

Town of North Yarmouth
Planning Board
Meeting Minutes of April 13, 2021
Remote Zoom Meeting
(recording is available via [Town Hall Streams](#))

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 PM. Present: Audrey Lones (Chairperson), Chris Cabot (Secretary), Sandra Falsey (Board Member), Gary Bahlkow (Board Member), Chris Gordon (Board Member), Kimry Corrette (Alternate) & Ryan Keith (CEO)

II. Minutes Approval

a. March 9, 2021

Audrey Lones motioned to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2021 Planning Board Meeting as presented; Chris Cabot seconded the motion. Discussion.

Vote 5 Yes 0 No

b. January 13, 2021 – Village Center Estates Phase II Site Walk

Audrey Lones motioned to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2021 Planning Board Meeting as presented; Chris Gordon seconded the motion. Discussion.

Vote 3 Yes 0 No

c. March 24, 2021 – York Ridge Major Subdivision Site Walk

The minutes of the York Ridge Major Subdivision Site Walk were tabled until the May Planning Board Meeting.

III. Old Business

a. Major Subdivision Application – Final Approval for Village Center Estates Phase II

The applicant requested to table the final approval.

IV. New Business

a. Major Subdivision Application – York Ridge Major Subdivision

b. Gary motioned to accept his email from 3/10, 3/15 & 3/25 into the public record (SEE ATTACHMENT A, B & C); Chris Cabot seconded the motion. Discussion.

Vote 5 Yes 0 No

Charlie Burnham, Atlantic Resource Consultants, LLC, on behalf of Construction Aggregate, Inc, reviewed and discussed the details for the for the proposed York Ridge Major Subdivision project with the Planning Board.

The applicant proposes a 13-lot residential subdivision, and it is located off of Rt 115 on the Gray Road on a portion of Map 010 Lot 071. This is Phase 1 of the development of this parcel, there is not additional phases schedule or planned at this time.

Chris Gordon expressed his concerns about the 50ft common buffers, he suggested adding specific language in the HOA regarding the maintenance of this area.

Paul Metevier, Alternate Planning Board member, joined the meeting.

Town of North Yarmouth
Planning Board
Meeting Minutes of April 13, 2021
Remote Zoom Meeting
(recording is available via [Town Hall Streams](#))

Paul Metevier discussed his concerns regarding the water issues there seem to be in the Walnut Hill area.

Gary Bahlkow reviewed his concerns regarding the ownership of the property, the proposed open space concept and a possible wetland area. He also discussed the wild rabbit habitat delineation. Chris Cabot advised that applicant should provide documentation showing there are not permanent restrictions on this property.

While Kimry Corrette noted that she was concerned at first about the open space concept but after further review likes the concept of this area not being maintained but allowed to grow wild.

Audrey Lones noted the maintenance of the sidewalks should be listed in the HOA agreement.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Audrey Lones read an email from Ginny Van Dyke of 64 Walnut Hill Rd, she discussed her concern about water supply within the subdivision.

Allison Harris, 26 Castle Hill Rd – expressed her concern about the buffer zones between 7 and 12 and whether the applicant is planning on using them as roads to access the top of the hill in the future. As well as whether the Phase II of the project will have open space in the whole a lot and she inquired about the Yarmouth Water Districts plans for a new water tank.

Lianne Mitchell, 25 Wander-R- Way – provided her concerns about water, she noted there was a Great Blue Heron at the pond each summer, she expressed her appreciation with the open space buffers between the houses and concerns about the double lot concept. She inquired about Phase II plans and the how it could affect the school system.

Ben Sahagian, 83 Gray Rd – He noted he is across the street from the proposed development. He asked what the plans are for the open space that is along Rt 115 to the proposed road. He inquired whether the applicant would consider added trees behind the existing lot as well as along lot 15 to provide a buffer.

It was determined there were a few things that are still needed:

- Land Ownership documentation
- Maps should be prepared to scale
- Sidewalk Maintenance in the HOA Agreement
- Updated HOA Agreement
- State Restrictions New England Cotton Tail Rabbits

Town of North Yarmouth
Planning Board
Meeting Minutes of April 13, 2021
Remote Zoom Meeting
(recording is available via [Town Hall Streams](#))

Audrey Lones motioned to hold a Public Hearing on the York Ridge Major Subdivision application at the May 11, 2021; Sandra Falsey seconded the motion. Discussion.

Vote 5 Yes 0 No

c. Site Plan Review – Fire Barn Project

Greg Payson, North Yarmouth Fire/Rescue Chief, on behalf of the North Yarmouth Fire Company, presented the proposed Fire Barn project to the Planning Board. The project consists of building a garage for North Yarmouth's first brand new fire engine dated back to 1960 as well as a museum on the back side of the building. The project is not a town project it is solely funded by the North Yarmouth Fire Company through donations. The structure will be located adjacent to the bean pit in the village green property.

There are a couple waivers requested:

1. The request to waive the 20 ft set up to 30 ft due to the engine length and not blocking the road when taking it out to waxing it.
2. The request to waiver the front and side window requirements.

Chris Gordon addressed a concern about not having running water and a public bathroom.

Chris Cabot noted that currently the board doesn't have the authority to grant the setback change however Ryan Keith noted that in the new land use ordinance changes Civic Buildings are exempt from this requirement.

d. Findings of Facts – Booster Pump Station Yarmouth Water District

Gary Bahlkow addressed his concern about the cutting of the ancient tree that was cut down on the project area. Ryan Keith noted that he spoke to Clark Baston, Road Commissioner about the tree in question. Clark indicated that the tree was a hazard for the road crew and would have eventually need to be cut down and the Yarmouth Water District saved the Town several thousand dollars.

Audrey Lones motioned to accept the Findings of Facts for the Booster Pump Station for the Yarmouth Water District with the amendment to Waiver #1: **Article X, SECTION 10.4 BUILDING DESIGN STANDARDS, B. Standards: 2. No less than 20 percent of the front façade of any building shall be window area.**

To maintain security of the facility and to provide protection of public water infrastructure, the windows are less than 20% façade required in the ordinance.

Chris Cabot seconded the motion. Discussion. **VOTE 4 YES 1 NO**

**Town of North Yarmouth
Planning Board
Meeting Minutes of April 13, 2021
Remote Zoom Meeting**

(recording is available via [Town Hall Streams](#))

Gary Bahlkow requested that the Code Office contact the Recreation Committee to let them know the Yarmouth Water District has land on Sweetser Road with a railway bed.

e. Findings of Facts - Minor Subdivision 64 Country Lane

Audrey Lones motioned to approve the findings of facts for the Minor Subdivision – 64 Country Lane as presented; Gary Bahlkow seconded the motion. Discussion.

VOTE 5 YES 0 NO

V. Administrative Business

a. Review of Previous Year's Applications

No meeting was held in April 2020

b. May 20th Planning Board Workshop

Audrey Lones reminded the Board of the May 20 Planning Board Workshop at 6:30 PM. The Solar Committee will be joining us for this meeting. Audrey requested Tracey send out a meeting request to the board as a reminder.

c. Town Meeting Warrant

Audrey Lones noted that the Select Board signed the Warrant for the 2021 Town Meeting. The Town meeting will be held on April 24, 2021 at 9 AM.

d. Site Walk Suggestion

Gary Bahlkow suggested the site walk the Board holds be either captured through video or audio.

VI. Any other Business

VII. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned 9:58 PM.

Recorded by Tracey Cox, Executive Assistant to CEO/Assessor

Planning Board Members

Audrey Lones - Chair

Chris Cabot - Secretary

Gary Bahlkow, Board Member

Sandra Falsey, Board Member

Chris Gordon, Board Member

~~Kimry Corrette, Alternate Member~~

Paul Metevier, Alternate Member

ATTACHMENT A

From: [Gary Bahlkow](#)
To: [Kimry Corrette](#); [Sandra Falsey](#); [Chris Cabot](#); [Christopher Gordon](#); [Audrey Lones](#); [Ryan Keith](#); [Tracey Cox](#); [Vanessa L Farr](#)
Cc: [Rosemary Roy](#)
Subject: Comments on YWD prior to March meeting
Date: Friday, March 5, 2021 1:54:06 PM

Hi all,

The draft minutes for Feb 9 meeting indicated I might not have been timely with my input to YWD Site Plan Review new business. So here are my thoughts ahead of the March meeting. I know this is long. Hopefully it makes the March meeting more efficient. Rosemary, I have you in the CC because we have an open thread elsewhere on timely and appropriate communication between PB, Applicants and Other Interested Parties.

Ryan, please forward this on to the YWD and whomever you see fit and appropriate. The following are my thoughts as a Member. I do not speak for the board. I look forward to further discussion at the March meeting and upcoming workshops as appropriate.

Ryan made two very helpful comments during the February 9 meeting. First one was “The Ordinance is the Ordinance”. I could not agree more. On one hand, there are many Ordinance sections that are precise - cookbook setbacks and site triangles for example. Little if any ambiguity what the bare minimum standards are for those. The Ordinance also bestows upon the PB wide latitude interpreting and applying the Big Picture from the Town Plan. The **14** Ordinance sections I provided to the PB and the Applicant at the last meeting are a list of some (most?) of the areas where I believe the most current YWD proposal comes up short AND the PB has authority to make the project better. It boils down to: Two access roads where one will do plus two high tension power lines where one will do are solved by clustering the existing and proposed buildings.

Rather than going down the list of **14** I’m opting for a narrative that lines up deficiencies and possible solutions. The narrative provides background to make various points. Forgive me if I wander the long road a bit too far. I will tie it all together using Ryan’s second bit of great, succinct advice: He reminded us there is a difference between a **request** and a **require**. For example, granting connectivity access over a project is probably a **request**. PB is within its authority to **require** modifications to an access plan. All within the confines of the Ordinance.

Background

The first thing that got my attention when YWD came in at sketch plan was formulating a request for connectivity (the old railroad grade and trail system that traverses the subject property). Skyline Farm is a nearby hub for horses. Chris Sweetser on excavator and myself on Bobcat built and refurbished the trail system several years ago. Paul Lones, Audrey’s

husband, facilitated by getting culverts, gravel and other materials delivered and paid for and chipping in an extra hand whenever needed. It is a nice little trail system. We had fun building it. The Boy Scouts built a bridge that connected our trails to the fields behind Skyline. It is a destination with little connectivity.

Trails that go round and round in one park are nice. Trails that connect to employment, services and provisions and public spaces are an entirely different thing – connectivity in a carbon conscience time. The connectivity opportunity I envision comes down scenic Sweetser road then turns onto the railroad grade on YWD land. A marked crossing to safely get over Route 9 to the continuation of this RR grade on the north side of Rt. 9. (The RR grade across Rt 9 from YWD northerly to 231 near the Royal River bridge is a town asset. It is presently an underutilized connectivity asset with great potential to be a non-motorized artery through town).

If the YWD were to allow access on their segment of RR grade pedestrians, horses and bikes could look both ways and cross Route 9 safely at 90 degrees. Without this stretch of RR grade pedestrians, horses and bikes will be forced to go to the end of Sweetser Rd, turn right onto Route 9, traverse Route 9 for about 500 feet then turn left across the flow of traffic to gain access to the town owned RR grade continuation on the other side of Route 9 (speed limit 45 zone for all of this).

The Ordinance and the Town Plan both have sections devoted to the importance of safe connectivity for pedestrians (and I think the intent is safety for horses and bikes too). A finding of fact around connectivity is in order. Request? Or Required?

The second thing that got my attention was “rural character” which is ambiguous but, like other ambiguous things, most of us know it when we see it. Sweetser Road is arguably one of the nicer roads with “rural character” in town. Gravel roads are low carbon too. The project is in the Farm and Forest District contiguous to the Village Center District. It is a gateway property. A large industrial development highly visible from both Route 9 and Sweetser Road right at the zoning district transition substantively change the character of both the Village approach and Sweetser Road. A finding of fact around Rural Character is in order. Request? Or Require?

Part of the “rural character” comes from the big, healthy, ancient trees along the town right of way. The YWD proposal as currently configured will either remove or irreparably damage the root systems of these ancients. Root systems on ancient trees extend, roughly, as wide as the crowns of those trees. So, just setting over a few feet from the trunk during excavation will look okay above ground for a few years. Yet the severe root damage will kill those ancients in short order. The Ordinance and the Town Plan both have sections devoted to the importance of retaining “rural character.” A finding of fact around ancient trees is in order. Request? Or Required?

After the site visit it became clear to me the existing and proposed access roads, three phase

power lines and proximity to the other industrial development on the parcel were out of sync. The Ordinance and the Town Plan both have substantial reference to efficient use of the site and clustering development. Findings of fact are in order.

Relevant Ordinance

The Ordinance provides for the PB to both **request** (the Ordinance uses the word “encourage”) and **require**. I encourage everybody to review the first paragraphs of Section 4. Paragraph **4.1 Purpose** at the very top of the Ordinance. This is Big Picture authority bestowed upon the PB. Here is a clip of **4.1** that resonates with me: **The Site Plan Review provisions set forth in this Ordinance are intended to ... fit the project harmoniously into the natural and (wo)man-made fabric of the Community.** (*note to Tracey – there is an inappropriate gender reference in this passage to go on our list of housekeeping items*).

Also, Paragraph **4.3.A. Planning Board Authorization** which underlines the Purpose in 4.1. Regardless of the up/down decision, the PB must make very clear findings of fact. We do this routinely. It is more pleasant when the PB finds happy facts. But all facts are not necessarily happy facts. The list of **14** is a good start upon which to document findings of fact.

Representations by Applicants and their method of presentation are not always in alignment with what the PB needs to understand. The PB needs to sort that out before finding of facts.

Also, Paragraph **10.2.A. Utilization of the Site** (again top of the list, not buried) another passage that resonates for me: *“Buildings, lots and support facilities must be clustered”*. Pretty sure burden of proof is up to the Applicant to document and otherwise convince the PB these are hardships or unwise.

Summary

Two roads where there only need be one, two power lines where there only need be one and clustering industrial buildings are well within the PB authority to **require** as findings of fact for approval. Or the Applicant has the burden of proof to convince the PB otherwise.

To date YWD submissions to date are inadequate in both form and substance. So far we have only seen map and satellite submissions of the couple acres they want to develop. This omission of maps and graphics showing the entire property prevents accurate evaluation of the entire property. 30 acres is not a big piece of ground. The PB needs to see the entire property at a useful scale which includes all the features required by the Ordinance under **Submissions**.

The representations of forested wetlands and slope obstacle to siting are not supported. The Applicant needs to do a better job of convincing. PB need look no further than wetlands and slopes encountered on the recently approved VCE. Much larger buildings on much steeper

slope fit in among truly mapped wetlands. YWD Submissions are either missing, incomplete and perhaps inaccurate. Etc.

Okay, sort of off topic but important:

As many of you may have heard, Nestle is selling Poland Spring and other water assets in Maine and elsewhere for 1.4 BILLION dollars! Water is valuable. We may take abundant clean water a bit for granted here in Maine, but globally clean water is a precious resource. YWD is not as big as Nestle but it is probably fair to say the YWD assets (not just this project, but the entire YWD) is worth \$100 million or more. Point being, they have access to capital sufficient to do a superb job. Eric has done a great job conveying to us that this project is critical to North Yarmouth and has his full support and attention. We all know it will be in place for a long time. The existing well is 70 years old and still going strong. This facility will have a similar life. Let's envision a 100 year useful life. It is worth getting right the first time.

What is mind boggling is that this public utility claims to not understand its primary asset that is probably worth tens of millions of dollars. They are saying they will need a new well soon but do not have a very good idea of where a replacement well can be located. This seems disingenuous when being presented as a reason to circumvent cluster provisions throughout the Ordinance. Pretty sure NY will sleep better at night knowing YWD will have planned ahead and be better prepared to act when the Hayes well fails. YWD is on record at the last meeting saying it will cost them a quarter million dollars just to know where to drill a new well. I'd like to see that documented and better explained/understood with respect to timing and location. It is not an unreasonable sum, given the value of the underlying asset. They will need to spend that money at some point. Why not now so they can best utilize this valuable asset? At the last meeting YWD went on record saying interruption of power supply is an obstacle to using one high tension power line. Again, seems convenient to advance the two high tension line proposal. Isn't that why they have backup generators? Need better clarity on these.

Utilities, like CMP and YWD, provide essential services. NY appreciate the essential services YWD provides and seeks a solid working relationship. Sometimes utilities narrow their focus on the providing the essential services in a vacuum, without adequate consideration to things important to the area they service. Thinking PGE and mega forest fires in California. There has been a regime change at YWD. The culture will likely change. Eric seems a talented, experienced and reasonable leader who truly wants to do the right thing. He surely has pressure from above to do the minimum for the cheapest. The PB has the authority to counterbalance that pressure on Eric and help him move this project from the current C- at best to a B+ or better.

Zooming out to a final point: Communications with Applicants and their professional service providers is tricky. NY is facing a full pipeline of interest in development. We are reasonably

well prepared with the current Ordinance using the **request v require** toolbox. Actions best communicate that NY is open for business, ready to absorb a bunch of growth and not going to settle for poorly conceived projects. Send this message to developers – good plans advance quickly and get unanimous approval. Not so good get delayed, voted down or have minority/majority splits votes. Unanimous rejections are not out of bounds. I often use the A-F scale. I give the current YWD plan a C- and do not see a way to vote in favor at this moment.

On that same scale, the VCE phase 2 we approved unanimously at the last meeting was a solid B or B+.

Be great to see YWD get into the B to B+ range.

Okay, one more point. Department of Homeland Security and EPA both have substantial discussion about siting and securing soft targets like water infrastructure. My takeaway - out of site out of mind with razor wire, motion sensing security and lighting are recommended.

Have a great weekend. See you Tuesday. Gary

P.S. to Ryan – has YWD responded to my request to site visit the property alone or with you prior to the March meeting? Their recent submissions show some other features have been staked out. I'm looking at the forecast and it is conducive to observing surface flow and emerging wetland late Tuesday afternoon, perhaps right before the meeting?

Gary Bahlkow
Planning Board Member
Town of North Yarmouth
10 Village Square Road
North Yarmouth, ME 04097
207-829-3705

Notice: Under Maine's Freedom of Access (Right to Know) law Title 1 MRS Section 402(3), all email and email attachments received or prepared for matters concerning Town business are likely to be regarded as public records. These records are open to inspection, including members of the media, there should be no expectation of privacy unless otherwise made confidential by law. If you have received this message in error, please notify this office immediately by return mail. Thank you.

ATTACHMENT B

From: [Gary Bahlkow](#)
To: [Audrey Lones](#)
Cc: [Kimry Corrette](#); [Sandra Falsey](#); [Chris Cabot](#); [Christopher Gordon](#); [Ryan Keith](#); [Tracey Cox](#); [Vanessa L Farr](#)
Subject: Re: Last Night's Meeting.
Date: Monday, March 15, 2021 12:53:56 PM

Hi Audrey

Thanks for your note. More detailed response on York embedded below. But first, bear with me on another long one!

Last meeting was a bit of progress on process and illuminating the Big Picture - from the Town Plan all the way thru Ordinance to the face of the earth. I know pressing boundaries that haven't been pressed much put you in a bit of a hot seat. So thanks to you (and the rest of the PB) for being gracious about it.

The YWD served as a pretty good exhibit A for why the town needs a planner to deliver the Big Picture the citizenry expects. When a developer isn't being completely candid or thorough it is difficult for a volunteer board with minimal staff support to understand and react in real time.

To wit, York looks like another exercise in the PB needing to use the power of 4.1, 4.3.A and 10.2.A. all the way out into the weeds of tables and subsections of subsections. My initial reaction to York is similar to YWD - it may meet the minimum standards for compliance with tabular requirements but it seems like the PB ought to be able to influence a better outcome. Here are my initial questions and reactions (again speaking as a member, not the PB - convey to applicant asap in an appropriate way):

1 - Does the applicant own the property or otherwise have proper authority? The presentation and preliminary submittals were not clear.

2 - Have the two adjacent parcels (70 and 71) in common ownership merged? If so, I believe the PB has authority to require the entire merged tract gets put on the table.

3 - I am open to understanding how the skinny strips of open space are an enhancement but am not seeing it. First impression is they are not open space at all but just for convenience of gravity septic and thus not meaningful open space. Which leads me to question why the project isn't using a common septic solution? Has thought been given to the physical obstacles associated with pumping those out? How about the neighborhood obstacles?

4 - Everybody must know by now my affection for honest wetland delineation of an **entire**

tract.

Understanding where the wetlands are and where the water flows helps drive good decisions. Similarly, I am not completely satisfied with the form letters from State agencies with respect to various features. Not just on York, but in general. Deer yard maps in NY are fair to poor. Rare and Endangered special concern wildlife species mapping is worse. Maybe worst of all are State mapping for Rare and Endangered botanical features. My experience with IFW and Maine Natural Areas Program is they are willing to conduct or subcontract a site assessment. Expense is minimal. The form letters do not necessarily warrant a box being checked off, at least for me.

5 - Not a fan of long, dead end roads with turn arounds that require backing up. Presumably there will be kids playing so making every delivery truck and wayward tourist to back up becomes a safety issue. Cul de sac is much safer and more friendly.

6 - The Ordinance requires anticipation of dead end roads connecting to future roads on the subject and/or adjacent parcels.

7 - Submittals need to be at the required scale! There are existing and proposed features required by the Ordinance but not shown yet.

8 - After the site walk we might change our mind but from google earth it looks like a pretty barren site. Submissions need to bear down on proposed landscaping and street trees.

9 - These developments where developer is gone after lot sales need scrutiny of the HO association bylaws. See 10.6.B. The developer selling lots only needs to be concerned with 1-3. 4-9 fall to the builder or other lot owner. Might want to see those addressed in the HO association bylaws. (After lot sales, the VCE phase 1 had/has some pretty significant erosion issues after heavy rains last fall. Be interesting to see how spring thaw goes up there. I'd like to understand how CEO vs DEP handle enforcement. Poor Toddy Brook got hammered with sedimentation at least twice last fall).

10 - Connectivity. Where are the opportunities? Staff comments alluded to some but there was not a supporting sketch or description. A planner and/or Parks and Rec could help here.

Like YWD, this York preliminary major subdivision is coming at the PB with expectations for fast decisions. I'd like some training and further public discussion on how the PB might properly exert influence on Applicants submitting C- or worse. The Town Plan is the Big Picture. The Ordinance seems (to me at least) to give PB broad authority. There seems like a lot of support among fellow citizens here in NY for the PB to exert influence on executing that Plan using the Ordinance. Perhaps an upcoming workshop could include a session with the Town Attorney? Or maybe MM could zoom with us or send somebody down for a

presentation?

Finally, 64 Country Lane is a good example of review that was mostly from the tables and other empiricals. Not a lot of high level attention needed. A good example of something Staff would either approve outright or bring to the PB for a quick rubber stamp. Perhaps Exhibit B for why NY is overdue for a talented, experienced planner. Might make the meetings a little shorter too!

Gary Bahlkow
Planning Board Member
Town of North Yarmouth
10 Village Square Road
North Yarmouth, ME 04097
207-829-3705

Notice: Under Maine's Freedom of Access (Right to Know) law Title 1 MRS Section 402(3), all email and email attachments received or prepared for matters concerning Town business are likely to be regarded as public records. These records are open to inspection, including members of the media, there should be no expectation of privacy unless otherwise made confidential by law. If you have received this message in error, please notify this office immediately by return mail. Thank you.

Tracey Cox

From: Gary Bahlkow
Sent: Thursday, March 25, 2021 4:13 PM
To: Audrey Lones; Kimry Corrette; Sandra Falsey; Chris Cabot; Christopher Gordon; Ryan Keith; Tracey Cox; Vanessa L Farr
Cc: Gary Bahlkow
Subject: York Ridge Site Visit follow ups

Categories: Planning Board

Hi everybody,

Nice to see you all yesterday.

Here are some follow ups that became apparent to me during the site walk. These comments are mine as a member and not a position of the board. Please pass along to Applicant and incorporate into minutes as appropriate:

1 - I do not see how the strips of open space serve any open space function and I did not hear anything from the Applicant about the purpose. A quick and dirty calculation of area consumed by the open space strips between lots plus the 50 foot strip along the north line is six acres. That six acres could be a much more meaningful piece of open space in almost any configuration I can think of.

2 - I'd like to see a calculation of net residential density on the entire parcel as well as a conceptual layout of what might come along. I am specifically not looking for anything binding or highly engineered but rather a good faith sketch. Possible water tank and additional residential development were mentioned by applicant. There is a lot of potential here.

3 - Applicant stated the property has been managed by the prior owner for rabbit habitat. Does that mean there might be Cottontail there? (Cottontail is currently a Candidate for Federal Listing). It certainly looks possible. It is the right kind of habitat and Cumberland/York County have known occurrences. Does any inventory or report exist? If nothing else, it warrants a field review by IFW and perhaps the folks at TNC who are managing T&E.

4. The staked centerline of the road implies the filling of a small wetland between 11+00 and 12+00 on the proposed road profile. With all the high and dry land nearby this seems unnecessary. This little wetland looks like the very top of Deer Brook headwaters. Needs a quick inventory of plant communities before filling if, indeed, it needs to be filled at all.

5. Rerouting the outlet of Wanderer Way from direct access to route 115 into this subdivision will reduce two close curb cuts on Route 115 into one. By the way, does anybody know if DOT is looking at speed limits there? Now that it is a VD it might be worth looking into. I do not know the channels this kind of request follows, perhaps select board? The truck and other vehicle volume was heavier than I expected and was flying by there yesterday. Slowing it down before it hits the hill going down to the stop sign on 231 might make the neighborhood quieter with less jake braking by trucks.

6. Pushing more density into the wooded area and keeping the field in open space will do a better job of retaining rural character. Note the subdivision at the corner of North Road and Milliken did a very good job of this. Take a look on town GIS. I will research Ordinance on PB authority for advancing this prior to next meeting.

7. The Applicant made a fair point looking for some flexibility in the 20 foot setback. I realize this means adding another change in the Ordinance update that is already badly backlogged. But I agree with his assessment that some flexibility to soften the "row" look might be worth considering. Perhaps as simple as every other lot could have a deeper setback, maybe 30 feet? It would be good to give Applicant some feedback on the will of the PB (and I may be missing some good reason to force a row house look. I like the row house look in urban setting. Not so sure it works as well in a village. Open to discussion).

8. A general comment not directly related to this project - a lot of the housing stock being created is pretty narrowly confined to middle/high end. The Town Plan talks a good game about creating affordable and senior housing. How does a community leverage that? There is a market for it. Are the margins too thin or is imagination/risk taking limited? How to get somebody to try the Pocket Neighborhood, for example? I'm curious to understand that better.

This is a superb property with great potential. Soils are very conducive to many things. The property offers some nice views to the north and west from the wooded area and some variable terrain features.

Finally, please make sure the submissions are at the required scale. My eyes hurt!

That's all for now.

Gary Bahlkow
Planning Board Member
Town of North Yarmouth
10 Village Square Road
North Yarmouth, ME 04097
207-829-3705

Notice: Under Maine's Freedom of Access (Right to Know) law Title 1 MRS Section 402(3), all email and email attachments received or prepared for matters concerning Town business are likely to be regarded as public records. These records are open to inspection, including members of the media, there should be no expectation of privacy unless otherwise made confidential by law. If you have received this message in error, please notify this office immediately by return mail. Thank you.