



Town of Windham

Town Offices
8 School Road
Windham, Maine

Meeting Minutes - Final

Planning Board

Monday, May 12, 2025

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. Call to Order – Chair's Opening Remarks

2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

Vice Chair, Evert Krikken, called the meeting to order. Other members present were: Shonn Moulton, Christian Etheridge, Anne Daigle, Marge Govoni, and Kathleen Brown.

Senior Planner, Amanda Lessard, was also present.

3 PB 25-019 Approval of Minutes - The meeting of April 28, 2025

Attachments: [Minutes 4-28-2025 - draft.pdf](#)

Shonn Moulton made a motion to approve the minutes from April 28, 2025.

Seconded by Anne Daigle.

Vote: Four in favor. No one opposed. Kathleen Brown abstained.

Public Hearings & Continuing Business

4. PB 25-020 #25-01 - Major Site Plan & Subdivision - Dolley Farm Subdivision - River Road - Preliminary Plan Review - 25 River Road, LLC

This application is for a 42-unit residential condominium development on a 33.5-acres property. The development will have an access drive to the 21 duplex buildings. All units will be served by private on-site septic systems, and public water will be extended 400-feet in River Road to service the dwellings. The subject property is identified as Tax Map: 5; Lot: 25; Zone: Medium-density Residential (RM) zoning district in the Presumpscot River watershed.

Attachments: [25-01_MJR_SUB-SP_PP_PB_MEMO_DolleyFarm_050825.pdf](#)
[25-01_MJR_SUB-SP_PRLM_AC&SR_MEMO_DolleyFarm_050625.pdf](#)
[25-01_25 River Rd LLC_050525.pdf](#)
[25-01_MJR_SUB-SP_PRLM_APPL_DolleyFarm_042325.pdf](#)
[25-01_MJR_SUB-SP_PRLM_PLANS_DolleyFarm_042325.pdf](#)
[25-01_PUBLIC_COMMENTS_Coons_051225.pdf](#)

Dustin Roma was present representing the application. He explained that they proposed

42 duplex condominium units, accessed by two private roadways, off of River Road.

- They would install six leach fields, three of those would have advanced treatment systems.
- Public water was to be available.
- The Fire Department had requested an additional hydrant.
- The stormwater permit application was submitted to DEP for review.
- They had designed the plan around an existing well for an abutter and were speaking with her about other possibilities.
- Staff preferred a sidewalk for pedestrian access down River Road to the convenience store.
- There would be lighting at the intersection with River Road.

Public Comment

Todd Coons, River Road – He had submitted an email and was not opposed to the development. His concern was with how it would effect his drinking water, access to River Road, and lighting. His biggest concern was the effect of blasting and disruption of ground water to the well on his property line.

Amanda Lessard read Mr. Coons email, detailing his concerns about elevation, proximity of access to his driveway, blasting for leach fields, noise, dirt and dust, setback, septic monitoring for runoff, pollution to the water table, traffic, phase 2, trash receptacle location, pedestrian traffic and ditch flooding.

Vicki Kapusta, River Road - She was still considering her use of the well. How far would the buffer row of evergreens extend? Would the walking trails go around her property? By removing trees and installing a sidewalk they would expose her house. There were bedroom windows at eye-level and she would like some buffering for that. Her house had a rock foundation, and she had some concern about blasting.

There was no more public comment. Public hearing was closed.

Board Comment

- How far was the apron from Thayer Drive to Mr. Cooms driveway?
- Where would run-off from Thayer Drive go?
- Did Mr. Coons have any recourse if something happened to his well?
- Where would a cluster mailbox be located? Would there be a spot to pull the car over for it?
- Would a school bus go into the development?
- How big were the garages?
- Pedestrian access along River Road would help create more of a village feel. Where would a sidewalk go?
- Was traffic review of the sidewalk a recommendation?
- Was there any benefit to considering a shared access with the neighboring property?
- What was the reasoning for location of the access and stormwater buffer?
- The applicant should provide an acceptable buffer for Ms. Kapusta's property.
- Ordinance requirements may not work well with some aspects of the plan.
- There was enough land to accommodate some spacing issues for the buildings and driveways.
- Recreational space and amenities had to be delineated on the plan.
- Building fenestration seemed an issue; would there be a fix for it?
- Consensus of the Board was to have a sidewalk along River Road, not a widened shoulder.

Shonn Moulton made a motion that the major subdivision and site plan preliminary application for project #25-01 Dolley Farm Subdivision was found complete in regard to the submission requirements based on the application checklist, but the Planning Board retained the right to request more information where review criteria were not fully addressed.

Seconded by Anne Daigle.

Vote: All in favor.

Shonn Moulton made a motion to postpone the major subdivision and site plan of #25-01 Dolley Farm Subdivision until such time as staff feels it is complete and able to come forward to the Planning Board.

Seconded by Anne Daigle.

Vote: All in favor.

Continuing Business

5. [PB 25-021](#) 25-04 - Major Subdivision - Highland Cliff Conservation Subdivision - Highland Cliff Road - Sketch Plan Review - Kurt Christensen Custom Homes, Inc

The application is to develop a 10-lot conservation subdivision with a minor private road 1,292 feet in length. Lots will range in size from 35,195 SF to 63,925 SF, with the remaining 13.5 acres as open space. Lots will be served by private subsurface wastewater disposal systems, drilled wells and underground utilities. Subject property is identified as Tax Map: 7; Lot: 44; Zone: Farm (F) and Stream Protection (SP) in the Colley Wright Brook watershed.

Attachments: [25-04_MJR_SUB_SKP_PB_MEMO_HighlandCliffConserveSub_050725.pdf](#)
[25-04_MJR_SUB_SKP_APP_LTR_HighlandCliff_4-30-25.pdf](#)
[25-04_MJR_SUB_SKP_PLAN_REV_HighlandCliffConserv_043025.pdf](#)
[25-04_MJR_SUB_SKP_PLAN_HighlandCliffConserveSub_013025.pdf](#)
[25-04_MJR_SUB_SKP_APP_HighlandCliffConserveSub_013025_opt.pdf](#)

Andy Morrill, from BH2M Engineers, was present representing the application. He explained:

- They had extended lot boundaries to the rear.
- They proposed a 50 foot perimeter buffer at the back of the properties.
- They also proposed a 25 foot wetland buffer. The only impacts to the wetland were the driveways on lots 2, 3, and 4.
- They needed to know if the Board would be satisfied with the 25 foot wetland buffer in order to finalize the plan.

Amanda Lessard reviewed the submission:

- There was a 100 foot primary resource setback and a 50 foot setback for secondary resources. The Board had to decide what was feasible under the circumstances.
- Construction area on the lots was limited because of wetlands.

Board Comment

- *Could the lots support both wells and septic systems?*
- *It would be difficult to review the plan until everything was shown on it.*
- *Lots 2, 3 and 4 should be reconfigured.*
- *Provide the lot sizes and increased building envelopes, and Board members could accept the 25 foot setback.*

Other Business**6. Adjournment**

Shonn Moulton made a motion to adjourn.

Seconded by Anne Daigle.

Vote: All in favor.