

READFIELD PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of Tuesday, June 2, 2021

Planning Board Members: Paula Clark (Chair), Jack Comart (Vice Chair), William “Bill” Buck, William “Bill” Godfrey, Jan Gould, Don Witherill, Henry Clauson

Others Attending: Ron “Chip” Stephens (CEO), Kristin Parks (Board Secretary), Eric Dyer (Town Manager), Kristin Collins (Town Attorney), Clif Buuck, Jed Davis, Leah Hayes, Grace Keene, Gina Turcotte

Meeting called to order at 6:30 pm by Paula.

1) **26 Mill Stream Road - Safe Space Meeting House (SSMH):** The application proposes to create a community center/club on property located at 26 Mill Stream Road in the Rural Residential District identified on the Assessors map 120, lot 013 and was initially considered by the Board at the May 25, 2021 meeting.

- Paula Clark: Tonight’s meeting is to consider completeness of the application by Safe Space Meeting House for a “Community Center/Club” proposed to be located at 26 Mill Stream Road.
- Brief timeline review by Eric Dyer on the application by SSMH (*copy inserted for reference*)
- Jed Davis, Attorney for SSMH, gave a brief intro and went over letter to the Town of Readfield on completeness of application (*copy inserted for reference*).
- Jack: Proposal also has to meet site review criteria, in addition to meeting the definition for a community center/club.
- Paula: The proposed activity must fit within the definition of community center/club. This structure was first reviewed for an expansion of an existing non-conforming single family residence and was permitted as such.
- Leah Hayes, representing SSMH on behalf of applicant Alexandra Twarog: The proposal is for a LGBTQ Club/Community Center and it would be used as a club would use it. The Club is on hold and no activities have been planned due to COVID.
- Planning Board would like more information about proposed events/activities.
- Jack: Question on parking and how it was determined that the lot is able to hold 35 cars. Requested a diagram of parking area, showing parking spaces and lanes consistent with the ordinance. Other questions asked: Hours of operations and time, if seasonal or full year, any food service or food preparation since there is a commercial kitchen, if food prepared on site how will odor be controlled, will there be liquor service, how would proposed sound proofing be done so as to not disturb the neighbors, need for septic system/letter from soil engineer as to ability of the current system to meet the proposed needs, will the use of the building include using it as a pub, what outdoor activities are proposed and what are the proposed hours of operation, will there be renting to outside groups, what is the distance from other residences (info in the application doesn’t seem accurate), fire safety issues and access (information needed from Fire Chief), is anyone renting the house or intend to live in the house, (Jed Davis said no one is living there or intends to live there), what exactly is the proposed lighting on the trail, the lease is

READFIELD PLANNING BOARD

not signed by anyone (we need a signed lease) who has the legal authority to enter into the lease (need proof of that).

- Review of letter from Clif, CEO at the time application first received. (*copy inserted for reference*). Information requests are still outstanding.
- Jed Davis (Applicant Attorney) would like a letter outlining all items of concern.
- Chip (CEO) and planning board members would like more detail and clarity before public hearing of events and activities and how the events will be planned and attendance.
- Kristin Collins (Town Attorney): look at the types of activity and frequency and if they fall under the ordinance as an approved use. Looking at completeness and if they have supplied all required submission items. Recommendation to go through list of submission requirements to determine completeness. Since this is under site review, it is not up to the CEO to approve application as complete but instead it is the Planning Board's role.
- Board discussed in detail whether the application met the Site Review submission requirements of Article 6 Section 3(I)(2) of the LUO.
- Discussion about whether to find the application complete given the lack of information, or find it complete subject to conditions on the submission of additional information. The PB felt that the application is not ready for a public hearing given the lack of needed information.
- **Motion** made by Henry to find that the application has met the basic submission requirements of Article 6, Section 3(I)(2) and that the Planning Board will not schedule a public hearing until it has received the documents and information as outlined in this meeting, **second** by Bill Buck. **Vote** 6-1, opposed by Jan.

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 pm.

Minutes submitted by Board Secretary, Kristin Parks