

Stephen J. Puleo

From: Benjamin T. McCall <bmccall@dwmlaw.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 8:46 AM
To: Stephen J. Puleo
Subject: RE: Request for Legal and Language Review – Proposed Kennel LUO Amendment (PB 25-079)
Attachments: 25-28_LUO_AMD_Art3,4,&5_ModernizationKennels_(OriginalRedlineClean)_120325 (BTM rev'd 2025.12.17).docx

External sender <bmccall@dwmlaw.com>

Make sure you trust this sender before taking any actions.

Hi Steve –

I've reviewed your proposed changes – please see the attached redlines. On the whole, these look good, but please note (and let's discuss as needed) the following:

- Consider adding minor kennels as allowed uses in the referenced commercial districts, just for consistency.
- Consider whether adding a minimum acreage to a major kennel is a desired performance standard.
- Do not leave setting a maximum capacity up to the CEO or the Planning Board. Instead, consider having a minimum amount of square footage per dog. This makes things easier from a compliance perspective and reduces risks of legal challenges.

It will be interesting to see how all of this works now that kennel licensing has been transferred to the State level. Please let me know if you'd like to discuss further or have any further questions.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Stephen J. Puleo <sjpuleo@windhammaine.us>
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2025 12:18 PM
To: Benjamin T. McCall <bmccall@dwmlaw.com>
Subject: Request for Legal and Language Review – Proposed Kennel LUO Amendment (PB 25-079)

****CAUTION**** This message originated from an **external source**. DO NOT reply, click links, or open attachments unless you have verified the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ben,

It was great seeing you last, nice presentation. I'm requesting your legal and language review of the proposed Land Use Ordinance amendment regarding kennels ([PB 25-079](#)).

The Planning Board has expressed interest in reviewing and approving all Major Kennel businesses located within the North Windham commercial districts. Staff's position is that, with the improved performance standards included in the amendment, this use should be permitted by right.

I'd appreciate your opinion on how this could be written effectively. Additionally, please consider whether all kennels in the commercial districts should instead be listed as conditional uses, with all applications reviewed and approved by the Planning Board, like the process outlined in [Section 120-419](#) (Roosevelt Trail Business and Professional Office Overlay District).

Your feedback on both the legal sufficiency and clarity of the language will be very helpful as we finalize this amendment.

Thank you for your time and expertise. Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Best regards,

Steve Puleo

Director of Planning

sipuleo@windhammaine.us | www.windhammaine.us

Office: 207-894-5960 x6123 | Direct: 207-777-1927 | Mobile: 207-712-1069 | Fax: 207-892-1916



Public Hours: Monday 7:00–5:00|Tuesday 7:00–6:00|Wednesday 7:00–5:00|Thursday 7:00–4:00|Friday

Closed

NOTICE: Under Maine's Freedom of Access ("Right to Know") law, documents – including emails – in the possession of public officials about town business are considered public records. This means if anyone asks to see it, we are required to provide it. There are very few exceptions. We welcome citizen comments and want to hear from our constituents, but please keep in mind that what you write in an email is not private and will be made available to any interested party. *AI-assisted draft, staff reviewed.

This email has been scanned for spam and viruses by Proofpoint Essentials. Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.