0 to waive item T under Article 4 General Performance Standards, street/road standards, because no new roads are proposed.

Discussion of request to waive existing contours and existing surface water drainage: Planning Board members conceded that no impervious surface is being added and that creation of a separate lot will not alter contours or increase runoff velocity. These items could be required conditional upon plans for a future building on the proposed lot. Myers said it would be up to the builder of the proposed building to provide this information. Bianchi said he thinks existing surface water drainage and existing contours are necessary information. Flint asked if the Planning Board can place a condition that any application for construction on the proposed lot include information about stormwater management. CEO Wright said he does not know whether this could be required for a residential use. He read aloud from the section of the Land Use Ordinance on General Performance Standard R, Storm Water Management (p. 4-16 – 4-17 of the June 2009 revision), “A storm water management plan shall be prepared for.. .subdivision applications... and be designed so that the post-development storm water runoff does not exceed the pre-development storm water runoff for the 24-hour duration, 2-, 10- and 25-year frequency storm events.” Wright suggested that if a storm water management plan were set as a condition for granting a building permit on the proposed lot, then it could be required. He suggested making this a condition on approval of the one-lot subdivision. Myers suggested making the stormwater management plan a condition on approval of a building permit for either a residential or a non-residential building on the proposed lot. She suggested that Wright check on the legality of such a condition. If it turns out to be improper, then the Code Enforcement Officer can ignore it.

Vote: On motion of Myers/Karkow, the Board voted 7 – 0 to waive the requirements for existing contours, existing surface water drainage, proposed contours, and a soil erosion and sedimentation control plan.

The Planning Board then went through the submission checklist to determine completeness of the application. The application is for a one-lot subdivision. 12 copies of the plan and application have been received. The fee has not yet been paid. A locus map, location map and boundary survey have been provided. In the existing conditions plan, existing contours and existing surface water drainage are waived. Wetlands delineation and existing signs were deemed not applicable. All other submission elements have been received.

In the proposed conditions plan, contours at a two-foot interval and soil erosion and sediment control plan are waived. All other submission elements were found either not applicable or received.

Under written documentation, a soil erosion and sedimentation control plan in compliance with LUO Article 4 Section P is waived. Evidence of title to the property, description of proposed use, net developable acreage calculation, evidence of technical capability and financial capacity have been received. All other elements in the checklist of written documentation were found inapplicable.

Vote: On motion of Myers/Bianchi, the Board voted 7 – 0 to find all application elements either received, not applicable, or waived, except that the fee has not been paid.

Chairman Campbell asked if anyone in the audience wishes to speak about this agenda item. No one spoke. Campbell concluded that a public hearing is not necessary.

#### Worksheet for Planning Board Review of a Subdivision

Campbell and the Planning Board then went through the checklist for subdivision review. The application is for a one-lot subdivision.

Under Article 4 General Performance Standards, the net developable acreage calculation is applicable and conforming. Stormwater management is applicable but not conforming. On motion of Myers/Simmons, the Board voted 7 – 0 that as part of approval of any development of the proposed lot, the owner must present a stormwater management plan that meets the requirements of Article 4 Section R Storm Water Management in the Land Use Ordinance. All other general performance standards were found not applicable.

Under Article 5 Specific Performance Standards, none of the listed uses were found applicable to creation of a one-lot subdivision.

Under Article 6 Planning Board Approval Criteria for Subdivision Review, the following items were found applicable and conforming: pollution; sufficient water; highway or public road congestion; aesthetic, cultural and natural values; conformity with Town ordinances and plans; financial and technical capability; groundwater; and access to direct sunlight. Soil erosion and sediment control was waived. All other items were found not applicable.

Vote: On motion of Bianchi/Myers, the Board voted 7 – 0 that all elements of the Carey subdivision application are either applicable and conforming, not applicable, or waived, except that storm water management shall comply with the provisions of Land Use Ordinance Article 4 Section R Storm Water Management.

Vote: On motion of Myers/Bianchi, the Board voted 7 – 0 to approve that a permit for a one-lot subdivision be issued by the Code Enforcement Officer with the condition that a satisfactory storm water management plan be submitted prior to issuance of any building permit for construction or development on the lot.

5. Subdivision Review, 10-Lot Subdivision, MacFarlane, Genthner Road (Map R3 Lot 34)

Surveyor John Mathieson was in representing owner Sandra MacFarlane, who wants to develop a ten-lot subdivision called Five Mast Subdivision on her land on the south side of Genthner Road. An informal pre-application meeting with the Planning Board was held in November 2008.

Mathieson said he has tried to minimize road cuts on Genthner Road. There are two existing road cuts, one for an existing woods road that crosses the property. His subdivision plan calls for two lots to share a single curb cut onto Genthner Road. There is an existing cabin on proposed Lot 10. It lacks electricity. Mathieson said he walked the property with soils evaluator Doug Meservey. All proposed house sites and in-ground septic test sites are in upland locations. Lot lines are designed to be in low lying areas where the existing drainage is. Forested wetlands are good for filtering out contaminants. The parcel is in the flowage of Duck Puddle Pond, but is 1000 feet away from any sensitive area.

Code Enforcement Officer's oral report

Wright said Mathieson submitted application materials in July, and has since added some missing material. Wright believes the application is now complete.

Determination of Completeness using Submission Checklist

There are no requests for waivers.

Chairman Campbell and the Planning Board went through the subdivision submission checklist. All elements of the existing conditions plan have been received except for inapplicable items (existing signs, easements). The locations of the nearest fire-fighting water supply are given in the written material (p. 5-6). All elements of the proposed conditions plan are either received or not applicable, except for post-construction two-foot contours around the road. Mathieson said he will provide these. Landscaping, buffering and screening are not required for this subdivision. The home sites are wooded. All elements of the written documentation have either been submitted or are not applicable. It appears that all elements of the application are either received or inapplicable, except for two-foot contours around the road as-built.

Audience questions: Chairman Campbell then opened the meeting to questions from the audience. Abutter Doug McGee asked why the Board found that a traffic impact analysis is not applicable. He was told that the volume of automotive traffic generated by the proposed development does not meet the threshold for requiring a traffic impact analysis. See page 4-27 of the June 2009 Land Use Ordinance, Article 4 General Performance Standards Section U Traffic Impact Analysis: this is required "if the project...will provide parking for fifty (50) or more vehicles or generate more than one hundred (100) trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour". McGee asked how the increase in impermeable area from roofs will impact the area, which is wet already. Campbell said a stormwater management plan has been submitted. According to the Ordinance, storm water is not allowed to leave the developed site any faster than it does now, pre-development. McGee also asked whether Genthner Road has the capacity to handle the increased traffic from a 10-lot subdivision. (No answer is recorded.)

Mike Martunas, who owns land on the north side of Genthner Road across from the proposed subdivision, asked why water and sewer were called "inapplicable" in the Board's review of the submission checklist. He was told that the lots are on individual wells and in-ground waste disposal

systems, not connected to a public sewer. Soil test forms have been submitted for each lot showing suitable soils for in-ground waste disposal systems.

On motion of Flint/Myers the Board voted 5 – 0 to find that the application is incomplete for lack of two-foot contours along the subdivision road after construction. The Planning Board therefore did not go through the performance standards checklist. (Karkow and Simmons left the meeting before the vote.)

Discussion of this agenda item ended at 9:40 p.m.

6. Approval of Amendment to Approved Sunset Ridge Subdivision, Brown (Map R-16, Lots 55-1, 55-2, 55-3, 55-4)

Architect Michael Hogan of The Maine Group was present to explain changes to the approved subdivision plan for Lots 3 through 6 of Sunset Ridge subdivision, approved in 2005. Owner Wayne Brown was in the audience. A revised subdivision plan shows changes in the as-built locations of driveways and house locations and alteration of the lot line between Lots 4 and 5.

The four lots in question are in the Duck Puddle watershed. The phosphorus management plan calls for a 250-foot buffer width. Some of the lots were not wide enough to accommodate the full buffer width, so part of the area west of the subdivision will be used as part of the phosphorus buffer. A 166-foot wide swath is shown on the subdivision plan adjacent to Lots 3 through 6. (See undated sheet titled “Phosphorus Control Plan for Lots in Duckpuddle Watershed, Sunset Ridge Subdivision”. This was attached to Drew Greiner’s letter dated August 28, 2009, part of Planning Board materials distributed in advance of tonight’s meeting.)

A reduced copy of the revised subdivision plan for Sunset Ridge is dated August 25, 2009, and contains four revision notes. A full-size mylar and paper copies will be provided for Board signature at a future meeting. Hogan also gave out copies of Waldoboro Tax Map R-16 showing the Sunset Ridge subdivision in light orange, and other adjacent land of Brown in pink, yellow, and blue.

Code Enforcement Officer’s report: Wright received a request for a building permit for Lot 6. On inspection, he found that the driveway as constructed did not match the driveway location shown on the subdivision plan. This requires amendment of the subdivision plan. On Lot 3, a house was built within the designated phosphorus buffer. The August 28, 2009 letter from Surveyor Drew Greiner, who calculated the original phosphorus buffer, states that Lot 3 needed only an 80-foot-wide phosphorus buffer but that he had shown a uniform 250-foot buffer “in order to square out the buffer area”. Greiner’s letter states that there is “plenty of buffer to cover the runoff needs of Lot 3”.

Wright said that a condition of the subdivision approval was that the location of the phosphorus buffer should be specified in the deed to each affected property. This has not been done. Brown said he will do this on future deeds.

Bianchi said that several neighbors have complained recently about the condition of Sunset Ridge Road. They were having to repair it at their own expense. Wright’s site inspection showed that parts of the stormwater management plan have not been implemented. Wright said that Brown has given the Town a performance bond for completion of the structures and features of the approved stormwater management plan.

Bianchi asked how much wetland alteration has been done, and where. Hogan said a driveway has been put through a wetland in a location not shown on the approved subdivision plan. The total wetland alteration is still below 4300 s.f. The Dept. of Environmental Protection has inspected the site. The subdivision as revised is still well below the threshold.

Chairman Campbell asked for any comments from the audience. No one spoke, although an owner in the subdivision was present.

On motion of Myers/Flint, the Board voted 5 – 0 to accept the proposed revisions to Sunset Ridge Subdivision as shown on the revised subdivision plan and detailed in the letter dated August 26, 2009 from Michael Hogan of The Maine Group regarding changes to Lots 3 through 6 on the subdivision plan. Hogan will supply copies of the full-scale revised subdivision plan for signature.

#### 7. Letter about Stormwater Management from Owner of Skyview Ridge Mobile Home Park

Chairman Campbell read aloud a letter from Andy Roberts, owner of Skyview Ridge Mobile Home Park, addressed to Patrick Wright. (This letter was not on the agenda and was not part of Board materials for tonight's meeting.) At the August 12 Planning Board meeting, the Board voted to get an opinion from the Knox-Lincoln County Soil and Water Conservation District regarding stormwater runoff from the whole mobile home park as it may affect the two proposed new mobile home sites (lots A and B) (see August 12 minutes, middle of page 7). The Public Works Director/Road Commissioner says there are significant stormwater management issues at the mobile home park. The Town does not have a stormwater management plan for the park as a whole, because the park predates the Land Use Ordinance. Roberts's letter says he does not want to commission a stormwater management plan for the whole park because of the expense. Drew Greiner has done stormwater calculations for proposed Lots A and B and concludes that "there should be no more erosion out at the street after the development than before the proposed development" of these two lots.

Wright offered to review Greiner's calculations and give the Planning Board a report of his findings and opinion. Campbell said Wright should do this, with attention to two items:

- a) a person from Knox-Lincoln County Soil and Water Conservation District has said that doing a stormwater calculation only for two proposed lots downslope near Friendship Street is not adequate and does not address what the Land Use Ordinance requires;
- b) whether it is true that runoff from above these two lots does not affect the stormwater calculations for the two lots.

#### 8. Handling Public Input at Public Hearings

There was discussion of how to handle procedural issues during public hearings. No one should speak until recognized by the chairman or meeting moderator. Board members wishing to reply to a question or statement from the audience should be recognized by the chairman or moderator.

#### 9. Next Ordinance Revision Meeting and Public Hearing: Thursday September 10, 7:00 p.m.; Next Regular Planning Board Meeting: Wednesday, October 14, 7:00 p.m.

Board members agreed not to hold an ordinance revision workshop on the fourth Wednesday in September.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

---

Charles Campbell, Chairman

---

Carlo P. Bianchi

---

Charles Flint

---

Edward Karkow

---

JoAnn Myers

---

Jonathan Perry

Submitted by:

---

Susan S. R. Alexander

---

Abden Simmons

WALDOBORO PLANNING BOARD