



Town of Carrabassett Valley  
1001 Carriage Road  
Carrabassett Valley, ME 04947  
207-235-2645  
[www.carrabassettvalley.org](http://www.carrabassettvalley.org)

---

**Carrabassett Valley Planning Board**  
**Thursday, August 10, 2023 at 4:30 P.M.**

**\*\*Meeting to be held at the Community  
Center - Begin Room\*\***

Guests may join remotely with **Zoom ID** [531 268 2243](https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5312682243) & **Passcode** of **04947** or:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/5312682243?pwd=TGxrUExKcXdqQTdlZUZhYUVteG5GZz09>

To use a traditional phone to call 1-929-205-6099 and follow prompts for Meeting ID and Access Code listed above. Please announce yourself and then remain quiet/muted while you listen.

**Agenda**

1. Call to Order, Board Member Attendance & Voting Quorum
2. Review the Minutes of the July 13, 2023 PB Meeting.
3. Application to Amend Gondola Village Subdivision Plan – Tax Map 135 – Commercial Spaces owned by SMC.
  - a. Public Hearing will be held during the review of the application.
4. Continued Workshop discussion as needed on the following:
  - a. Sign Ordinance
  - b. Parking Space Size
  - c. Subdivision Application process?
  - d. Non-Conforming Structures in the Zoning Ordinance
  - e. Update on subcommittee Contract Zoning development
5. Other Business?
6. Adjourn

**Town of Carrabassett Valley**  
**Minutes of the Planning Board Meeting**  
**July 13, 2023**

Location: Carrabassett Valley Public Library: Begin Room  
Time: 4:30-6:45  
Topic: Signage, parking space, subdivision process, non-conforming structures  
Board Present: Brian Demshar, Roddy Ehrlenbach, Tim Flight, Tim Gerencer, John Slagle, Scott Stoutamyer; Jim Benoit, Alternate  
Board Absent: Tom Bird,  
Others Present: Chris Parks, CEO; Sue Davis

Chair Brian Demshar opened the Thursday, June 22, Carrabassett Valley Planning Board meeting at 4:33 p.m. in the Begin Room at the CVPL. After determining that there was a quorum, Demshar called for approval of the June 22 minutes. After consideration with some changes, John Slagle moved acceptance, seconded by Roddy Ehrlenbach. The Board then moved on to discuss four topics in the workshop format.

***Sign ordinance***

After all comments and review, a red-line copy will be presented for actual voting. The definition of a sign as any communication that is visible from a public way would include Town roads as well as state highways that are maintained by public funds.

Under General Restrictions, ¶5(d), all agreed that temporary signs should be removed after an event or political campaign is over within 24 hours, not 30 days.

With regard to temporary signs, ¶4, the effort centered on taking out as much gray as possible and leaving final action to the discretion of the codes enforcement officer. Discussion centered on allowing an event sign to go up no more than a week before the event, and that it, too, should come down within 24 hours of the end of the event.

CEO Chris Parks noted that signs not on the property connected with the event were sometimes directional signs. All appeared to agree that with today's near-universal GPS capabilities, those should not be necessary.

With regard to banners, agreement centered on all banners being considered temporary. Parks did note that if the standards were changed and adopted, items such as the existing Hostel sign would be allowed while it remained in good condition and was kept tight and tidy. Temporary signs, whether banners or other, need to be "neat and tidy" and well maintained, per ¶5 (c), or there is a likelihood they could become litter.

Parks noted that all signs including temporary signs need permits. Discussion suggested that the CEO be allowed discretion in all areas of temporary signs, including allowing signs to go up as much as two weeks before an event.

Whereas existing signs can be allowed if they are non-conforming, all new signs would have to comply. With regard to roof signs, Ayotte's roof sign may be allowed although non-conforming in some regards. There was some discussion of preferring a sign on a 20-foot pole or on the top of a single-story building. The location of the sign on a roof also appeared to need better definition, referring to Mountainside Garage's Bay signs being above the eaves of the building but located on a gable facade. Parks also asked the question of whether those signs, by example, are

viewable from the highway, or if the buffer of trees allows screening that would not require review

Shoreland zoning only allows two signs on a single property. If non-conforming, they can remain if receiving normal maintenance and repair with no change in other features. ???

With regard to the construction of signs, the Board considered describing materials more generically but with substance, as with “natural vs. chrome” while encouraging the use of wooden frames. Re the surface area allowed in ¶6 General Standards, questions arose on allowed square footage: did it count one or both sides of a two-sided sign whether the sign had the same message on both sides or said different things on each side, for example “Welcome” on one side and “Thanks for coming” on the other. Is the square footage the sum of the area of each of its sides?

Under ¶6(a), some wondered if there was a conflict in allowing more square footage on one type or another type based on the district. Did the definition need to be corrected? Parks will check out comparable language in other sign ordinances. John Slagle thought we should be concerned with restrictions, but give discretion to the CEO. Any concern about later CEOs being less competent than Parks was easily assuaged by the fact that authority still lay ultimately with the Planning Board.

### ***Parking space size***

All agreed that there was no compelling reason to support the original 10’x20’ size of a marked parking spot. The loss of ground to parking was a strong argument to reduce the size to 9’x18’. Looking ahead, the growing use of electric vehicles suggested future concerns may include allowing space for charging stations or chargers. All agreed that if it became an issue in the future, it could be changed.

### ***Subdivision application process***

There appeared to be agreement that the present ordinance was sufficient to handle the enormity of the recent West Mountain application. In discussing making it user friendly for the Board, all agreed the burden lay on the applicant, to make sure nothing was missed.

### ***Nonconforming structures***

Parks outlined his concern. He questioned the Planning Board’s discretion to have a non-conforming structure relocated on its lot though replacement, which is not allowed in a strict reading of the ordinance. The question is then whether it might be better to allow a significantly deteriorated structure to be removed completely and replaced with far less expense. Roddy Ehrlenbach cited his example of spending \$12,000 the first way whereas he could have accomplished the same or better for \$4,000. It was suggested they could strike out “other than the willful act of the owner or his agent” language of ¶2(a). The shoreland zoning component of the replacement should also be considered.

### ***Other business.***

Parks noted that Sugarloaf is preparing an application for Gondi Village. The process will include public hearings, contacting abutters, the HOA, etc. Parks is not sure this would be ready in two weeks as soon as the tentatively schedule 7/27 meeting.

The Board agreed to schedule the next meeting for August 10, to give the Sugarloaf application sufficient time. They will also review the workshop findings at that meeting.

Ehrlenbach moved to adjourn, seconded by Tim Flight and approved unanimously.