

**Kingfield Planning Board  
Informational Meeting**

Date: Tuesday, February 27, 2024  
Location: Webster Hall  
Time: 6:00-7:40  
Topic: Signage, JV CZ application; schedule  
Board present: J. Clukey, S. Davis, R. Hawkes, S. Hoisington, B. Smith, C. Tranten  
Board Absent: M. Wahl  
Public: Wade Browne, Myra Coffin, Terry Coffin, David D...?, John Goldfrank,  
Aaron Hanson, Jonathan Jordan, Kim Jordan, Taylor Jordan, Hunter Lander, Michelle  
Lucy, Jeffrey Maget

Planning Board chair Clay Tranten opened the Informational Meeting. He emphasized that this was not a Public Hearing but rather a meeting to gather information as the PB addresses these topics. The meeting will start with the Signage Ordinance then take up the Jordan Ventures Contract Zoning application.

***Signage Ordinance***

Tranten explained that in preparing the signage ordinance paragraph passed at last June's Town Meeting, he had been told by the Kingfield Town lawyer that Kingfield had a weak sign ordinance, that we needed a stand-alone ordinance. Scott Hoisington accepted the job of putting this together, going from one page within the zoning ordinance to 17 pages for a stand-alone ordinance.

Tranten invited Hoisington to introduce the work done to date. Hoisington explained that the PB started at the Comprehensive Plan, to create an ordinance with as little ambiguity as possible. He started by looking at signage ordinances in place in similar communities, specifically Greenville, Rangeley and Bethel, which he used to put together what the PB thought would fit Kingfield.

In preparation for today's meeting, Richard Hawkes and Hoisington did a physical survey of Kingfield Signs that became a 3-page excel document. About 5% of the signs appear to be non-conforming by this ordinance standards, therefore grandfathered signs. Done partly to aid the code enforcement officer, this list also provides a baseline going forward. Thanks to a long list of CEOs over the years, each with different styles of filing and organization, not even the Town office can locate all of the permits. There may even be 20-30 signs that are not permitted.

***3. Non-Conforming Signs (including grandfathered signs) and A. & B.***

Resident Kim Jordan, manager of Jordan Lumber company, asked for clarification of the non-conforming sign issue. Currently it reads: *The eventual elimination of non-conforming signs is an objective of The Kingfield Sign Ordinance.* Although her sign is grandfathered, she did not like the use of the word "elimination." After much discussion, Planning Board member Sue Davis suggested making the statement positive rather than negative, stressing the mission of having such an ordinance.

The Nostalgia Tavern sign was discussed as an example of a sign that has been abandoned and would thus be removed.

Rob Woodhouse asked about the posts of non-conforming signs. He wonders if the current language suggests that replacing a damaged post would require a new permit and the loss of

grandfathered status. There was much discussion about repair and maintenance that is allowed that still retains the non-conforming status. The language needs clarification. Hawkes proposed that the PB take the action to re-work the language of 3 and 3. A and B.

### ***Village area***

John Goldfrank expressed his concern that the downtown village be treated differently to reflect its historic nature. He feels that as the focal point of the community the village is an important part of Kingfield's marketing and should be restricted accordingly. He thought signage there should be limited and more restrictive.

### ***5. Signs not requiring a permit 5.D. Banners***

Kim Jordan asked about banners—currently 2 are allowed. Clay Tranten expanded that streamers and banners on permanent signs might not be allowed. There is room for clarification with this language.

### ***5.K. Signs on motor vehicles and trailers***

There seemed to be consensus that sign advertising on motor vehicles and trailers that were on private property did not need permitting, whether the vehicles were registered or not. This needs clarification.

The discussion of unregistered vehicles on private property turned into a discussion of junk yards, which require their own permit, and whether the old Knapp's Garage property was properly permitted for the number of old cars on the property.

### ***6. Restrictions & Requirements applicable to all signs. F.1. Lighting of Signs***

Lighting of signs cannot create a safety hazard or glare to motorists, cyclists. Pedestrians were included but all agreed that made no sense and agreed it should be eliminated.

**6. F. 5:** John Goldfrank asked questions about backlit signs and the difference between digital and internally lit, about changing texts vs. static that only changed with a price changed, for example.

### ***8. Temporary signs, pp. 14-15: Flea Market, Special Event signs, etc.***

Flea market, agricultural signs—such as Christmas Tree or Farmers' Markets, roadside stands, etc.—special event signs for the Pops or Kingfield Festival Days, etc., should be clearly defined relative to time allowed. Some, like Kingfield Festival Days, do not conform to site designations when signage is limited, for example.

Under H. 1. and 4., timing is contradictory: H.1. says "*signs shall be placed no earlier than 14 days prior to the event*" but H.4. says "*placed no earlier than 2 days before...*" Also, H.1. says "Signs" and H.4. "Event fulfillment signs." Make an action that H. 1.-5. need clarification.

### ***8. F. and G.: For Sale signs, Construction Site signs***

The ordinance allows For Sale signs on businesses that have closed to remain up for as much as 2 months, to facilitate the sale of the property. [Add mention of property for sale signs being removed after a reasonable time—separate matter?]

Similarly, Davis added that she added that contractors be allowed to leave their signs up on a project that they have finished up to a month after the project is done as a nice way of advertising their work.

### ***9. Enforcement: Violations and Penalties***

Rewrite **9. A.** for greater clarity: New language: *The owner of a sign that is in violation of this ordinance after the effective date shall be in violation until the sign is either removed or brought into compliance.*

Former language: *The owner of a sign which was or is unlawfully erected or maintained either prior to or after the effective date of this ordinance shall be in violation of this ordinance until the sign is either removed or brought into compliance with this ordinance.*

**9. B.** Browne asked about how the PB intended to enforce the ordinance. The paragraph explains the enforcement remedy: the CEO notifies the owner of the sign of the violation. If not remedied, the CEO notifies the municipal officers/Select Board, which notifies the owner by certified mail, return receipt requested. If unsuccessful, the SB then turns to legal action.

#### ***Sign disposal***

Browne then asked who was responsible for the expense of taking signs down for any of the reasons listed in the ordinance. Although not stated in the ordinance, Tranten thought it to be the owner's responsibility, but that sometimes the CEO or Town will need to take the sign down. Browne's point was that the responsibility for the expense should be clearly defined.

#### ***Legal review***

The Planning Board intends to have the signage ordinance and the Jordan Contract Zoning application looked at by lawyers, possibly after its next meeting March 12 where it will incorporate the discussion from today's meeting.

Wade Browne, also a member of the Select Board, cautioned about spending the lawyer's time at c. \$200/hr. on documents that hadn't been fully vetted at the board level. Tranten noted that Maine Municipal Association, which serves Kingfield as a member, could also review documents.

#### ***Jordan Ventures Contract Zoning:***

Planning Board member Richard Hawkes led this review. As he had done with the PB's first contract zoning application, Hawkes created 40 questions for the more complicated WMMH application, reduced to 26 questions for this smaller Jordan Ventures application.

1. Density is the only zoning issue the Jordan's considered affected. Hawkes disagreed, that the landscape buffer with neighbors needed also to be considered. Jonathan noted that he has talked with the two abutters, both of whom saw no problem, which he stated in the application. Jordan added that once the units were complete, should the abutters be concerned, he would fix it. Hawkes requested that this be included in G.1. and 2., as Restrictions and Conditions of the application.
2. Hawkes was concerned that the application was consistent with Comprehensive Plan. That language is included at the beginning of the application, including talk about affordable housing.
3. Re Town water and town sewer: a letter has been received from the water district stating that the projected demand can be met. [Sewer will be on site/private.]
4. Storage will be provided by garage space.

5. Pets: limited to one dog, one cat and renters responsible to pick up dog poop.
6. Other ordinances impacted should be stated: subdivision ordinance is impacted because there are 3 or more dwelling units; shoreland zoning is not involved. The entrance and exit are provided for in plan. Whether the road and driveways are paved should be mentioned.
7. General standards: open space provisions, limited to space over leach fields. How does PB feel about open space over the leach field? Yes, the space mentioned should suffice; there are not many people with only 8 units. The Jordans do not plan on having families with kids. For playing there is a ball field across the street. At the Jordans' project across the street, they have made allowance for gardens by removing cedar trees when requested by the tenants. Contract Zone needs to be aligned with the Comp Plan and what's good for the town including open space when units are built to such density.
8. Hawkes asked if this is to be built to ME Uniform Building and Energy Code (MUBEC). Tranten pointed out that Kingfield has not adopted MUBEC. Jordan assured the PB that they would follow standards. Hawkes suggested that statement needed to be in the application. Since this is private, not state or federally founding, there is no need for inspectors. Permit of occupancy is not built in.
9. Underground power and utilities are required as well as compliance with State fire Marshall requirements for sprinklers.
10. The fire hydrant across the street is not shown on the site plan and should be added.
11. Because the Jordans cite the Comprehensive Plan goal of "housing demand, availability and affordability" in the application, they need to address it. Hawkes recommends that this be included in G. 1 & 2., Conditions and Restrictions. He would like to see the project's rental application and rules and regulations as was provided by WMMH. Tranten demurred that this was a smaller project. Sue Davis added that the Jordans already have a successful history of tenants and their management. Hawkes wanted to know if the Jordan's planned on targeting businesses in Kingfield to try to ensure it touches Kingfield businesses first. Such affordability requirements notwithstanding, their history of rent at \$900/month, curenly at \$775 across the street, is quite affordable. Hawkes only point was that because of the process, there will be other people who need to know that.

After hearing no other comments, Tranten announced that the Public Hearing on this proposal will take place Tuesday, March 19, for both the Sign Ordinance and Jordan ventures. He added that the agenda will also include discussion of the state requirement to have an accessory dwelling unit ordinance in place by July 1.

Browne thought that the schedule was too full and tight. Tranten suggested that we might meet the State deadline by virtue of having the ADU ordinance in process by that time. The PB will make that decision at its next meeting 3/12.

Babe Smith moved to adjourn, seconded by Jared Clukey. With unanimous consent, the meeting adjourned at 7:40.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Davis, Secretary