

**MINUTES  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
TOWN OF BOWDOINHAM  
ZOOM ONLY  
NOVEMBER 20, 2025 – 6:00 P.M.**

---

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tracy Krueger – Acting Chair  
Chris Vonderweidt

MEMBERS ABSENT: Richard Joyce  
William Shippen  
Reeve Wood  
Nate Drummond, Chair  
Justin Schlawin

STAFF PRESENT: Jason Lorrain, Code Enforcement Officer

PUBLIC PRESENT: Jason Hodde

**1. REGULAR MEETING - CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINE A QUORUM WAS NOT NEEDED**

On Thursday, November 20, 2025, a meeting of the Bowdoinham Maine Planning Board was held via zoom. Acting Chair, Tracey Krueger called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. It was determined that a quorum was not needed. Those wishing to attend via Zoom were given passcode: 649558 with a Meeting ID of 812 0965 0859. It was noted that, joining by phone, if a computer was not available, interested parties could call into the public meeting and participate by phone by calling (646) 876-9923 when the meeting begins.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**2. NO OLD BUSINESS**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**3. LAND USE ORDINANCE: REORGANIZATION DISCUSSION OF ARTICLE 5**

Sections Discussed:

1. Purpose & Intent

- General and specific purposes remain unchanged; formatting improvements accepted.

2. Administration & Authority

- Issue: Who classifies projects (Town Planner vs CEO)?

- Decision: Update language to allow CEO classification or clarify delegation authority.

Comments:

- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that Land Use Ordinance should reflect the reality of which staff member is best suited to make the determination, which may be the Code Enforcement Officer.

- Chris Vonderweidt stated that the planner position is not technically called the “Town Planner”, and is this an issue?
- Tracy Krueger suggested a way around the issue is to state Planning Staff shall classify each proposed project.

### 3. Tier Classification

- Tier I: Minor projects; update references.
- Tier II: Moderate projects; cannabis uses included unless Tier III.
- Tier III: Large projects; maintain flexibility.

#### Comments:

- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and commented that “Larger, more complex projects for which a more detailed review process and additional information are necessary” was too vague.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that the sentence is vague by design, to allow the planner/Code Enforcement Officer to bump a project to the Planning Board if they feel it needs a greater review.
- Tracy Krueger and Chris Vonderweidt agreed that the language should stay in the Land Use Ordinance.

### 4. Fees

- No changes to fee amounts; section reformatted.

### 5. Submission Requirements

- Simplify structure into three sub-bullets: Proposed Development Plan, Existing Conditions Plan, Additional Information.

#### Comments:

- Jay Hodde questioned whether Submission Requirements for Site Inventory & Analysis (Tier III applications only) should be located after the current subsection 3.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that it should stay in its current location.
- Tracey Krueger commented that it is confusing because the terms Site Inventory & Analysis and Site Plan Review sound very similar.
- Chris Vonderweidt commented that it should stay in its current location because it is a preliminary process.
- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and questioned if the applicant needed to submit 8 copies of written materials and maps.
- Code Enforcement Officer Jason Lorrain commented that 8 copies is a standard number for a 7-person board.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that the submission requirements for Tier II and III could be reduced to three sub-bullets:
  - (i) Proposed Development Plan, must include.
  - (ii) Existing Condition Plan, must include.
  - (iii) Additional Information, must be included on the Proposed Development Plan or in supplemental materials.

- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that the current (iv) could go into the new (iii) Additional Information, with the exception of (P) which should be moved to the new Proposed Development Plan.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and said that bullet (d) should change to “Additional submission requirements for Tier III applications. The information must be included on the Proposed Development Plan or supplemental materials.

#### 6. Review Procedures

- Tier I: CEO review within 10 days after completeness check.
- Tier II & III: Rename “conference” to “meeting”; clarify roles as “Planning Department Staff.”

#### Comments:

- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and commented that the CEO should not send out a notification to the property abutter/s unless the application is complete.
- Code Enforcement Office Jason Lorrain stated that it should stay the original way to give the abutters time to make comments within the narrow timeline allowed.
- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting stating that he was confused about workshop and conference in this section.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that he believed “conference” and “workshop” are being used interchangeably, and he thinks we should use “workshop”.
- Tracy Krueger and Chris Vonderweidt agreed that “conference” and “workshop” are the same thing and should be consistent.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that the Town Planner is the staff in charge of setting up the Staff Workshop but maybe change it to “Town Planner and other relevant town staff”.
- Tracey Krueger commented that the “Town Planner” is not an actual town job title. And asked if we need a specify roles or can we say department staff?
- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that Board of Selectman and Select Board are used in the Land Use Ordinance interchangeably.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and indicated that Select Board is the more common use of the two different terms.
- Tracy Krueger commented that “newspaper of general circulation should say” a local newspaper”.

#### 7. Approval Criteria & Performance Standards

- Maintain current order; ensure alignment between sections.

#### Comments:

- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and commented that the Criteria do not seem to be listed in any meaningful way.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated he agreed that there is no logical order, and maybe reordering alphabetically is appropriate.
- Tracey Krueger and Chris Vonderweidt stated they had no strong feelings on the Criteria list.

- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and commented that LD 1934 changes Maine statute for lighting and will take effect on September 30, 2026.

#### 8. Use-Specific Standards

- Add missing uses; remove redundant definitions; confirm cannabis requirements.

#### Comments:

- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and commented that Asphalt/Concrete Plant/Fabrication is not listed in Table 5.1.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that Jay Hodde made a nice catch and should add it to Table 5.1.

#### 9. General Provisions

- Clarify “appropriate municipal officials” for improvement guarantees.

#### Comments:

- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and commented that he moved a section from H. concerning a Commercial Complex to Section 11). because it seems to fit better in that section.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that he agreed with Jay Hodde’s comment on Commercial Complex.
- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and commented that Nursery School is not defined in the Land Use Ordinance and not listed in Table 5.1.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that it should be changed to Pre-School because it is a more commonly used term.
- Tracey Krueger commented that the Planning Board should look into the definition of daycare centers and whether pre-schools need to be added to the definition section of the Land Use Ordinance.
- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and commented that Food Processing Facility is not listed in Table 5.1.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that the Planning Board should add it to Table 5.1.
- Jay Hodde emailed comment prior to the meeting and commented that a definition of a Self-Storage Facility is in the Use-Specific Performance Standards Section and recommends removing the definition.
- Nate Drummond emailed comment prior to the meeting and stated that he agreed with removing the definition from that section.
- Tracey Krueger agreed that it makes sense to remove the definition from the that section.

#### Key Agreements:

- Maintain flexibility for Tier III classification.
- Ensure consistent terminology.
- Reformat submission requirements for clarity.
- Address LD 1934 lighting law changes in a future warrant article.

Next Steps:

- Jason Hodde to incorporate agreed changes into draft ordinance.
- Tracy Krueger to review consistency across related articles.
- Nate Drummond to confirm alignment with Comprehensive Plan.
- Schedule follow-up meeting for final review before public hearing.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**4. FUTURE MEETING DISCUSSION**

Next meeting will be on December 18, 2025, to discuss Articles 6, 7, and 8 of the LUO.

**5. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned by unanimous acclamation at 8:20 pm.

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

