

Arundel Planning Board Minutes

May 25, 2017 7:00pm

Mildred L. Day School Library - 600 Limerick Rd. Arundel

Board Attendees: Richard Ganong, Chip Bassett, Roger Morin, Jamie Lowery, Marty Cain, and Tad Redway *Town Planner*, Corinne Goulet, *Board Secretary*

Call to Order: Chair Ganong called the meeting to order at 7:06pm.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MOTION: Mr. Morin moved and Mr. Bassett seconded the motion to approved the agenda amended to exclude the consideration of minutes.

VOTE: Unanimous in favor.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Tabled – no quorum.

III. ORDINANCE REVISIONS:

Item 1: Proposed Repeal and Replacement of LUO 5.9 Landscaping & Buffering

Extensive discussion regarding what would constitute a hardship for existing land and business owners, what exactly would be required for existing residential and business entities, and what would be required for anew conditional use permit or a new business entity. Mr. Bassett requested that verbiage in Section 5.9.4.2 be changed to “Buffering shall achieve between 75-100% year-round visual obstruction....” Additionally, it was requested that Section 5.9.4.5 be edited to “... all designated *and/or* screening buffering...”

No final decision made on the repeal or replacement of the Ordinance. Discussion completed with an offer from Mr. Redway to correlate the LUO 5.9 with the individual sections of the current ordinance. Attendees were unanimously in acceptance of this offer.

Item 2: Proposed Changes to Residential Districts R1, R2 and R3

Discussion begins with objection to how R1 is classified as Urban. Mr. Redway reminds Board that the classification of R1 as Urban is in accordance to the Comprehensive Plan’s intent to promote “infill” over a long-term period of 10-20 years.

Mr. Bassett asks what exactly the Board is supposed to be deciding upon. Mr. Redway highlighted consideration to retain 1 acre lot size minimums and to allow for alternative land uses in R1 to encourage higher density development. Alternative uses suggested were age restricted housing and planned use development. Mr. Ganong and Mr. Bassett voiced objection to some issues listed as Uses in the Comprehensive Plan for R1. Particularly: congregate care facilities, animal husbandry, equestrian facilities, and agritourism.

Mr. Ganong, Mr. Lowery and Mr. Cain request larger scale maps to review and facilitate better discussion about what boundaries may be changed. If/when the Board comes to a consensus Mr. Redway suggests a meeting with the Comprehensive Planning Board to discuss intent.

Mr. Ganong closes the topic with statement that it will be revisited next meeting with appropriate mapping.

Item 3: Proposed Addition of Section 9.3.22: Food Trucks & Food Carts

Discussion facilitated with use of a Decision Tree.

Decision 1 – Should the Town permit the Service of Food outside of the standard brick and mortar restaurant?

YES – Unanimous

Decision 2 – What type of Temporary Food Service Establishments should be permitted?

YES – Mobile Ice Cream Trucks (Unanimous)

YES – Canteen Trucks (Unanimous)

NO – Food Push Carts (3 against – Ganong, Bassett, & Morin)

YES – Food Trucks (Unanimous)

NO – Food Trailers (Unanimous)

The Board discussed allowing establishments to be open 6a-10p 7 days a week. Additional discussion noted that alcohol or marijuana products would **not** be allowed for product sale.

Decision 3 – If the Board supports Temporary Food Service Establishments, where should these uses operate?

Mobile Ice Cream Trucks – Anywhere (per Ganong, Lowery & Morin)

“Mobile” Canteen Trucks – Anywhere (per Ganong, Lowery & Bassett)

Food Push Carts – N/A

Food Trucks – Any business zone (per Bassett, Ganong, Morin & Lowery)

Food Trailers – N/A

*Mr. Lowry suggests that special event exemptions be made available. Mr Ganong & Mr Bassett concur.

Decision 4 – In the event that the Board permits Food Trucks, or Food Trailers, or Food Carts, should the vehicle be periodically removed or can it stay for a specified period of time?

Food Push Carts – N/A

Food Trucks – More information needed.

Food Trailers – N/A

Decision 5 – Should the food service vehicle have all water, electricity, and liquid waste supplies contained within the vehicle?

Food Push Carts – N/A

Food Trucks – Yes, but electrical can be derived from an outside power source (Unanimous)

Food Trailers – N/A

Decision 6 – Should the food service vehicle provide separate parking for its customers?

Food Push Carts – N/A

Food Trucks – Adequate parking should be available but how much that is requires definition.

Food Trailers – N/A

Additional discussion centered around seasonality if a paved surface requirement should be noted for winter months.

Decision 7 – Should the food service vehicle provide separate outdoor seating for its customers?

Food Push Carts – N/A

Food Trucks – Available but how much requires definition.

Food Trailers – N/A

Decision 8 - Should there be a minimum distance between different temporary food service providers?

Food Push Carts – N/A

Food Trucks – 1 per lot (Unanimous)

Food Trailers – N/A

Decision 9 (also listed as Decision 8 on the Decision Tree) – Should temporary food service providers be allowed to have exterior or should all signage be confined to the surface of the vehicle?

Food Push Carts – N/A

Food Trucks – Yes, but confined to vehicle (Unanimous)

Food Trailers – N/A

Decision 10 (listed as Decision 9 on the Decision Tree) – Should temporary food service providers meet minimum design and lighting standards for their vehicles conforming to the design standards of the zone?

Food Push Carts – N/A

Food Trucks – No decision, review of confirming standards required.

Food Trailers – N/A

VI. MYLAR SIGNING & OTHER BUSINESS:

Attendees sign appropriately.

Adjourn: Chair Ganong adjourns meeting at 9:45pm.