

Kingfield Planning Board

Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2024
Location: Webster Hall
Time: 6:00-6:30 Special Meeting
Topic: Jordan Ventures site plan review
Board present: J. Clukey, S. Davis, R. Hawkes, S. Hoisington, B. Smith
Board on Zoom: Richard Hawkes
Board Absent: C. Tranten, M. Wahl;
CEO Absent: Ben Hitchcock
Public: Jonathan Jordan, Kim Jordan, Taylor Jordan

Because the Chair was absent and the Vice Chair was attending by Zoom, Sue Davis, Secretary, called the meeting to order at 6:00. She noted there was a quorum and that Richard Hawkes was attending by zoom.

As this is a special PB meeting with one agenda item, site plan review for Jordan Ventures Contract Zone site plan review application, there will be no other business conducted.

Davis then asked Richard Hawkes to lead the discussion from Zoom.

Jordan Ventures Contract Zoning Application Site Plan Review

Hawkes requested comments from Board members. Davis asked for clarification of the difference between Planning Board Review Criteria and Findings of Fact. Hawkes clarified that the first questions were for Site Plan Review, the second for subdivision applications.

Hawkes then outlined his comments:

1. Approved contract zone application with G1 and G2 not provided.
2. Assume no public hearing needed, as already discussed with public during contract zoning application phase with limited comments and concerns.
3. Septic design provided for one of the units (4@2 units). Confused. Is there one septic field for the two units? Site Plan drawing shows two septic fields? Please clarify.
4. No erosion and sediment control plan provided. 2 proposed dry wells shown for drainage I assume?

Since the applicant is an excavation contractor, rather than an engineered drainage plan, request the applicant provide a written paragraph (statement) on how they will provide appropriate drainage mitigation for the large roof area and impervious pavement area. If nothing is required, so state, with explanation.

5. No landscaping plan showing property line landscape buffers. Note with neighbors saying it will be done later. What is that timeline?
6. No topographical data shown. Note: This lot is very flat. Consider this not required.
7. Form should be completed by PB chair, or designated rep with comments noted.

Hawkes and Davis then moved on to a page-by-page review of the application, which Chair Clay Tranten will sign when he returns.

The checklist for Site Plan Review was checked by the applicant. The PB proceeded to confirm/check the first 10 listed:

1. Signed copy of the application. Yes
2. Copies of covenants, etc. Yes
3. Existing and proposed use of property. Yes
4. Name, address, map and lot number of abutters within 200 feet. Yes

5. Variances requested of the Zoning Board of Appeals: N/A
6. Approved Contract Zone application, including conditions and restrictions (Exhibits G1 and G2) if this is a site plan related to a Contract Zone application: No-one has seen this, neither Kim nor Richard. Mark Wahl doesn't think it is needed. Part of State Law, has to be in the deed registration. Make it a condition that that happens sometime. By-pass for now.
7. Construction schedule, costs and performance guarantee, etc.: previously submitted.
8. Site Plan application fee: pending designation by the Select Board.
9. Is Public Hearing required by the Planning Board? No: hearings held during Contract Zone approval suffices
10. Map requirements: satisfied
11. Supporting documents:
 - a. Topographical features re water, wildlife, archeological, scenic: N/A
 - b. Construction: met
 - c. Elevation view: met
 - d. Circulation: N/A
 - e. MDOT entrance to major route: N/A
 - f. Water/Sewer: met
 - g. Landscaping: has put a buffer up between development and abutters
 - h. Drainage: provided as a written statement at this meeting.
 - i. Erosion/sediment control: Drainage mitigation plan: Applicant has provided a written statement for this.
 - j. Topographical: N/A
 - k. Air emissions: N/A
 - l. Noise: N/A
12. Supporting documents: from municipal officials
 - a. Kingfield Water District
 - b. Fire Chief
 - c. Sewer: Select Board to approve. Two leach fields and two septic tanks, identical systems.
 - d. Road Commissioner

Variance / Waiver Requests, of which there are only two:

1. Density: ordinance requires 40,000 sq.ft. a unit; JV is using 5,738 Sq. ft.
2. Setback for multifamily dwellings: ordinance requires 50' landscape buffer; JV proposes 15'

Planning Board Review Criteria and Standards: The Board went over each of the 19 listed:

1. Preservation of landscape: ✓
2. Relation of Proposed Buildings to the Environment: ✓
3. Vehicle access: ✓
4. Parking and circulation: ✓
5. Surface water drainage: ✓
6. Erosion and sedimentation control: ✓
7. Utilities: ✓
8. Advertising features: ✓
9. Special features: ✓
10. Exterior lighting: ✓
11. Emergency vehicle access: ✓
12. Landscaping: ✓
13. Public and private water supply: ✓ It is public here.
14. Noise: ✓
15. Phosphorous: From shoreland zoning, ✓ or N/A

- 16. Historic location: ✓
- 17. Projects located on sand and gravel aquifers: ✓
- 18. Municipal services: ✓
- 19. Financial and technical capacity: ✓

Rural 1 and 2 districts: N/A

Residential Area: N/A

Select Board action: to pursue G1 and G2

Mark Wahl moved to approve the site plan review, seconded by Jared. Condition is for Select Board or Town Manager to pursue the G1 and G2. The motion passed unanimously.

CEO Ben Hitchcock can now issue a permit. He is in on Fridays.

Babe Smith moved to adjourn, seconded by Jared Clukey, which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Davis, Secretary