



41 Terry D. – Asked if there are Town that do not have to comply – he knows that there are
42 some Towns that have already passed ordinance.

43
44 Brian S. – explained if a Town is a Select Board form of government with Town Meeting
45 you have until July 1, 2024.

46
47 Kathy T. – added if you are a Council/Town you have until January 1, 2024

48
49 Brian S. – so we were scrambling trying to rush but this allows us to take a step back and
50 not rush. He asked Planner Tombarelli if there was anything else that really caught her
51 eye in that bill.

52
53 Karen G. – added that the subdivision language was stronger so that it did not go around
54 the subdivision law. She feels like they strengthened that language.

55
56 Kathy T. – they also beefed up Shoreland

57
58 Karen G. – under Zoning Requirements they added that an accessory dwelling unit is
59 allowed on a lot that does not conform to the municipal zoning ordinance if the
60 accessory dwelling unit does not further increase the non-conformity.

61
62 Brian S. – same page, saw this in an earlier version an accessory dwelling unit that was
63 built without municipal approval must be allowed if the accessory dwelling unit
64 otherwise meets the municipal standards. He thought that was there already.

65
66 Kathy T. – responded that she did not know, but it sounds like they are basically
67 “grandfathering” what has already been done.

68
69 Karen G. – to answer Brian’s question regarding a timeline working backwards,
70 obviously we do not have a Town Meeting date yet – should we be conservative and
71 start with the first week of May or second week of May and work our way backwards?

72
73 Jean L. – Town Meeting is the first Monday in May

74
75 Karen G. – so we need to go back to the end of April

76
77 Jean L. – I wouldn’t even do that. I would go back a month before that–

78
79 Karen G. – that’s what I was thinking

80
81 Jean L. – you do not know what could happen, there is going to be storms and stuff, and
82 joint committee and that is not going to be easy. I would go back at least a month is not



83 two. I just saw this – you have to set up a permitting process for accessory dwelling units
84 that does not require Planning Board approval.

85
86 Brian S. – in New Gloucester do they require Planning Board approval for ADUs?

87
88 Jean L. – no

89
90 Brian S. – in Historic Overlay we do

91
92 Jean L. – they would in Historic Overlay and Village Districts but not in Rural Residential,
93 etc.

94
95 Brian S. – so now we can't do that in Historic Overlay/Village Districts?

96
97 Jean L. – that is not a good idea...and what about your groundwater, wetlands.

98
99 Brian S. – I now have another question. Currently if you create 3 or more dwelling units
100 in a five-year period you have to go to subdivision so how can you establish a permitting
101 process for ADUs that does not require Planning Board approval, if for instance, trigger
102 subdivision.

103
104 Jean L. – this is what happens when you have people sitting up there making ordinances
105 that no nothing about zoning.

106
107 Kathy T. – it is not very clear, is this for one accessory dwelling unit? If there was one it
108 might be acceptable.

109
110 Brian S. – it says unit(s) plural

111
112 Brian S. – so we have not got rule-making

113
114 Kathy T. – no, I do not think so

115
116 A discussion ensued about the Historic District and current requirements for Planning
117 Board Review at **9:58** minutes:

118 <https://cloud.castus.tv/vod/ngtv/video/649cc30f352e7000080c3da4?page=HOME>

119
120 Kathy T. – there might be a way around this – could add Village Design standards
121 (required as part of the building permitting process).

122
123 Jean L. – any new ordinances have to go to Town Meeting

124



125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166

Kathy T. – brought attention to number 10 which seems to conflict with the language about not being able to require Planning Board Review and that it should not be construed to override a subdivision

Karen G – I think it is how you read it... if it does not require Planning Board approval, make sure you have the permitting process in place vs. the application and permitting process in place so you do not have to go to Planning Board... I think that #10 makes it clear that this does not circumvent subdivision.

Brian S. – could you (Planner) ask MMA for clarification

The LMPC looked for dates to have the ordinance completed by:

Brian S. – If we were to look at having the Planning Board Public Hearing in March (1st Tuesday), then we need to have Joint Committee Meeting in February.

A conversation about “what if” after rule-making there are substantial changes – it would have to go back to LMPC, joint, etc. Discussions surrounding a second opportunity (referendum/vote) at the June election if it does not pass.

LMPC also talked about the map, what would be included, education component, workshop vs. question & answer.

Kathy T. – Basically the education piece is why we are doing this and it is because we have to and if we do not, we have to go with the State language as written.

Jean L. – gave the example of when the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance went through and that we packed the place because people were upset about things...and Shoreland Zoning is an important thing.

Brian S. – part of that is going to come down to how it is worded on the article and who does that.

Kathy T. – a lot of times it depends on who is on town staff, it gets drafted and then goes to Select Board for approval

Jean L. – ...I always insisted that it goes to legal (not MMA – Town Attorney)

Brian S. – a warrant article that talks about bringing us into compliance

Jean L. – and if you are doing anything else, a warrant article needs to be worded very carefully. At Town Meeting this year some warrant articles were left with holes in them.



167 Brian S. – so our attorney gets in September, Joint Meeting in February, Planning Board
168 Public Hearing March, Town Meeting May something.

169
170 Jean L. – and I would get a Q & A session some time before December

171
172 Brian S. – do we need to have a couple more meetings before December?

173
174 Terry D. – is a public information meeting going to be the only way? Do we also have an
175 online frequently asked question or say some presentation that people can look at if
176 they can't make the public meetings?

177
178 Karen G. – the public meetings would be recorded so they could watch later...and we
179 could also have a summary...

180
181 Continuing discussions about public outreach at minute **28:00** at link referenced above.

182
183 Brian S. – as far as any further discussion on LD 2003, I did want to bring to everyone's
184 attention LD 1134 which was carried over to the next legislative session in January. LD
185 1134 is an act to improve housing affordability by amending the definition of subdivision
186 under the Site Location of Development laws. A subdivision is a division of 5 or more lots
187 (new definition) to be offered for sale or lease to the general public.

188
189 Jean L. – five!?

190
191 Brian S. – yes, and that's not the part that even stands out. The part that stands out to
192 me is that they removed the words dwelling unit. It's (the legislation) has been carried
193 over so it did not die. So, I think it something that we need to watch because removing
194 the word dwelling units from the subdivision statute. (Example) Someone puts 10-
195 dwelling units on a one parcel in NG does not trigger subdivision.

196
197 Entire discussion about LD 1134 can be found **30:52 – 37:10** at link above.

198
199 **VII. New Business**

200
201 A. Jean Libby – Thank You!

202
203 Karen G. – I would like to make a motion to thank Jean Libby for her 25 years
204 on this committee as well as many others, we have appreciated you and are
205 going to miss you so much...

206
207 Brian S. – seconded and third that motion.

208



209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239

The LMPC presented Jean L. with flowers.

B. Potential Amendment to Previously Approved Site Plan language.

Kathy T. explained that there is currently no language in Site Plan for amendments i.e., what is required for submittals.

VIII. Adjourn

Jean L. made a motion to adjourn at 43:01 of recording

Karen G. seconded it at 43:03

Motion carried 6-0

Meeting was adjourned at 43:09 (7:13 PM)