

July 20,2026

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

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.

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 begins 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”?

7. 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.

8. Any final discussion items?

9. 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.