

## Brownfields Assessment Program Update

By David Versel, Senior Planner

We are pleased to announce progress on our Brownfields Assessment Grant. This \$200,000 grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will allow us to fund environmental assessments and remediation plans for several abandoned sites throughout our region. The first step in the process was to select an engineering consultant to oversee the project. After receiving nine qualification statements, SMRPC assembled a review committee to assess the applicants. The committee was comprised of Paul Schumacher and me from SMRPC, Town Planners Judy Bernstein (Kennebunk), Jim Gulnac (Sanford) and Peter Morelli (Saco), and Brian Phinney, the City of Biddeford's Environmental Code Officer. We requested proposals from four of the applicants and interviewed them on January 21, 2005. The selected consulting firm of Aquarion Engineering Services is now under contract and we are gearing up to begin the project in earnest.

The first task for the consultant will be to identify potential brownfield sites for review. The EPA defines brownfields as "abandoned, idled, or under-used industrial and commercial facilities where expansion or redevelopment is complicated by real or perceived environmental contamination." These may include both large or small properties and can encompass a variety of historic uses. The criteria we intend to use to assess the sites are:

- What has the highest likelihood for successful redevelopment?
- Is there a developer or private investor ready to invest in the site?
- How does the site fit in with the community's growth strategy?
- What is the overall benefit to the community?
- Is there a regional value to the project?
- Can the project be used as a model for other communities?

If you have any brownfield sites in your town that you would like to have considered for this program, please contact me at 324-2952 or [dversel@smrpc.org](mailto:dversel@smrpc.org). Also, we have developed a webpage for this project where project information and news updates will be regularly posted: [www.smrpc.org/new/development/brownfields/brownfields.htm](http://www.smrpc.org/new/development/brownfields/brownfields.htm).



21 Bradeen St., Suite 304  
Springvale, ME 04083

*Return Service Requested*

NON-PROFIT  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Sanford, ME 04073  
Permit #55

February 2005

Vol. 15, No. 1



SOUTHERN MAINE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

# Regional Newsletter

## Growth Management in Maine: What Happens Next?

By David Versel, Senior Planner

A new year has dawned in Southern Maine, but the same growth management issues remain. Most of our member communities are actively grappling with how to manage growth. Some are updating comprehensive plans, others are overhauling zoning or subdivision ordinances, and others are considering growth caps. Despite all the work being put in throughout our region, we are still searching for answers. Perhaps the best illustration of our struggles was the spate of newspaper articles documenting the hardy individuals camping out in front of several of our municipal offices on New Year's Day, hoping to obtain growth permits.

Regardless of what one thinks of planning, zoning or growth caps, I think we can all agree that the current state of affairs of growth management in our region is less than perfect—a fact that state government has clearly noticed. There are active efforts to enact major alterations to the State of Maine's two regulatory tools for the growth management program: the statute itself and the review rule used by SPO staff to assess the consistency of local plans with the statute. A draft of proposed changes to the rule was distributed to staff of the 11 regional planning councils in the state in November, with a strong emphasis on improving the transparency of the review process and clarifying plan consistency standards. RPC staffers offered comments to SPO on the draft and it is now being reworked by SPO. We expect a new version of it to be presented sometime later this year. SMRPC and the other regional planning councils will continue to be involved in the rulemaking process.

The Legislature is also going to be heavily involved in shaping the future of the growth management program during this session. In December 2004, the Community Preservation Advisory Committee (CPAC) met to discuss its legislative agenda for this session. The result of this meeting was the submittal of an omnibus bill containing ten proposed revisions to the Growth Management statute. Though it appears that many of these suggestions will not make it to the floor of the Legislature, they will certainly provide the Legislature with an awful lot of food for thought in 2005. Here is a brief summary of the bill's contents:

- **Making comprehensive planning a mandatory prerequisite** for zoning and growth management, and requiring all local plans to be consistent with state law.
- **Adding a series of definitions** for "terms of art" such as contract zoning, impact fee, rate of growth ordinance, capital budgeting, cluster development, infill development and transfer of development rights, to ensure that local plans use the same words to mean the same things.
- **Limiting the use of rate of growth ordinances (growth caps)** to temporary situations when sudden rapid growth creates a threat to public health, safety and welfare.
- **Setting out a process for planning and implementation** that ensures that implementation actions such as ordinance revisions and capital investments do not occur until comprehensive plans have been completed and found consistent with state law by SPO.
- **Requiring clustered, high-density and infill development** through a similar mechanism to those requiring towns to allow group homes and manufactured housing.
- **Requiring towns to identify suitable locations for low to moderate-income housing** in comprehensive plans to help ensure that these units actually get built.
- **A "NIMBY" provision barring towns from disallowing projects** for irrational reasons.
- **Fiscal support for planning and financial incentives to towns** that produce consistent comprehensive plans. This would be funded by a new state Local Government Fund.
- **Establishing a state review body** that reviews all local land use-related ordinances.
- **Authorizing the state Attorney General's office to enforce the Act** if SPO staff finds that municipalities are violating its provisions.

Clearly, the above list presents a far different picture of growth management than what we know today. Though CPAC has submitted these items, the primary intent is to spur discussion. The outcome of these discussions in the Legislature is unknown—it is entirely possible that nothing will change in 2005. Either way, we will be closely monitoring the action up in Augusta, so please keep an eye on our website at [www.smrpc.org](http://www.smrpc.org) for updates. If you want to weigh in on these ideas, please contact us—we're listening!

## !! Website News !!

We are in the process of overhauling our website to make it more visually appealing and user-friendly. The front page and Transportation section have already been made over, and we are working on the other sections. If you have any thoughts, please contact our webmaster, Dave Carpenter.

### SMRPC Staff Contacts

**Paul Schumacher** Executive Director  
[pschumacher@smrpc.org](mailto:pschumacher@smrpc.org)

**Peg Sawyer** Office Manager/Bookkeeper  
[psawyer@smrpc.org](mailto:psawyer@smrpc.org)

**For General Inquiries**  
[info@smrpc.org](mailto:info@smrpc.org)

#### Land Use Planning Section

**Jonathan "J.T." Lockman** Planning Director  
[jlockman@smrpc.org](mailto:jlockman@smrpc.org)

**David Versel** Senior Planner  
[dversel@smrpc.org](mailto:dversel@smrpc.org)

**Jamie Oman-Saltmarsh** Land Use Planner  
[jamieos@smrpc.org](mailto:jamieos@smrpc.org)

#### Transportation Section

**Tom Reinauer** Transportation Director  
[treinauer@smrpc.org](mailto:treinauer@smrpc.org)

**David Carpenter**  
Kids and Transportation Coordinator  
[dcarpenter@smrpc.org](mailto:dcarpenter@smrpc.org)

**Josh Mack** Transportation Planner  
[jmack@smrpc.org](mailto:jmack@smrpc.org)

#### Economic Development Section

**Chuck Morgan**  
Economic & Community Development Director  
[cmorgan@smrpc.org](mailto:cmorgan@smrpc.org)

**Gordon Platt**  
Small Business Development Ctr. Director  
[gplatt@usm.maine.edu](mailto:gplatt@usm.maine.edu)

#### All staff may be reached at:

Southern Maine Regional  
Planning Commission  
21 Bradeen Street, Suite 304  
Springvale, ME 04083  
207.324.2952 voice 207.324.2958 fax  
website - <http://www.smrpc.org>

## Executive Director's Column

I want to begin my column by acknowledging the service to the SMRPC Executive Board of Chet Chapman. After 10 years of service on the Board (the last three as Chair), Chet has stepped down. For many years, Chet has been our strongest connection to Oxford County and we are all very appreciative of his service to the Commission. Chet will be replaced on the Board by Rob Heard, another Selectman from the Town of Porter.

\* \* \*

As most people in the region are aware, the fate of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is once again up in the air. By mid-May the Secretary of Defense will forward a list of possible base closures to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. We have been through this drill before, but there seems to be a greater sense of urgency regarding this round of closures. It is possible that 20-25% of all U.S. military installations may be closed. For this area and the entire state of Maine, the reasons for concern are evident.

The Seacoast Shipyard Association provides annual numbers concerning employment at the Shipyard. The numbers represented by the shipyard are staggering as far as an economic engine for the region is concerned: a total of 2,951 employees in Maine alone with an annual payroll of over 185 million dollars. In York County alone employment at the shipyard numbers over 2,800. For many York County communities, the shipyard is by far the largest employer of its residents. The towns in our region sending the most workers to the shipyard are: Sanford: 392; Kittery: 346; South Berwick: 277; Berwick: 239; Eliot: 230; and Biddeford: 211. If these were jobs lost as part of a plant closing in any community in Maine, they would be considered disastrous. Considering that these losses might potentially occur region wide, there is even more reason for alarm.

There would also be negative spin-off impacts from these job losses. One of the most notable trends from the previous reductions in force at the shipyard was that these are very difficult jobs to replace as far as income. Trying to replace jobs that pay on average over \$50,000 a year is not easy as far as economic development is concerned. If we were to take this income out of the local economy the impacts are multiplied – from small retail stores to construction to suppliers who may provide goods and services to the shipyard.

For instance, in South Berwick, a community of about 6,000 residents the loss of 277 jobs would also mean the loss of over 19 million dollars in income generated by residents of that community. The unemployment rate in the Kittery/York labor Market area (comprising Kittery, York, South Berwick, Eliot and Berwick) would more than triple to about 8%. In the Sanford Labor Market Area the unemployment rate would increase to over 9%. These figures do not even deal with the social and cultural costs of a possible closure. Most everyone in this region has a friend or relative working at the shipyard. It is a time of great uncertainty and a time when the region has always rallied to the cause of keeping the shipyard open. It is that time once again.

*Paul Schumacher*

## STATE PLANNING OFFICE NEWS

### Fund for Maine Land Conservation Receives \$250,000 Gift

The Fund for Maine Land Conservation of the Maine Community Foundation (MCF) recently received a \$250,000 gift from an anonymous donor. The gift will raise the total assets of the endowed fund to almost \$380,000. The gift will allow MCF to nearly triple the amount of grants that it funds. The Fund for Maine Land Conservation supports projects and organizations that promote collaboration between land trusts, municipalities, watershed groups and other nonprofit organizations whose work is focused on land conservation, stewardship and smart growth. This year MCF partnered with the Horizon Foundation ([www.horizonfoundation.org](http://www.horizonfoundation.org)) to broaden the scope of the conservation fund, and to increase the amount of funding available for granting to Maine land trusts.

Recent grants made from the fund include: \$7,500 to the Georges River Land Trust for a community conservation planning project, \$7,500 to the York Land Trust to implement community-based conservation strategies for the Mount Agamenticus to the Sea project and \$2,000 to Maine Land Trust Network to develop models of collaboration for land trusts in the state. MCF hopes to build the Fund for Maine Land Conservation. **May 15, 2005, is the next deadline for applications.** For complete application guidelines, please call toll free 1-877-700-6800 or visit [www.mainecef.org](http://www.mainecef.org).

### Mercury Disposal Ban Takes Effect, Grants are Available

A legislative ban that prohibits the disposal of household items containing mercury took effect on January 1, 2005. Homeowners and residents will no longer be able to discard mercury-containing lamps, thermostats, thermometers, switches, relays, medical or scientific instruments, or any other device where mercury has been added in the manufacturing process in their household trash. Items that contain mercury, a hazardous metal, will need to be separated and taken to a municipally-designated collection facility or event for recycling and proper disposal. With this step, the Legislature aims to improve the management of toxic wastes to help protect our health and environment.

SPO furnishes grants (with little or no local match required) to help municipalities construct storage facilities and to implement programs to capture mercury products as well as universal (another category of household hazardous wastes) and electronic wastes. To date, SPO has awarded grants totaling nearly \$800,000 to 63 public entities to construct regional facilities to collect these wastes. In addition, the office has awarded prefabricated storage sheds to public programs serving up to 55 communities to store mercury products and universal wastes awaiting collection and transport to the regional facilities. SPO has also proposed additional bond funding to continue to support these efforts. For more information, contact Sam Morris at 287-8054 or [sam.morris@maine.gov](mailto:sam.morris@maine.gov).

### Intergovernmental Advisory Group Update

The first meeting of the Intergovernmental Advisory Group (IAG) was held on December 15, 2004. Governor Baldacci welcomed the members and spoke of the need to change the way Maine delivers government services and the need to maximize the resources between the three levels of government: state, county, and municipal.

The advisory group brainstormed both short- and long-term issues, from rethinking jurisdictional boundaries and governance structures to looking at outdated, unnecessary, or unfunded mandates. Member of the working group stressed that there are many regional entities now that deliver regional services, and the challenge is to move to the next level. The group noted that it would be important not to lose public participation in government (local civic boards) while achieving regional efficiencies. The group also stressed that we must balance cost savings with quality of services, as we do not want to dilute the quality of services.

The group created three subcommittees to explore: 1) governance; 2) mandates; and 3) incentives. House Chair, Representative Chris Barstow has put in a bill title, *An Act to Modernize Maine Government*, as a holding place for the IAG's legislative proposals for the upcoming session. For more information, contact Jody Harris, the SPO representative on the IAG, at 287-5424 or [jody.harris@maine.gov](mailto:jody.harris@maine.gov).

## Regional Needs Assessment Update

By Josh Mack, Transportation Planner

Maine DOT's year-long Regional Needs Assessment process is now at its midway point. The new process, which has replaced the Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (RTAC), uses a steering committee and creative new public involvement approaches to focus on regional transportation needs. This new approach assesses transportation needs in a more holistic way by looking at how Maine DOT can link its transportation planning efforts with more locally controlled land use and economic development planning. Another facet of this process is that it approaches transportation planning by categorizing highways and other transportation modes into corridor systems. At this point, the Southern Maine Regional Needs Assessment effort has performed an initial identification of corridor systems, corridor issues and recommended policy and programming objectives to Maine DOT for each corridor.

As Maine DOT's contractor for the Southern Maine region, SMRPC is attempting to make the agency's interface with the public more visible and transparent. To increase visibility, we are taking advantage of technology to reach more people. Through broadcast e-mails, interested parties have information about the process directly sent to them. We have also created a weblink that provides background information, documents and maps relating to the regional needs process. The website also increases transparency of transportation planning activities in the region with links to a regularly updated online public calendar of transportation planning events, links to meeting agendas and minutes, transportation documents and maps. Other more traditional forms of outreach, such as public meetings, press releases and open houses are also part of the mix of this public outreach effort.

This February SMRPC is launching a Regional Needs Assessment Survey. If you have not received a survey in the mail, please take the time to access the downloadable survey on the Regional Needs Assessment web page at: [www.smrpc.org/transportation/rna/rna.htm](http://www.smrpc.org/transportation/rna/rna.htm) or contact Josh Mack at [jmack@smrpc.org](mailto:jmack@smrpc.org) for a copy of the survey.

## MaineDOT Driveway Permits Now Required Before Local Permits

By Meg Lane, Maine Department of Transportation

With the State of Maine experiencing unprecedented housing starts, more and more construction is under way along state highways. MaineDOT wants to make municipalities, code enforcement officers and planning board members aware of changes in rules affecting both current and new driveways for homes and businesses. Unfortunately, there have been recent instances when construction is well under way before MaineDOT is aware of a project and they are forced to change and, in some instances, stop work. Needless to say, this causes confusion and frustration for the property owner, who often blames the town for not disclosing this rule up front.

A mailing going out to all municipalities in January 2005 provides brochures on driveway permits in hopes they will be distributed to planning boards, code enforcement officers and the general public. **Essentially, anyone installing, physically changing or changing the use of a driveway on a state highway must get a permit from the Maine Department of Transportation first. In addition, State Law requires that Planning Boards have entrance approval documentation from MaineDOT before granting a subdivision approval. Once the MaineDOT permit is obtained, then the municipality can grant its local permits. (The brochure outlines exceptions.)**

Driveway permits are required so that Maine can balance safety with efficient traffic flow on Maine highways. The permits are free and MaineDOT makes every attempt to respond promptly to applications. An Access Permit may be denied by MaineDOT for lack of sight distance, poor design, or failure to meet other access management standards.

If you have any questions, call Bruce Mattson of MaineDOT at 941-4310 or check the website: [www.mainedot.gov](http://www.mainedot.gov) and look for licenses, permits & applications in the left margin.

Additional copies of MaineDOT's brochure, titled "Your Guide to Permits for Driveways and Entrances" are available by calling Kendra Danforth at MaineDOT at 1-800-380-7822.

## Route 236 Corridor Implementation Committee

By Josh Mack, Transportation Planner

As of February 10, the Route 236 Corridor Implementation Committee, a group working on mobility and safety issues on Route 236, has conducted three meetings. The Committee has accomplished a great deal including:

- Development of an "Action Plan Purpose and Needs Statement"
- Review and prioritization of findings and recommendations of former planning studies relating to Route 236
- Initial identification of gaps in former recommendations
- Review of candidate projects on the corridor, as well as past projects, transportation and census data, and local land use and access management regulations

At this stage, the Committee is exploring ways in which to improve regional coordination in regulating land use and highway access along the corridor. The group is also looking into expanding impact fees in the region, including research into developing a regional transportation impact fee. For more information about the committee visit the committee's new weblink at [www.smrpc.org/transportation/corridor/corridor.htm#236](http://www.smrpc.org/transportation/corridor/corridor.htm#236).

## Route 109 Corridor Committee

By Josh Mack, Transportation Planner

After taking the findings of the Route 109 Interim Report to the Sanford Town Council and Wells Selectmen, the Route 109 Corridor Committee has won support from the two towns to go forward with a detailed review and analysis of each town's access management policies and regulations. The objective of this effort will be a collaborative and coordinated access management or mobility plan for the corridor that is reflected in the towns' policy and regulatory documents.

SMRPC will hold a workshop with each planning board this February to identify strengths, weaknesses and recommendations for the respective comprehensive plans, zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations. The towns will reconvene in March to assess the planning board workshops and discuss next steps. For more information about the committee visit the committee's new weblink at: [www.smrpc.org/transportation/corridor/corridor.htm#109](http://www.smrpc.org/transportation/corridor/corridor.htm#109).

## Atlantic Shoreline Transit System

By Tom Reinauer, Transportation Director

SMRPC has been working for the past two years with coastal York County towns, chambers of commerce, local trolley operators, the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT), the Maine Turnpike Authority, the Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority (NNEPRA), and others on the design of a seasonal transit system. The original name of the project was "Coastal Explorer," but it has since been renamed the "Atlantic Shoreline Transit System." The principal consultant for the planning and design phase of the project was Tom Crikelair & Associates, a firm that has also worked on the design of the Island Explorer system in the Bar Harbor/Acadia area and the Mountain Explorer in Bethel/Sunday River.

The plan calls for integrating several new or revised trolley and bus routes with existing private trolley operations. SMRPC will continue to be working with the project advisory committee on the implementation phase of this exciting project. MDOT will be going out to bid shortly for new vehicles, and services are scheduled for start up in the summer of 2006.

For more information contact Tom Reinauer at [treinauer@smrpc.org](mailto:treinauer@smrpc.org), or visit our website for the full document with all of the details.

## Case Notes

By Madge Baker, Esq.

**Hannah O'Toole v. City of Portland**, October 27, 2004, Maine Supreme Judicial Court. *Variance*

**Facts:** O'Toole owns two undeveloped, contiguous lots measuring 30 feet by 100 feet dating from the 1920s. She proposed to combine the two lots but even then the lot will not comply with current zoning. Portland has enacted the "practical difficulty" test for residential variance applications. That test includes the following: "The need for a variance is due to the unique circumstances of the property and not to the general condition of the neighborhood;" and "no other feasible alternative to a variance is available to the petitioner." The ZBA turned down the variance appeal, concluding that the lots were not unique because of the condition of the neighborhood is one of 30 foot wide parcels, and because she made no attempt to acquire additional property. Superior Court did not agree with the ZBA. The City appealed.

**Issue:** Was the practical difficulty test correctly applied to the facts of this case?

**Ruling:** 1) The Court first looks at the ZBA finding that 30-foot wide parcels are the condition of the neighborhood. The Court infers that the ZBA used the 1920s condition of the neighborhood to reach this conclusion. The Court disagrees with this interpretation of the meaning of the term "general condition." The Court maintains that "general condition" means *present* conditions. In this instance the answer is no. 2) Next the Court examines whether the circumstances of the property are unique. The Court concludes that O'Toole had not provided the evidence needed to make a determination as to whether the circumstances are unique. Statements in the record are conflicting on the point. In this instance the answer is yes.

**Outcome:** The Supreme Judicial Court upholds the ZBA because the appellant did not meet one of the hardship tests.

**Comment:** The opinion comments on discussions between the ZBA and its Attorney that discuss the likelihood of this decision setting a bad precedent. The Court found that because the Board based its decision entirely on the facts of the particular case the Board had been illegally influenced by the attorney's opinion.

**Peregrine Developers v. Town of Orono**, July 23, 2004, Maine Supreme Judicial Court. *Zoning interpretation*

**Facts:** Peregrine Developers proposed to build a housing complex in the Forestry and Agricultural District where multifamily dwelling is a permitted use but dormitories are not. Peregrine called it a "multifamily dwelling," even though the units would be rented to students. Multifamily dwelling is defined in the ordinance. Dormitory is not but "commercial dormitory" is. The Planning Board disapproved the project because it decided the housing complex would be a dormitory. The ZBA agreed. Superior Court also upheld the decisions of the PB and ZBA.

**Issue:** Is it or is it not a "dormitory?"

**Ruling:** The Court finds that the project does meet the definition of "multifamily dwelling" because each dwelling unit will have independent cooking and sleeping facilities. The "commercial dormitory" definition talks in terms of "rooming units," units without cooking facilities. Thus the Court finds the proposed buildings more like multifamily dwellings, which are only classified in this instance by the PB and ZBA as dormitories because students will live in them. The Court concludes "there is no indication in the Ordinance that a 'dormitory' is a structure defined by the types of individuals who would reside in the structure. The Town of Orono may not deny applications for development by using a more restrictive standard for regulation than is contained in its Ordinance." The Court also noted that there are lots of nonconforming "dormitories" in Orono according to the PB definition of dormitory as a place students live.

**B&K Realty v. Town of Ogunquit**, Decided January 13, 2005, Superior Court of York County. *Zoning interpretation*

**Facts:** The owner of an existing 11-room building proposed to convert it into four motel units and to construct an addition with 38 more units. The facility had provided seasonal housing to individuals working at the Ogunquit Playhouse. All rooms were rented for the season. The facility was not advertised to the public. The Town Ordinance prohibits new hotels and motels the district where the property is located, but it does allow legally existing nonconforming hotels and motels to continue, expand, and be reconstructed or structurally altered. The Planning Board concluded this building was neither a hotel or a motel, so the grandfathering clause did not apply.

**Issue:** Was the Planning Board's interpretation of the words "hotel" and "motel" correct?

**Ruling:** The court upheld the PB's decision. "Hotel" is defined as a place where lodging or meals and lodging are available to the public. The Board made specific findings such as there was no front desk, no guest register, no payment of lodging sales tax. Lodging was available only to a very few, not to the general public. "Motel" is defined with emphasis on its providing "transient accommodations." The Planning Board and the court agreed this was employee housing not housing for transients. The only other word the court looked at was "general." The hotel definition refers only to "the public." The motel definition talks in terms of the "general public." The court concludes that "general" in this context is a redundant word and that "public" and "general public" have the same meaning.

## Changes to DEP Shoreland Zoning on the Horizon

By J.T. Lockman, Planning Director

The Maine Department of Environmental Protection is currently working on amending the State of Maine Guidelines for Municipal Shoreland Zoning Ordinances (also known as Chapter 1000 of the Regulations of the DEP). Once the regulation is adopted, all of our towns will need to prepare changes to their Shoreland Zoning provisions. Rulemaking hearings are set for April-May 2005. After the rules are adopted the Department typically gives Towns a generous amount of time to amend their ordinances to bring them into compliance.

Here are some highlights from the DRAFT document that caught my eye:

- Saltwater setbacks would now be measured from the maximum spring tide level (not the mean high water mark).
- All structures that do not conform to the water setback would need to be moved back as far as possible, whenever ANY type of foundation is added (even just a slab).
- Tear down/rebuilds would need to be moved completely out of the water setback area.
- Water-dependent structures could not be converted to a non-water-dependent use.
- Resource Protection Districts for high and moderate value wetlands would be based on the recent Beginning with Habitat mapping project (not the old 1973 Freshwater Wetlands mapping).
- Structures in any General Development-type district will require a 75 foot water setback (currently 25 feet).
- Fill extensions related to septic systems will need to meet water setbacks.
- Appeals from decisions of the Code Enforcement Officer would have to be "de novo" hearings, and could only be "appellate" hearings if specified in the Town's ordinance. (Do you remember your Latin from school?)
- Patios would be counted as floor area for the purposes of calculating expansion of a nonconforming house.
- Rental units with cooking facilities would be considered "dwellings," regardless of the rental time period.
- Lots on Wetlands would have a shore frontage requirement.
- Clearing standards would specifically make sure that vegetations thinner than 2 inches in diameter would remain.
- Enforcement Notices from the CEO could no longer be appealed to the Board of Appeals.

There are 46 changes proposed in all—the above points are just some of the most important. Though none of these changes looks major, I think we can all agree, that even the smallest of changes in the Shoreland Zone is often a BIG DEAL. Jamie Oman-Saltmarsh has been assigned to be our designated staff person to assist Towns with understanding and complying with these upcoming regulatory changes. She can be contacted at [jamieos@smrpc.org](mailto:jamieos@smrpc.org). Copies of the Draft SLZ Guidelines with exact wording, as well as a detailed summary, are available in the news area at our website, [www.smrpc.org](http://www.smrpc.org).

## New Color Aerial Orthophotos Now Available!

By Jamie Oman-Saltmarsh, Land Use Planner

It has been almost two years of waiting, but the color aerial images of towns in York County have finally arrived! The high resolution digital orthophotographs were produced from aerial photos collected over southwest Maine in Spring 2003, and were flown at 6,000 feet. The multi-agreement program was developed and funded in coordination with the Maine GeoLibrary Board. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) contributed toward this project via a separate funding agreement with USGS. Electronic versions of the aerial photographs are available to Maine GIS users over the internet from the Maine Office of GIS (MEGIS) database over the internet. The website for this interface is: <http://megisims.state.me.us/website/orthomap/viewer.htm>. You may also download images for free from the Maine GIS Internet Data Catalog.

SMRPC has already stored a complete copy of the images covering the York County region—we have them in our office. The Oxford County region is next in line for images, but the delivery schedule from MEGIS is uncertain at this time. The images for the York County area were made at a 1 foot ground sample distance, while the Oxford County images were made at a 2 foot ground sample distance, so the resolution for the Oxford County area will not be as detailed as the York County images. The quality of all the new color images, however, far surpasses the black and white images from the 1990's! For more information about the new color aerials, please contact J.T. Lockman at [jlockman@smrpc.org](mailto:jlockman@smrpc.org).