

July 22, 2026

TO: Casco Planning Board members
Mr. John Wiesemann, Casco CEO
Mr. Andrew Morrell, BH2M, Heath Road Minor SD
DM Roma, Country Village Assisted Living
Mr. & Mrs. Magiera, abutters to Country Village Assisted Living SPR

FROM: Doug Webster, Acting Casco Planner

RE: Planner notes for upcoming 7-27-26 Casco Planning Board Meeting
6:30 P.M., Casco Community Center, 940 Meadow Road, Casco, Maine

Introduction

The agenda for the upcoming 7-27-26 meeting contains three development review items and one discussion item (Roads/Street standards). The three development review items are: Island Cove Heath Road minor subdivision (SD), the Pachamama Sanctuary, and a site plan review application (SPR) for Country Village Assisted Living Facility.

I have reviewed the Island Cove Heath Road SD and the Country Village Assisted Living Facility in this memo. It is my understanding that other qualified professionals (on behalf of the Town of Casco) will be representing the Pachamama Sanctuary item. I wish to be very clear that, as of the writing of this memo, I have not been involved with any aspect of this agenda item.

As noted above, I have added Mr. and Mrs. Magiera to the distribution list of this memo given that their property directly abuts the Country Village Assisted Living Facility in the Casco Village. Within this memo, I have comments regarding the stormwater element for this Site Plan Review application and wanted to be sure that they were apprised out of respect for their property ownership.

Heath Road Minor SD

As the Board recalls from the 6-22-26 meeting, various aspects of this agenda item were discussed. There was no formal action taken at the 6-22-26 meeting although there were discussions regarding the following aspects of the 2-lot minor SD application:

- The apparent consensus was that a pre-application conference was not warranted given the relatively minor nature of the application
- The consensus from the PB was that a site walk was not necessary
- There was a conceptual discussion regarding the PB considering waivers for both stormwater and for showing a plan and profile for the proposed access drive

Per PB discussions at the 6-22-26 meeting, the applicant's representative has submitted a proposed revised plan with a revision date of 6-30-26. This revised plan reflects many of the

items identified in my memo for the 6-22-26 meeting and the PB discussions at the last meeting.

As the Board recall from the 6-22-26 meeting, there was discussion with the applicant/representative regarding considering increasing the lot size for lot #1 to allow the proposed accessway to be utilized in the future for additional lot(s) per current ordinance standards. The revised plans and accompanying comments indicate that the size of lot #1 is unchanged. In the event that future lot(s) may wish to utilize the accessway, a variance and/or waiver will be necessary. Per below, I have recommended that there be a condition of approval memorializing that the applicant has been advised of this as an integral part of this (assumed) approval.

I believe the applicant's intentions are to have the plan be approved at the upcoming PB meeting. My comments for this section of the memo are based on the submittals to date, PB discussions at the 6-22-26 meeting, and the revised plan dated 6-30-26.

Procedural Matters regarding abutters and Public Hearing notice

Regarding notification, the Casco SD Ordinance requires the applicant to notify abutting property owners within 500' with proof of mailing required (210-5.1, sub. F).

Public notice of the Public Hearing is to be posted in a newspaper on general circulation twice with the date of the first publication at least 10 calendar days prior to the hearing. It is noteworthy that the State SD Statute requires the date of the first newspaper posted notice to be 7 days prior to the hearing; the practical upshot being that Casco's SD ordinance is slightly more restrictive than the State SD Statute.

Recommended Changes to the 6-30-26 Plan (letters for reference purposes only)

- A. As stated in the memo for the 6-22-26 meeting, the building envelopes should be shown for both lots specifically showing that envelope does not include either the road buffer area on lot #1 and the stream (SZ) buffer area for lot #2. The building envelope should end where the road/stream buffer begin to be clear as to the area that can be used for building.
- B. There does not appear to be a label for the building envelope either on the face of the plan or in the legend. There should be a clear indication on the plan that this is the building envelope for both lots.
- C. For title clarity purposes, I suggest adding a note or language within the "Remaining Land"/Hancock lot that this lot was the first dividing prior to triggering subdivision review. I have seen such notes be very helpful in the current day and age of lending institutions becoming increasingly concerned with clear titles regarding subdivision.
- D. Current note #7 states the applicable zoning. It states that the subject parcel is in the Residential Zone. As the Board is aware, the NE portion of the property is a Shoreland district (Stream Protection sub-district). I suggest that note #7 be amended to reflect this additional Zoning district.

- E. Current note # 19 discusses waivers per the discussion at the 6-22-26 meeting. Based on this discussion, it is assumed that these two waivers may/will be granted at the upcoming 7-27-26 meeting. In anticipation of this, and per State SD Statute, I advocate that the anticipated date of the PB waivers (7-27-26) be added to this note #19. It is important the minutes for the upcoming PB meeting specifically include any such motions to grant waivers to buttress the note on the face of the recorded SD plan.

Recommended Actions/Suggested Discussion/Action Sequence

1. Have abutters been duly notified per above?
2. Has the Public Hearing been duly noticed per above?
3. Public input per Public Hearing
4. PB input on: Planner memo, public input, and any outstanding questions/issues
5. Discuss the waivers, and consider a motion to grant these as appropriate. Ideally, there would be a separate motion for each waiver, and include the basic reasons/reasoning for granting the waivers in each motion.
6. If the PB finds the submittal complete, including the waivers, consider a motion to find the application complete.
7. Does the PB endorse the recommended changes to the final plan per above section "Recommended Changes to the 6-30-26 Plan"?
8. Given the discussion at the 6-22 meeting regarding considering increasing the lot size of lot #1 to allow for a third (or more) lots to be accessed from the proposed new accessway, does the PB endorse the planner recommendation to consider a condition (COA) of approval (to be included in the minutes and notice of decision) that the applicant has been advised that under current ordinance standards, a variance and/or waiver is necessary to allow an additional lot(s) to utilize the proposed accessway.
9. Any final discussion items?
10. Consider a motion approve the request by Island Cove Building and Development for a 2-lot minor subdivision located off of the Heath Road, based on the submittals and discussions to date and revised subdivision plan, subject to the condition that the minutes from this 7-27-26 meeting and the notice of decision for the application state that the at the 6-22-26 Planning Board meeting the Board recommended that the applicant consider increasing the lot size of lot #1 to allow for additional lot(s) be served by the proposed accessway. Per currently adopted ordinance standards, a waiver and/or variance will be necessary to allow any additional lot(s) to utilize the accessway.

Country Village Assisted Living Facility-Site Plan Review

Introduction

As the Board recalls from meetings last year, Mr. Craig Alaimo, representing the property owner (960 Meadow Road Holdings LLC), operating the Country Village Assisted Living

Facility, is requesting an expansion to the existing nursing home from 30 to 45 beds. The expansion triggers Site Plan Review (SPR) per the Casco Zoning Ordinance.

As the Board is also presumably aware, I am not a Professional Engineer (PE). I do, however, have extensive experience with soils and reviewing stormwater plans (involving interface with PE's) over the years, as well as being a Local Plumbing Inspector (LPI) for 35+ years. I wanted to be clear about this, given my comments below involving the proposed stormwater system and the subsurface wastewater disposal system (SSWD).

DH Roma, consulting engineer, have compiled and submitted a SPR application with accompanying maps. The submittal is divided into 8 sections, and 6 attachments in the bound report. The eight *sections* are: (1) Application, form & checklist, (2) Project Narrative & site map, (3) Right, title, and interest, (4) Abutter list, (5) Variance approval, (6) Utilities, (7) Subsurface Wastewater Disposal (SSWD), and (8) Stormwater management report. The six *attachments* are (1) Soils, (2) Redevelopment standards/calculations, (3) Underdrain filter, basin sizing calculations, (4) Roof drip edge sizing calculations, (5) Stormwater model output, and (6) Inspections, maintenance, and housekeeping plan.

The proposed expansion adds 17,425 SF of new impervious cover for a total (including existing) of 33,620 SF/.77 acre. The proposed additions to the existing structure are 2,735 SF of a one-story addition and 2,380 SF of a two-story addition for a total expanded building footprint of 5,115 SF. As outlined in the submittal, the project requires a MeDEP stormwater permit by rule. There is proposed courtyard with pavers, and an expanded parking lot to accommodate the increased staffing needs in accordance with parking standards in the Zoning Ordinance. There is a relatively minor parking waiver request to reduce the size of 7 of the proposed 25 spaces (23 required per Zoning) to 9' x 18' as compared to the 10' x 20' that is specified by Zoning.

Procedural Matters

RTI-Although the submitted packet contains a section on Right, Title, or Interest (RTI), I was unable to locate any documentation that Craig Alaimo is the duly authorized representative for the property owner (per the submitted deed) of 960 Meadow Road Holdings LLC. In some instances, applicants submit a copy of the corporation annual report or similar showing ownership of the corporation or how they are duly authorized.

I was also unable to locate how DH Roma is duly authorized by 960 Meadow Road Holdings LLC/Craig Alaimo as their agent. Perhaps this was previously submitted. If there is sufficient documentation regarding Mr. Alaimo, and he is attending the upcoming meeting, then his verbal consent at the meeting to authorize DH Roma is sufficient.

Regarding notification, Section 215-7.3, subsection H (Site Plan Review) requires proof of mailing with return receipt required. The board should confirm that these RTI matters are addressed before substantively discussing the application.

History/Overview

Over the past few years, Mr. Alaimo has understandably been seeking paths to allow him to expand the existing facility. There have been proposals for a Contract Zoning Agreement and possibly seeking Zoning Ordinance amendments. Last fall, after initial PB input and based on legal input from the Town's attorney, there was a legal opinion that Mr. Alaimo could indeed seek a variance to address the Net Residential Density, he understandably sought approval from the Casco Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). This aspect is also discussed in section 5 of the submittal.

At the 4-13-26 Casco ZBA meeting, Mr. Alaimo, representing 960 Meadow Road Holdings LLC, was granted a variance to expand the existing facility from 30 to 45 beds (see section 5 of the submittal). The Casco ZBA was aware that although a variance was being sought, the project still needed PB SPR. It is noteworthy that the ZBA, in the resulting notice of decision, had a finding that "The (ZBA) encouraged the Planning Board to scrutinize the stormwater and subsurface wastewater disposal system measures associated with the proposed expansion with the objective of not adversely affecting abutting properties". Part of the reasoning behind this finding was input from abutting/neighborhood property owners. The ZBA's approval of this variance enables Mr. Alaimo to seek PB SPR approval.

The submittal includes a conditional approval from the Maine Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) on 4-14-26 for a 3,012 gallons per day (GPD) subsurface wastewater disposal system (SSWD) with multiple tanks and two force mains. The system utilizes a provision in the Maine Subsurface Wastewater Disposal Rule that allows for 40% +/- reduction in the disposal field sizing based on the advance wastewater treatment (AWT) units. There is semi-annual monitoring of the wastewater, and reporting, associated with the SSWD system as detailed in the DHHS letter in section 7 of the submittal.

Soils

Although the subject property is 8.39 acres, a relatively small portion is proposed for the expanded facility. This portion is understandably quite densely utilized to accommodate the respective needs. There is the building expansion, the courtyard, the stormwater treatment, four SSWD fields, and the expanded parking lot on the front (easterly) portion of the property.

The soils are classified as "Skerry" (SkB is the abbreviation) which are classified as a moderately well drained fine sandy loam soil. Although the soils for this part of Casco are shown in the August 1974 Cumberland County Medium Intensity Soil Survey issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, these soils are generally more accurately described in the March 1995 Soil Survey of Oxford County, also issued by the U.S. Dept. of Ag.

Per the soil survey, these soils have a typical soil profile (beginning at the surface going deeper) described as a fine sandy loam from 0" to 6", then from 6" to 22" as gravelly fine sandy loam, then from 22" to 65" as a gravelly loamy sand. There is relatively high ground water table associated with these soils and they are rated as medium surface runoff and moderate permeability. This is particularly relevant element as the on-site parent soils have a bearing on the ability to infiltrate stormwater.

Stormwater Comments

The submittal contains extensive stormwater calculations and proposes several components listed on page 3 of section 8 (Stormwater management report). The proposed stormwater measures are shown on Sheet GU-1 of the accompanying maps. Some of the elements include roof drip edge drainage, a stormwater area with underdrains, a level lip spreader, and rip-rap aprons for both a drain running generally north/south and two aprons for the proposed parking lot. The technical details associated with reviewing these calculations practically necessitate the skills of a duly qualified P.E.

It is noteworthy that this relatively portion of the subject property is bounded to the south by the Town of Casco (field/area used for Casco Days) and to north by the Magiera's that have previously expressed concerns about the current stormwater runoff situation at prior public meetings.

Per the introduction above for this agenda item, I am not a P.E., but offer the following comments for the board's consideration regarding the proposed plan for the stormwater and associated elements based on the submittal and accompanying Grading and Utility Plan entitled GU-1: (*NOTE: letters for reference purposes only*)

- a. There appears to be relatively extensive re-grading of the area to the west (downgradient) of the four proposed SSWD fields that come quite close to the Magiera property line running generally north-south
- b. The termination of the rip-rap swale and associated level lip spreader is also quite close to the Magiera property line/corner on the northwest corner of the subject property
- c. The proposed stormwater settling area with the underdrain is in very close proximity (re-grading proposed up to the line) to the Magiera property line running generally west-east (perpendicular to Meadow Rd./Rt. 121). I believe that they have an existing parking area in this vicinity which is used in conjunction with their training business. Perhaps consideration should be given to the implications of existing pre-development conditions compared to proposed post-development conditions by extending both pre and post development contours over/onto the Magiera property line to better understand the likely outcome. The purpose of this is to enable the Board and stakeholders to make informed decisions.
- d. Based on the proposed contour lines and the spot grades, it appears that the drainage from courtyard area (with pavers) drains to the proposed parking lot. Such relatively gentle grades with water sheet flow can be problematic with regards to winter storms (with rapidly falling temperatures) causing icing. This situation also increases the volume of sheet-flow water across the parking lot which is discharged upgradient of proposed disposal fields "A" and "B" (see below)
- e. The two proposed rip-rap aprons apparently designed to address the stormwater sheet-flow from parking lot discharge just above proposed disposal fields "A" and "B". Local Plumbing Inspectors are trained to attempt to avoid introducing water

upgradient of disposal fields. Perhaps consideration be given to adding additional stormwater measures to minimize introducing water upgradient of the disposal fields

- f. Given the parent soils together with the relatively large roof area, are the designed roof drip edge drainage sufficient to handle the anticipated volume? It is also noteworthy that some of the courtyard area has roof drip edge drainage that adds to the volume of water from the courtyard

Possible peer review: Given these questions, and perhaps other input from abutters and/or the PB, the board may wish to consider a peer review of the stormwater component of the application with attention to the interface of the SSWD system and minimizing impacts on abutting properties. As the board is aware, Section 215-7.3, subsection D (Applications for Site Plan Review) provides the ability of the PB to require the applicant to post escrow monies sufficient to cover the costs for any professional review of the site plan documents which the Planning Board may feel is reasonable to protect the general welfare of the Town.

Buffering

The developed portion of the subject property is located in the Village District which is 215-4.5 of the Casco Zoning Ordinance. Subsection D addresses “Other Standards” for the Village District. Subsection D (1) which states that a 20’ landscaped front buffer is required. This subsection also states that all non-residential uses must meet the standards in Section 215-5.7 (“Buffer zones”) which addresses front, side, and rear buffers. Based on the zoning use classification of “Nursing Home”, which is characterized as an institution per the definition, it seems apparent that this is a non-residential use. It appears that the standards for buffers in 215-5.7 are applicable. The submitted application did not appear to address buffering.

I encourage PB members to read the two-page Section 215-5.7 (Buffer Zones) as there are several specific provisions. It is noteworthy that subsection (2) allows the PB to waive the buffering although this appears to give the PB the authority to waive only the *front* buffer. I note that 215-7.4, subsection B (Site Plan Review-submissions section of the Zoning ordinance) states that the PB may waive submission requirements. As the relatively new planner, I am unaware of prior circumstances where the PB may have waived a performance standard (such as side line buffering) as part of a site plan review application.

Criteria and Standards

Section 215-7.5, subsection (A), contains 12 elements that the PB is to discuss and apply to a SPR application as appropriate. I encourage PB members to review this section of the Zoning ordinance. The submitted application did not appear to address these.

Recommended Actions

1. The board should ensure that the requisite *procedural matters* are addressed:
 - RTI-Documentation regarding Mr. Craig Alaimo presenting 960 Meadow Road Holdings LLC

- DH Roma presenting the property owner (960 Meadow Road Holdings LLC)
 - Was the meeting duly advertised as a public hearing
 - Were abutters duly notified per ordinance requirements (return receipt)
2. If the above procedural matters are addressed:
- The board may wish to have the applicant make a presentation
 - Public input/concerns (if any)
3. Stormwater:
- Does the board have any concerns given the notes herein and/or others' comments
 - Does the board wish to consider requiring a peer review of the stormwater per comment above
4. Buffering:
- Given the discussion in this memo, does the PB believe that buffering should be part of the project, and if so, on the front, and/or sides?
 - Is the CEO and/or PB aware of situations where the PB has waived performance standards associated with a site plan review application?
5. Criteria and Standards:
- If there are any outstanding items to be addressed regarding this application, it is prudent to get all known elements on the table at the beginning of the review. As such, I encourage the board to discuss the criteria and standards in 215-7.5.

Given the various points raised in this memo, and pending PB input at the upcoming meeting, I have not reviewed the application for completeness. It seems apparent that there are some potentially substantive decisions that necessitate PB input before further steps are taken with this application.

