

**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday April 8, 2025 @ 6:00 PM**  
**City Council Chambers**

**1.Call the Meeting to Order-** Chair Willis called the meeting to order at 6pm.

**2.Roll Call-** Chair Willis, Lisa St. Hilaire, Christian Fox, and Pam Mitchel. Adam Lemire, Jacob Waltman, and Zachary Hanley could not attend. Others present included- Ted Mitchell- representing Echo Properties, Val Bolduc- representing Bolduc Builders, Emil Pazdziorko- abutting property owner, Jim Coffin- Coffin Engineering, and Kris McNeill Code Enforcement Officer.

**3.Public Hearing:** Echo Property Management LLC is proposing to build three- 1100sf single family rentals on an existing lot at 596 Water St. This is a continuation of the application that was tabled at the 3/8/25 meeting. The developer made some adjustments to his site plan, with the help of Jim Coffin. The application is still missing the first-floor elevations- this can be a condition of approval. The applicant has included letters from IFW, MNAP and Kris McNeill Code Enforcement, has given a statement that there is no historic significance about this lot. The developer feels that there will be little to no impact on traffic at this site with approximately twelve vehicle trips per day. There were no other questions. Pam Mitchel moved that this application is complete with the condition of the first-floor elevations needing to be added. Christian Fox seconded the motion. No further discussion. All members present in favor.

**Review Criteria**

**6.5.1.1** The application is complete, and the review fee has been paid.

*We have completed the application, and the fee has been paid.*

**6.5.1.2** The proposal conforms to all the applicable provisions of this Ordinance.

*We feel this proposal complies to applicable provisions.*

**6.5.1.3** The proposed activity will not result in water pollution, erosion, or sedimentation to water bodies.

*Measures will be taken to ensure that no erosion or sedimentation will take place during construction.*

**6.5.1.4** The proposal will provide for the adequate disposal of all wastewater and solid waste.

*All liquid waste will enter the public sewer system and will consist of typical household effluent. Please see letter of approval from Public Works and Wastewater.*

**6.5.1.5** The proposal will not have an adverse impact upon wildlife habitat, unique natural areas, shoreline access or visual quality, scenic areas, and archeological and historic resources.

*This project will not have an adverse impact upon wildlife habitat, unique natural areas, shoreline access or visual quality scenic areas and archeological or historical resources.*

**6.5.1.6** The proposal will not have an adverse impact upon waterbodies and wetlands.

*There are no waterbodies or wetlands on or adjacent to the property.*

**6.5.1.7** The proposal will provide for adequate storm water management.

*The property has not had any storm water issues in years. This project will not alter stormwater run-off nor will it increase the amount of impervious surface on the site.*

**6.5.1.8** The proposal will conform to all applicable Shoreland Zoning requirements.

*This property is in the shoreland residential overlay zone.*

**6.5.1.9** The proposal will conform to all applicable Floodplain Management requirements.

*This property is not within the flood zone.*

**6.5.1.10** The proposal will have sufficient water available to meet the needs of the development.

*This project will use a quantity of water adequate for 3x 1100sf houses. There is not a concern the public water supply will be threatened.*

**6.5.1.11** The proposal will not adversely affect groundwater quality or quantity.

*This project will not adversely affect groundwater quality or quantity.*

**6.5.1.12** The proposal will provide for safe and adequate vehicle and pedestrian circulation in the development.

*We will provide safe and adequate vehicle and pedestrian circulation/access on the property. Each apartment will safely be able to park 2x vehicles in garage and individual driveways. Turn around access and the end of the road will provide appropriate space.*

**6.5.1.13** The proposal will not result in a reduction of the quality of any municipal service due to an inability to serve the needs of the development.

*No, it will not.*

**6.5.1.14** The applicant has the adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the provisions of this Ordinance.

*Yes, we do. Please refer to the statement of financial capacity in appendix.*

## **6.5.2 Site Plan Review Criteria**

**6.5.2.1.** The proposal will be sensitive to the character of the site, neighborhood, and the district in which it is located including conformance to any zoning district specific design standards;

*Yes, we are excited to bring needed inventory to Gardiner and deliver a nice project aesthetic which will not only conform to the community but will add long term value.*

**6.5.2.2** The proposal will not have an adverse impact upon neighboring properties;

*No, it will not. All access for construction will not require any disruption of neighboring properties.*

**6.5.2.3** The proposal contains landscaping, buffering, and screening elements which provide privacy to adjacent land uses in accordance with the appropriate performance standards;

*We will ensure to appropriately provide buffering/screening during construction.*

**6.5.2.4** The building site and roadway design will harmonize with the existing topography and conserve natural surroundings and vegetation to the greatest practical extent such that filling, excavation and earth moving is kept to a minimum.

*Yes, we will deliver a final product that will harmonize and align with existing topography. We will have to remove a few trees for construction. We will however ensure very minimal change to surroundings and vegetation.*

**6.5.2.5** The proposal will reflect the natural capabilities of the site to support the development. Buildings, structures, and other features should be located in the areas of the site most suitable for development.

Environmentally sensitive areas including waterbodies, steep slopes, floodplains, wetlands, significant plant and wildlife habitats, scenic areas, aquifers, and archeological and historic resources shall be preserved to the maximum extent;

*Yes, we are placing each structure in the most appropriate location on the project site. Wetland, wildlife habitat, scenic areas are not applicable on this site.*

**6.5.2.6** The proposal will provide for a system of pedestrian ways within the site appropriate to the development and the surrounding area. The system will connect building entrances/exits with the parking areas and with existing sidewalks, if they exist or are planned in the vicinity of the project;

*The three apartments will not require an additional walkway beyond the driveway access. There is ample, adequate, and safe space for pedestrian access on the site plan.*

**6.5.2.7** In urban and built-up areas, buildings will be placed closer to the road in conformance with setback requirements and parking areas shall be located at the side or rear of the building;

*We will meet all setback requirements. Parking will be located individually per unit (2x spaces per unit) There will be additional turn around space before unit 3 if necessary.*

**6.5.2.8** Proposals with multiple buildings will be designed and placed to utilize common parking areas to the greatest practical extent;

*Yes, there will be additional space and turn around in front/side of unit 3.*

**6.5.2.9** Building entrances will be oriented to the public road unless the layout or grouping of the buildings justifies another approach.

*In this case the homes will be facing the driveway access. The site plan illustrates the orientation. The site plan demonstrates setback requirements are met and the three apartments layout efficiently.*

**6.5.2.10** Exterior building walls greater than 50 feet in length which can be viewed from the public road will be designed with a combination of architectural features with a variety of building materials and shall include landscaping abutting the wall for at least 50% of the length of the wall.

*None of the three apartments will have the length of 50'.*

**6.5.2.11** Building materials will match the character of those commonly found in the City and surrounding area including brick, wood, native stone, tinted/textured concrete block, or glass products. Materials such as smooth-faced concrete block or concrete panels and steel panels will only be used as accent features. Materials shall be of low reflectance, subtle, neutral or earth tone colors. High-intensity and bright colors shall be prohibited except when used as trim or accent. Building materials for industrial or commercial buildings located within an approved industrial park or subdivision are not required to comply with this provision.

*Yes, the materials being utilized for this project will align and harmonize with the community. We will be using asphalt shingles for the roof material. We will be using Truwall vinyl siding for each home.*

**6.5.2.12** Building entrances and points where the development intersects with the public road and sidewalk will be provided with amenities appropriate for the area such as benches, bike racks, bus stop locations and other similar landscape features.

*Not applicable to this project.*

**6.5.2.13** A proposal which includes drive-through service will be designed to minimize impact on the neighborhood. Drive-through lanes will be fully screened from adjacent residential properties and communication systems will not be audible on adjacent properties. *The driveway access will adequately and safely provide access to the three apartments. There is no drive-through service on the driveway.*

**Waivers-** *the applicant did not request any waivers.*

Board members looked at Section 7 and felt that all the requirements had been met. Section 8 reviews lighting. This application does not require a lighting plan. 8.9 is exterior material storage. There will be a dumpster, and it will be screened. There will be a fence down both sides of the property and there will also be some plantings. Section 9- There is a stormwater management plan now, so that need is met. Section 10- the developer does not think that he will be using a sign. Kris McNeill Code Enforcement reminds the applicant that with three dwellings, this driveway/road will need a name as a private road. . There was some discussion about road frontage, but this is an existing lot, so that does not apply.

Pam Mitchel moves that the application meets the standard of Gardiner's LUO with the condition of the first-floor elevations be included. Christian Fox seconded the motion. Chair Willis asked if there was anyone in the audience that had questions or comments. Emil Pazdziorko is an abutting property owner and was here for the previous meeting. Mr. Pazdziorko reported that all of his questions have been answered and he looking forward to this project. There was no further discussion. All members present in favor.

Pam Mitchel moves to approve this project with the previously mentioned condition. Christian Fox seconded the motion. No further discussion. All members present in favor.

Application approved.

**4. Public Hearing:** Valerien Bolduc is proposing to subdivide Map26A-Lot015A at Orchard St into eight separate lots, including road. Mr. Bolduc is here to present his information. This is a simple 8 lot housing subdivision. He does not have information about the homes that will be built, he is requesting a land division only at this time. There is one house currently done and just sold. He is ready to start the second home, after this project is approved. He tells the board that he and his son will be working on this project for at least three years. This application is more about dividing the land up right now. The Board decided that there should be a neighborhood meeting for this project, and also a site inventory analysis. A neighborhood meeting and site walk was scheduled for May 6<sup>th</sup> and this meeting will be treated as a site inventory analysis.

The applicants has standing, and board members agree that they can hear this application without bias. City staff did not obtain any outside services to process this application. This project is at the end of an existing subdivision. This lot was not part of the existing subdivision. The applicant has worked with the City and the Public Works director to build the road for this proposed subdivision, per city standards. Mr. Bolduc would like to have the road taken over by the City when the project is done if possible. Chair Willis opened the public hearing at 6:50pm. Margaret Harvey, co- owner of a property that abuts this lot, informs the board that this is ancestral home, and they are concerned about the rock wall being further damaged because people that abut the property have taken sections of it apart. After talking with Mr. Bolduc, she feels that they can work together, and has no concerns at this time. Jon Stonier is a direct abutter. He is not concerned about the development, but he is concerned about additional traffic and the current state of the road. There were no other questions. Chair

Willis closed the public hearing at 7:10pm, Board members discussed items that the application is missing in order for them to proceed with review any further. The application should include a list of abutters, a FIRM map, wet land map, showing where the wetlands are in relation to this project, tax map, a letter from MNAP, and also a map showing where local water wells are in the area.

The board decided to table this application and review again at the May 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. There will be a Site Walk/Neighborhood meeting, on site on May 6<sup>th</sup>. The board will review this application as Preliminary and Final Subdivision at the May 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Pam Mitchel moves that the Site Inventory Analysis is complete. The Board identified several items that the application will need, for when it returns to Planning Board in May. Christian Fox seconded the motion. No further discussion. All members present in favor.

- 1. Public Hearing:** To review possible amendments to the Land Use Ordinance- 4.4.1 Planning Board approval deadlines. Pam Mitchel moves to send this to City Council with the recommendation to approve. Lisa St. Hilaire seconded the motion. No further discussion. All members present, in favor.
- 2. Public Hearing:** To review possible amendments to Section 10 of the Land Use Ordinance- LD2003 Requirements- Lisa St. Hilaire moves to send this change to City Council with the recommendation to approve. Pam Michel seconded the motion. No further discussion. All members present in favor.
- 3. Other Business-** Nothing at this time.
- 4. Adjourn-** Pam Mitchel moved to adjourn at 8:04 pm. Lisa St. Hilaire seconded the motion. No further discussion. All members present, in favor. Adjourn at 8:04 pm.