

**Planning Board Meeting - Minutes
Tuesday, October 20, 2009
Cumberland Town Hall
290 Tuttle Road, Cumberland, Maine
7:00 PM**

A. *Call to Order*

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. *Roll Call*

Present: Bill Ward, Board Chair, Bill Richards, Vice-Chair, Bob Couillard, Chris Neagle, John Ferland, Bob Vail

Absent: Pam Russell

Staff: Carla Nixon, Town Planner, Pam Bosarge Board Clerk

C. *Approval of Minutes - July 21, 2009 and October 7, 2009*

Mr. Richards moved to approve the minutes of July 21, 2009.

Mr. Vail seconded. VOTE: Unanimous

Mr. Couillard moved to approve the minutes of October 7, 2009.

Mr. Richards seconded. VOTE: Unanimous

D. *Consent Calendar / Deminimus Change Approvals:*

1. Rockwood IV - Drainage

Ms. Nixon stated that Rockwood IV was having a problem with water ponding near the patios along Route One. David Chase constructed a drainage solution without prior approval by installing a pipe along the foundation to a culvert which drains towards Route One. This will be reassessed in the spring and the developer has placed money in escrow should this solution not work over the winter months.

Mr. Neagle recused himself as he has done legal work for the association.

Mr. Couillard asked the depth of the pipe.

Ms. Nixon stated 8-10". It is quite shallow which is why there is the concern that it might not function over the winter, hence the escrow.

2. Autumn Ridge - Drainage Easement

Ms. Nixon stated during site inspections of the Autumn Ridge subdivision road, it was determined that a drainage easement on the north side of the road would be beneficial to ensure adequate room for future maintenance / replacement of drainage features. Consequently, the Subdivision Plat Plan has been revised to include a 20' easement from Orchard Hill Road to Sta. 3+50 on Autumn Ridge Road and a 10' easement from Sta. 3+50 to the southern boundary line at the Orchard Ridge Subdivision.

The Board approved the Consent/ Deminimus Calendar items.

E. Hearings and Presentations:

The Board took item # 5 (recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan) as the first agenda item due to the fact that there were many members of the Comprehensive Plan Committee present in the audience.

1. Public Hearing: To review and make recommendations to the Town Council regarding the draft 2009 Comprehensive Plan.

This item was continued from the October 7, 2009 workshop meeting.

Ms. Nixon stated she would not make another presentation on the Comprehensive Plan since one was done at the last meeting. She noted there has been an article in the Forecaster regarding the plan, and that the presentation she made at the October 7, 2009 workshop is being re-broadcast on channel 2 twice a day. She pointed out that there are several committee members present this evening. Ms. Nixon stated Mr. Sam York, a member of the Committee and also the Lands and Conservation Committee, presented language not included in the original chapter on sustainability. Mr. York's comments focus more strongly on energy. At the last meeting, Mr. Vail, the Chair of the Comprehensive Plan Committee asked to have a red-lined version for review at the next Planning Board meeting. Ms. Nixon stated Mr. York is present to review the proposed changes.

Mr. Neagle asked Mr. York to present the proposed changes.

Mr. York briefly reviewed the proposed changes to the Sustainability chapter; stating the Conservation Committee would like to see the Planning Board recommend inclusion of these changes into the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Vail, Comprehensive Plan Committee chair stated there are a lot of proposed changes, none onerous, but in fairness to the Committee he recommended the Planning Board pass their recommendation on to the Council and that the Comprehensive Plan Committee meet to discuss the changes prior to the Council meeting date.

Mr. Ferland, also a Comprehensive Plan Committee member, thanked Mr. York for his passion on these energy-related items.

Ms. Nixon suggested the Planning Board make a motion indicating it is in agreement with the changes should the Comprehensive Plan Committee agree in its future meeting with the proposed amendments; this would preclude the need to have the plan come back again to the Planning Board.

The Planning Board heard testimony from the following Comprehensive Plan Committee members.

Mr. Mark Lapping of 12 Acorn Lane urged the Committee to accept and embrace the plan. The plan focuses on:

1. protection of valuable water resources;
2. locally grown food production;
3. community for a life cycle; being able to age in the community.
- 4.

Mr. Lapping encouraged adopting the plan as an example for other communities.

Mr. Bingham of 19 Brook Road stated Mr. Lapping is an example of the type of members and level of conversations that took place during this Committee's work. He agreed with forwarding the plan to the Council and if there were any changes after the Committee's review to forward the changes to Council.

Ms. Jo-Ann Smith agreed the Committee should review the changes, she stated she was the opposite of Peter who has served on several committees, and this was her first experience. These changes were the only outstanding work not reviewed by the committee.

Ms. Smith also asked that the new Town Center Advisory Committee utilize the same scrutiny, consistency, and diligence when it considers how to adhere to the desires of the Comprehensive Plan with regard to Main Street.

The public portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Neagle stated the Committee did a remarkable job; this was excellent work which will allow the Planning Board many opportunities; he would *enthusiastically* recommend to the Council the adoption with the stipulation that the Committee be given opportunity to review the proposed changes to the Sustainability Chapter.

Mr. Richards seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

Mr. Vail thanked everyone who served on the Committee; and summarized that there are some important changes contained in the plan with one of them being the adoption of a conservation subdivision ordinance to preserve agriculture land.

2. Public Hearing: Minor Site Approval: Request for a six (6) month extension of approval for the Cumberland Congregational Church for an expansion to the parking lot of the existing church located at 282 Main Street, Tax Assessor Map U11, Lots 47 & 48; in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) district; Congregational Church in Cumberland, Owner.

Mr. Neagle disclosed he was a member of the Church for twenty years, but is no longer a member.

Ms. Nixon presented background information as follows: The Church is requesting a six month extension to their approval for a parking lot expansion and reconfiguration plan. Under Section 206.9 of the Zoning Ordinance (Site Plan Review), an applicant may request up to 2- six month extensions. This is the first request for a six month expansion. Sometimes the Board has simply moved to grant both two month extensions at the same time.

Mr. Jeff Sloan, Church moderator stated they are continuing to raise funds and are requesting an extension of the parking lot approval.

Mr. Neagle moved to grant two (2) six (6) month extensions to the Site Plan Approval for the parking revisions at the Cumberland Congregational Church located at 282 Main Street, Tax Assessor Map U11, Lots 47 & 48. This extension is granted based on the findings of fact and conditions of approval of December 16, 2008.

Mr. Vail seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

3. Public Hearing: Minor Site Plan Amendment for the Cumberland Congregational Church at 282 Main Street, Tax Assessor Map U11, Lots 27 & 28 in the MDR district to remove the condition from the November 18, 2008 Site Plan approval, that the existing play yard

fence be located 15' from the rear property lines. Cumberland Congregational Church, Owner, Applicant.

Mr. Ward stated he is an owner of a property which houses a daycare and if the Board feels he can't be fair and unbiased he would recuse himself.

The Board agreed they had no problems with Mr. Ward participating in the review of the daycare.

Ms. Nixon presented background information as follows: The Cumberland Congregational church received Board of Appeals special exception approval on 11/8/08 for a daycare/nursery school. One of the conditions of that approval was "That the existing play yard fence be located 15' from the side and rear property lines." The Planning Board then reviewed the application for minor site plan approval; that approval contained the same condition. On 9/10/09 the applicant appeared before the Board of Appeals to request that this condition be removed. James Katsiaficas, an attorney at Perkins Thompson, argued successfully that the current ordinance requirement that there be a 15' side and rear setback does not apply in this case because the day care use is a lawful nonconforming use in that there has been a daycare or nursery school within the church since the mid 1960's. The Board of Appeals granted the request to have the condition of approval removed. The applicant is now before the Planning Board with the same request.

Ms. Nixon also stated that last month, William Longley and Ms. Nixon met on site with Doug Pride who was representing the church, and based on that meeting, the church has proposed to plant a row of small shrubs (probably arborvitae) 4' to 5' tall approximately five feet apart along the south side of the playground, next to the MacGowan's property and also to install a 5' chain link fence four feet behind the property line (on the church's side).

Ms. Nixon also stated that the only residential abutter, Rachel McGowan, called Ms. Nixon yesterday to ask about this item. While she is primarily concerned about the parking lot reconfiguration project, she also expressed concern about the removal of this condition. She was not planning to attend the meeting. Included in the packet are some photos of the area where the playground abuts her property line.

Mr. James Katsiaficas of Perkins, Thompson stated he was representing the Church. Mr. Katsiaficas stated the daycare use was a legal "non-conforming" use. Mr. Katsiaficas reviewed the history of daycare use in the Church. In 1965 Prop opened a Head Start program and the Cumberland Community Nursery School opened in the 1970's and is still in operation. In 1988 the State began regulating Day Cares and Nursery Schools and required they obtain approval from local municipalities. The playground and fence have been in existence since the 1970's and are grandfathered. The Board of Adjustment and Appeals believed in good faith that the fence needed to meet the standards as if a new application. The use however was grandfathered and the fence did not need to move. The Board of Appeals at their September 10, 2009 meeting voted to approve the application to amend the prior decision of the Board on November 13, 2008 for the Cumberland Congregational Church at 282 Main Street, Tax Assessor Map U11, Lots 47, and 48 in the Medium Density Residential (MDR) district. The Board voted to remove the condition "that the play yard fence be setback 15' from the side and rear property lines"; and stated the applicant is to install a fence on their side of the property with plantings for buffering to address the concerns of safety and buffering. The plantings are to be a solid screen of vegetation 6' high. The plantings will be on the outside of the new fence.

Mr. Neagle stated it seems a fair request under Section 206 Board of Appeals the solution will provide a better buffer than the previous fence. Section 206 doesn't specify the distance of a buffer or fence; it seems a good practical solution, which he will support.

Mr. Ferland asked if the new fence was to replace the chicken wire fence; and he asked the distance of the setback of the new fence.

Mr. Sloan stated the chicken wire fence is on the MacGowan's property. The new fence will be set back approximately 4' due to the arc of the swings.

Mr. Richards stated swing sets can be moved, and asked if the Church had any discussions with Mrs. MacGowan.

Mr. Sloan stated no, this has been a tough issue, and the Church intends to be good neighbors.

Mr. Richards stated he will support the request, but stated that it was incumbent on the Church to reach out to the MacGowan's.

Mr. Sloan stated there has never been an issue of noise from the daycare.

Mr. Couillard stated he liked the moving of the fence and addition of plantings and asked the type of plants.

Mr. Sloan stated 9 arborvitae plants, five feet apart and six feet tall.

Mr. Couillard suggested staggering the plants for a more private buffer.

Mr. Vail stated a year ago everyone would have done things differently, he has looked at the property, and this was an unnecessary burden on the Church. There are two groups of children currently using the playground. A church is a community center that hosts lots of activities.

Mr. Ward agreed and suggested they do their best to screen and buffer from the neighbor.

The public portion of the meeting was opened.

Mr. Mark McConnell of 13 Maple Street stated he was a member of the Church and embarrassed by the problem, two wrongs don't make a right, and he didn't understand the process, which seemed to waste a lot of time.

The public portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Neagle moved to amend the site plan approval to remove the 15' setback condition on the side and rear of the play yard and replace the condition the condition as follows: That a new fence be constructed along the McGowan property line approximately four (4) feet from the line and plantings of at least nine (9) 4' to 5' tall arborvitaes be placed in a way to maximize buffering of sound and sight be placed between the fence and the property line. All other conditions and findings of fact remain the same as the November 18, 2008 approval.

Mr. Ferland seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

4. Public Hearing: Minor Site Plan Review for J Brothers Variety Store to add an addition at 42 Gray Road, Tax Assessor Map U16, Lot 1 in the Mixed use Zone (MUZ); J Brothers Variety, Applicant, Jerry Howland, Owner.

Ms. Nixon presented background information as follows: This is one of the projects that could have been handled through staff review, but our ordinance states that the expansion of any non- residential use requires site plan approval. This application is for a 10' x 14' addition that will “square off” the existing building. The space will be used to enlarge the kitchen which is currently small and cramped. There will be no changes to the parking, circulation, lighting, etc. There will be a very slight increase in roof area, but this will not affect the drainage adversely.

The application lists numerous waivers due to the very small nature of this project. Rather than listing each one, she suggested the motion be “To approve the waiver requests as indicated on the application form”.

The area to be filled in is highlighted on the plan to show the proposed expansion.

Mr. Neagle stated this is a great store and this change would be positive.

Mr. Neagle moved to grant the following waiver requests as they would be an economic burden on the applicant.

- 206.7.3.8 Location of drainage courses**
- 206.7.3.9: Direction of existing surface drainage**
- 206.7.3.10: Location, front view, dimensions of existing signs**
- 206.7.4.2: Grading plan at 2 foot contours**
- 206.7.4.3 Utility plan**
- 206.7.4.5 Surface water drainage**
- 206.7.4.6 Handling solid waste, hazardous & special waste**
- 206.7.4.7 Driveway, parking & loading areas**
- 206.7.4.8 Landscape plan**
- 206.7.4.9 Location, dimension, and ground floor elevations**
- 206.7.4.10 Signs / location**
- 206.7.4.11 Location and type of exterior lighting**
- 206.7.4.11 traffic/peak hour and daily generated**
- 206.7.4.15 stormwater calculations / erosion**

Mr. Vail seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

Mr. Neagle moved to adopt the findings of fact and waive the reading.

Mr. Richards seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

Mr. Neagle moved to approve with the standard condition of approval the application for Minor Site Plan Review for J Brothers Variety Store to add an addition at 42 Gray Road, Tax Assessor Map U16, Lot 1 in the MUZ zone, Jerry Howland, Owner.

Mr. Richards seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT

.1 Utilization of the Site

Utilization of the Site - The plan for the development, including buildings, lots, and support facilities, must reflect the natural capabilities of the site to support development. Environmentally sensitive areas, including but not limited to, wetlands, steep slopes, floodplains, significant wildlife habitats, fisheries, scenic areas, habitat for rare and endangered plants and animals, unique natural communities and natural areas, and sand and gravel aquifers must be maintained and preserved to the maximum extent. The development must include appropriate measures for protecting these resources, including but not limited to, modification of the proposed design of the site, timing of construction, and limiting the extent of excavation.

The infill of a corner of the building for a 10' x 14' addition will not impact environmentally sensitive areas.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.2 Traffic Access and Parking

Vehicular access to and from the development must be safe and convenient. Driveways must be designed to provide the minimum site distance according to MDOT standards. Access and egress must be located to avoid hazardous conflicts.

There will be no changes to traffic access and parking.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.3 Access way Location and Spacing

Access must meet the specific ordinance requirements.

There will be no changes to accessway location and spacing.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.4 Internal Vehicular Circulation

The layout of the site must provide for the safe movement of passenger, service, and emergency vehicles through the site.

The existing circulation has been satisfactory and no changes will be made to the circulation pattern.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.5 Parking Layout and Design

Off street parking must conform to the specific standards.

The parking layout and design has been satisfactory in previous years for this use. There are no proposed parking lot changes.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.6 Pedestrian Circulation

The site plan must provide for a system of pedestrian ways within the development appropriate to the type and scale of development. This system must connect the major

building entrances/ exits with parking areas and with existing sidewalks, if they exist or are planned in the vicinity of the project. The pedestrian network may be located either in the street right-of-way or outside of the right-of-way in open space or recreation areas. The system must be designed to link the project with residential, recreational, and commercial facilities, schools, bus stops, and existing sidewalks in the neighborhood or, when appropriate, to connect the amenities such as parks or open space on or adjacent to the site.

There will be no changes to pedestrian circulation.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.7 Stormwater Management

Adequate provisions must be made for the collection and disposal of all stormwater that runs off proposed streets, parking areas, roofs, and other surfaces, through a stormwater drainage system and maintenance plan, which must not have adverse impacts on abutting or downstream properties.

The minimal additional impervious surface created by the roof of the small addition will not have any adverse impacts.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.8 Erosion Control

.1 All building, site, and roadway designs and layouts must harmonize with existing topography and conserve desirable natural surroundings to the fullest extent possible, such that filling, excavation and earth moving activity must be kept to a minimum. Parking lots on sloped sites must be terraced to avoid undue cut and fill, and / or the need for retaining walls. Natural vegetation must be preserved and protected wherever possible.

.2 Soil erosion and sedimentation of watercourses and water bodies must be minimized by an active program meeting the requirements of the Maine Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook for Construction: Best Management Practices, dated March 1991, and as amended from time to time.

Appropriate erosion control measures will be outlined in the building permit application.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.9 Water Supply Provisions

The development must be provided with a system of water supply that provides each use with an adequate supply of water. If the project is to be served by a public water supply, the applicant must secure and submit a written statement from the supplier that the proposed water supply system conforms with its design and construction standards, will not result in an undue burden on the source of distribution system, and will be installed in a manner adequate to provide needed domestic and fire protection flows.

There is adequate water provided by an on-site well. There will be no increase in the demand for water.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.10 Sewage Disposal Provisions

The development must be provided with a method of disposing of sewage which compliance with the State Plumbing Code. If provisions are proposed for on-site waste disposal, all such systems must conform to the Subsurface Wastewater Disposal Rules.

The existing septic system is functioning well and there will be no additional demand for septic disposal.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.11 Utilities

The development must be provided with electrical, telephone, and telecommunication service adequate to meet the anticipated use of the project. New utility lines and facilities must be screened from view to the extent feasible. If the service in the street or on adjoining lots is underground, the new service must be placed underground.

There is existing electrical service to the building. No additional service is required.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.12 Groundwater Protection

The proposed site development and use must not adversely impact either the quality or quantity of groundwater available to abutting properties or to the public water supply systems. Applicants whose projects involve on-site water supply or sewage disposal systems with a capacity of two thousand (2,000) gallons per day or greater must demonstrate that the groundwater at the property line will comply, following development, with the standards for safe drinking water as established by the State of Maine.

There will be no adverse impact on groundwater as a result of this project.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.13 Water Quality Protection

All aspects of the project must be designed so that:

.1 No person shall locate, store, discharge, or permit the discharge of any treated, untreated, or inadequately treated liquid, gaseous, or solid materials of such nature, quantity, obnoxious, toxicity, or temperature that may run off, seep, percolate, or wash into surface or groundwaters so as to contaminate, pollute, or harm such waters or cause nuisances, such as objectionable shore deposits, floating or submerged debris, oil or scum, color, odor, taste, or unsightliness or be harmful to human, animal, plant, or aquatic life.

.2 All storage facilities for fuel, chemicals, chemical or industrial wastes, and biodegradable raw materials, must meet the standards of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection and the State Fire Marshall's Office.

No toxic materials will be utilized, stored or created on this site. The proposed plan complies with all of the above requirements.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.14 Capacity of the Applicant

The applicant must demonstrate that he / she has the financial and technical capacity to carry out the project in accordance with this ordinance and the approved plan.

The Applicant has stated the construction cost as being approximately \$8,000 which he will pay for from savings. There are no public improvements associated with this project.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.15 Historic and Archaeological Resources

If any portion of the site has been identified as containing historic or archaeological resources, the development must include appropriate measures for protecting these resources, including but not limited to, modification of the proposed design of the site, timing of construction, and limiting the extent of excavation.

Based on the fact that the site is currently developed and that only minor modifications to site are proposed, there will be no adverse impact on historic and archaeological resources. The building elevations show that the addition will be of a consistent architectural style as the parish hall.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.16 Floodplain Management

If any portion of the site is located within a special flood hazard area as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, all use and development of that portion of the site must be consistent with the Town's Floodplain management provisions.

The property is not located in a floodplain as depicted on FEMA maps.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.17 Exterior Lighting

The proposed development must have adequate exterior lighting to provide for its safe use during nighttime hours, if such use is contemplated. All exterior lighting must be designed and shielded to avoid undue glare, adverse impact on neighboring properties and rights - of way, and the unnecessary lighting of the night sky.

No changes to the exterior lighting are proposed, the existing lighting is sufficient for the proposed use.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.18 Buffering of Adjacent Uses

The development must provide for the buffering of adjacent uses where there is a transition from one type of use to another use and for the screening of mechanical equipment and service and storage areas. The buffer may be provided by distance, landscaping, fencing, changes in grade, and / or a combination of these or other techniques.

The minor nature of this project does not necessitate buffering.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.19 Noise

The development must control noise levels such that it will not create a nuisance for neighboring properties.

There will be no increased exterior noise created as a result of this project.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.20 Storage of Materials

.1 Exposed nonresidential storage areas, exposed machinery, and areas used for the storage or collection of discarded automobiles, auto parts, metals or other articles of salvage or refuse must have sufficient setbacks and screening (such as a stockade fence or a dense evergreen hedge) to provide a visual buffer sufficient to minimize their impact on abutting residential uses and users of public streets.

.2 All dumpsters or similar large collection receptacles for trash or other wastes must be located on level surfaces which are paved or graveled. Where the dumpster or receptacle is located in a yard which abuts a residential or institutional use or a public street, it must be screened by fencing or landscaping.

.3 Where a potential safety hazard to children is likely to arise, physical screening sufficient to deter small children from entering the premises must be provided and maintained in good condition.

No equipment or materials will be stored on site.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met,

.21 Landscaping

Landscaping must be provided as part of site design. The landscape plan for the entire site must use landscape materials to integrate the various elements on site, preserve and enhance the particular identity of the site, and create a pleasing site character. The landscaping should define street edges, break up parking areas, soften the appearance of the development, and protect abutting properties.

The internal nature of this project does not necessitate any additional landscaping.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

.22 Building and Parking Placement

.1 The site design should avoid creating a building surrounded by a parking lot. Parking should be to the side and preferably in the back. In rural, uncongested areas buildings should be set well back from the road so as to conform with the rural character of the area. If the parking is in front, a generous, landscaped buffer between road and parking lot is to be provided. Unused areas should be kept natural, as field, forest, wetland, etc.

.2 Where two or more buildings are proposed, the buildings should be grouped and linked with sidewalks; tree planting should be used to provide shade and break up the scale of the site. Parking areas should be separated from the building by a minimum of five (5) to ten (10) feet. Plantings should be provided along the building edge, particularly where building facades consist of long or unbroken walls.

There will be no changes to the building and parking placement.

Based on these facts the standards of this section have been met.

SECTION 300 – AQUIFER PROTECTION (if applicable)

The site is located within the aquifer protection area; however there are no proposed uses that will adversely affect the aquifer.

206.9 Limitation of Approval

Construction of the improvements covered by any site plan approval must be substantially commenced within twelve (12) months of the date upon which the approval was granted. If construction has not been substantially commenced and substantially completed within the specified period, the approval shall be null and void. The applicant may request an extension of

the approval deadline prior to expiration of the period. Such request must be in writing and must be made to the Planning Board. The Planning Board may grant up to two (2), six (6) month extensions to the periods if the approved plan conforms to the ordinances in effect at the time the extension is granted and any and all federal and state approvals and permits are current.

STANDARD CONDITION OF APPROVAL:

This approval is dependent upon and limited to the proposals and plans contained in the application and supporting documents submitted and affirmed to by the applicant. Any variation from the plans, proposals and supporting documents, except de minimus changes as so determined by the Town Planner which do not affect approval standards, is subject to review and approval of the Planning Board prior to implementation.

PRORPOSED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL: None

5. Public Hearing: To recommend to the Town Council draft zoning amendments to the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance re: comments received from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

Ms. Nixon presented background information as follows:

The Maine Department of Environmental Protection has reviewed the Town’s draft Shoreland Zoning Ordinance and has asked that we make a few minor changes. These changes are very minor.

Mr. Richards moved to forward to the Town Council the draft zoning amendments to the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance including comments received from the DEP. (See attached changes)

Mr. Couillard seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

F. Administrative Matters:

Ms. Nixon stated Mr. Neagle and Ms. Russell’s Board terms are up for renewal at the end of December. Mr. Neagle has agreed to re-up, but Ms. Russell has stated she will not be able to extend her commitment. The Town Council will be interviewing for a new member. Ms. Russell will finish her term and attend the November and December meetings.

G. Adjournment:

Mr. Vail moved to adjourn.

Mr. Couillard seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

William P. Ward, Board Chair

Pam Bosarge, Board Clerk

