



# TOWN OF DAYTON, MAINE PLANNING BOARD

Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, August 27, 2024, 6:30 P.M.  
Dayton Town Hall  
33 Clarks Mills Road

## **CALL TO ORDER & DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

**Members Present:** Shannon Belanger (Chair), Darren Adams, Justin Lord, Nick Donilon, and John Boissonnault.

**Town Employees Present:** none.

Meeting was called to order by Chair Shannon Belanger at 6:30 PM.

The Board is still in need of a Planning Board secretary position to be filled.

## **MINUTES**

September 26, 2023  
October 10, 2023  
July 16, 2024  
August 13, 2024

## **MOTION**

Motion by John, seconded by Justin to postpone the review of the meeting minutes. All in favor.  
PASSED.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

## **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW & WORKSHOPS**

- I. **TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER** – Antoinette Burns, applicant on behalf of Tilson Infrastructure; David and Rose Marie Hill, owner. Conditional Use Permit for a 120' tall transmission tower with a 12' wide access road and overhead utilities for a property with street frontage off Hight Road and Clarks Mills Road. Tower to be located near 388 Hight Road. The property is located in the Rural Forest and Critical Rural zoning districts. Tax Map 1, Lot 16. **Report site walk results, workshop application for completeness with zoning ordinance, determine a public hearing**

Heather Carlisle of Tilson was present.

Shannon Belanger reported the site walk results for the 8/24 site walk held at 9am. All Planning Board members were present as well as the Code Enforcement Officer, Jim Roberts.

1 Those present from the public included: Joe Albert, Debbie Bennit, Richard Wood, Lindsay  
2 Houlton, Jorge M, Sam Stagg, David and Bridgett Pendleton, Colin A., and Pete Daley.

3  
4 The following items were reported:

- 5 • Yellow stakes marked the proposed access off Hight Road
- 6 • Red ballon observed at entrance road moderately thick canopy of deciduous  
7 trees
- 8 • Yellow stakes marked the proposed access road on the property to the tower  
9 parking area and tower perimeter
- 10 • Blue stakes marked the corners of the proposed cell tower fence enclosure area.  
11 Fence enclosure to be a chain link fence.
- 12 • Orange stake marked the monopole cell tower location
- 13 • The monopole has 1 carrier committed at this time and the pole could support up  
14 to 4 carriers. The 1 committed carrier is Verizon.
- 15 • The pad area around the monopole to include equipment shelters and utilities.
- 16 • Access road to the tower and/or the fence enclosure to have a knox box.  
17 Applicant to confirm.
- 18 • Inquiries were made about holding another site walk once the leaves have fallen.
- 19 • Inquiries were made about requiring an amendment to the conditional use permit/  
20 site plan prior to more carriers being located on the monopole/tower.
- 21 • Applicant to provide an emissions study based on 1 carrier. Applicant to  
22 investigate provided an emission study based on up to 4 carriers.
- 23 • The site was chosen by Verizon's consultant based on the coverage needs of the  
24 area. The site meets certain criteria Verizon looks for. Properties in the area were  
25 contacted and this property owner responded with interest to allow the tower.
- 26 • The tower has a lease agreement on the property.
- 27 • The owner of the property was not present. They have given written permission  
28 to the applicant to pursue this tower application on their property.
- 29 • The tower would be able to support 5G if the carriers pursued that.
- 30 • The tower will be 120 feet tall from the proposed based/ground elevation.
- 31 • The FCC regulations exempt cell towers from having to meet building height  
32 requirements in zoning districts.
- 33 • Fire Department submitted a request recommending the tower consider allowing  
34 radio equipment on the tower to help improve their radio communication system.
- 35 • Concerns regarding tower radiation were voiced.
- 36 • Concerns on decreasing property values were voiced.
- 37 • Applicant to provide information confirming improved Verizon coverage for  
38 Dayton residents, not just in neighboring communities.
- 39 • Applicant to investigate moving the tower location further back on the property  
40 but not going into the Critical Rural zone.
- 41 • Applicant to provide any habitat studies performed. A vernal pool was mentioned  
42 by an abutter but it is unknown if it is a significant vernal pool.
- 43 • Applicant to investigate connecting utilities along Hight Road since there is a  
44 break in coverage.

- 1 • Tree clearing limits are defined on the site plan and to be discussed further.
- 2 • Review criteria described by Planning Board (setbacks, access, buffers, parking,
- 3 drainage, etc).
- 4 • The red balloon to stay up until 11:45am.
- 5 • The red balloon was visible to those approaching the site from the easterly end of
- 6 Hight Road.

7  
8 The Planning Board also reviewed the memo prepared for today's workshop. Various notes and  
9 revisions were recommended to the site plan to capture the Rural Forest zoning requirements,  
10 abutting Critical Rural zone, and use. The Planning Board asked for the applicant to  
11 communicate the desire of the Board to Tilson to see the tower moved further north to create a  
12 greater distance to abutters.

13  
14 The Planning Board will have to consider what buffers for residential abutters are possible. The  
15 plan must depict existing tree lines. Some evergreen plantings may be recommended to  
16 improve the buffer.

17  
18 Site plan to identify any fuel tanks, lighting, knox box to road gates and chain link fence to be  
19 reviewed. The noise ordinance note to be added to address any generator operations. Plan to  
20 define employee spaces, notation prevent backing out onto Hight Road and sight distances  
21 needed. Refuse disposal note needed.

22  
23 A statement address pre vs post drainage conditions is recommended and what control  
24 measures are proposed. Soil erosion and sedimentation control measures are noted. Existing  
25 utility poles serving the property are identified. Can utility poles connect on Hight Road to  
26 improve power coverage in the area. Applicant to investigate.

27  
28 Applicant will contact the drafters and survey crew to being working on plan revisions. Once  
29 plan revisions are provided, they will present them back before the Planning Board at a future  
30 meeting.

- 31  
32  
33 **II. LIZOTTE USED CAR DEALERSHIP – Joseph Lizotte, applicant; Roger Moreau, agent;**  
34 **Michael Hirst, owner. Conditional Use Permit for Motor Vehicle Sales. The applicant**  
35 **proposes to lease 6,000 SF of land for a used car lot. An office and work/storage area is**  
36 **proposed within the existing barn. The existing dwelling on the property to remain. The**  
37 **property is located at 586 New County Road. The property is located within the Rural**  
38 **Fields zone and is identified as Map 6, Lot 41-6. Report site walk results, workshop**  
39 **application for completeness with zoning ordinance, determine a public hearing**

40  
41 Roger Moreau and Joseph Lizotte were present.

42  
43 Shannon Belanger reported the site walk results for the 8/24 site walk held at 9am. All Planning  
44 Board members except Justin were present as well as the Code Enforcement Officer, Jim  
45 Roberts.

46  
47 Roger Moreau, Mike Hirst, and Jennie Moreau were present on behalf of the proposal.

48  
49 Site walk comments were reviewed:

- 1 • Cones were placed along New County Road to help slow traffic and provide a
- 2 safety measure during the site walk.
- 3 • The barn area was observed. Nice improvements to the space have been
- 4 completed. The proposed office and service area observed.
- 5 • The proposed car lot area was mowed and staked at the corners of the 10 car lot
- 6 and future 16 car lot.
- 7 • The well location was observed and is close to the proposed car lot and parking.
- 8 • Dumpster was observed and location to be determined on the plan.
- 9 • Trees observed along New County Road and recommended to be cut to improve
- 10 sight distances to the west.
- 11 • Sight distances to the east clear.
- 12 • Wetland area observed next to the car lot proposed location. Wetland to be
- 13 delineated on the plan. Wetland (4,350 SF) may be filled with a MDEP PBR
- 14 application.
- 15 • Tree lines along the property line observed.
- 16 • Drainage statement needed to address pre and post drainage conditions. A
- 17 swale design may be proposed to capture New County Road drainage and
- 18 maintain flow direction.
- 19 • Applicant to consider relocating the lot away from New County Road. It is
- 20 currently too close as proposed.
- 21 • Shannon provided Mike Hirst the review comment memo prepared prior to the
- 22 last Planning Board meeting which outlined concerns to be addressed.
- 23 • Lot coverage to be calculated and noted.

24  
25 The Planning Board reviewed the memo prepared for the last workshop. The site plan  
26 to be revised to address the following: A full boundary plan of the property is  
27 recommended to be used on a 24" x 36" size plan so all features can be reviewed along  
28 with plan notes added. Notes are needed that detail the Rural Fields zoning  
29 requirements, the stream to the north to be identified, wetland delineation is needed as  
30 the parking area is proposed on an area that appears to have wetland. Notes on the  
31 existing and proposed uses are needed.

32  
33 Planning Board to discuss buffer requirements. Any fuel tanks for other explosive  
34 material storage to be identified. What lighting exists or is proposed. Shade trees along  
35 the road may be required.

36  
37 Off-street parking is required to meet the 75' setback from the street ROW. The  
38 applicant asked if the car display area for sales is required to also meet the setback.  
39 The Planning Board discussed. The code requires the off-street parking for the  
40 proposed use to meet setbacks. Customer parking for the repair garage and used car  
41 lot would need to meet the setback requirement. The sales are may be within the  
42 setback but a decently sized buffer is recommended. This area of New County Road is  
43 near a very dangerous intersection.

1 The plan to note business hours and a noise note to be added to the plan. Parking  
2 space dimensional requirements are 9' by 20' with a 24' wide aisle for 90 degree  
3 spaces. Gravel area parking area was discussed and 12" gravel can be used. The  
4 parking lot is not required to be paved.

5  
6 The road opening onto New County Road requires a MDOT road opening permit. The  
7 applicant should apply for this permit as this will dictate how the parking and access  
8 driveway are designed. Exit and entrance signs are recommended. Stop sign is  
9 recommended.

10  
11 If the property is to have a dumpster it must be shown on the plan. A dumpster has to  
12 meet setbacks as well. The business sign also has to comply with 6.13 requirements.

13  
14 Stormwater pre and post calculations or statement from design professional not yet  
15 provided and would be recommended. Proposed grading and contours to be shown on  
16 the plan as well. Plan to note if the property is within a flood hazard area.

17  
18 Existing utilities serving the property to be identified on the plan as well.

19  
20 The applicant will work on plan revisions and submit for continued workshop before the  
21 Planning Board.

22  
23 Yvonne Shaw asked if the project will have a public hearing. The Planning Board will  
24 workshop and discuss a public hearing once the plans meet zoning requirements.

25  
26 Yvonne Shaw also informed the Planning Board that MDOT has plans to redesign the  
27 intersection of Hollis Road and River Road just west of this property. The intersection  
28 redesign may effect the property access and be a safety concern.

29  
30 **OTHER**

31  
32 The next Planning Board meetings will be held on September 10<sup>th</sup>.

33  
34 **ADJOURN**

35  
36 **MOTION**

37 Motion by Darren, seconded by John to adjourn at 7:45 PM. All in favor. PASSED.

38  
39  Date: 11/12/24

40 Shannon Belanger, Chairman

41  
42 Copies to: Jim Roberts, Code Enforcement Officer; Selectmen; and Tax Assessor

43 THESE MINUTES MAY NOT BE TRANSCRIBED VERBATIM. SECTIONS MAY BE  
44 PARAPHRASED FOR CLARITY.