

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
TOWN OF CUMBERLAND
Cumberland Town Hall
290 Tuttle Road, Cumberland, Maine 04021
Tuesday, December 16, 2014
7:00 p.m.**

A. *Call to Order:* The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

B. *Roll Call:*

Present: Chris Neagle, Chair, John Ferland, Vice-Chair, Teri Maloney-Kelly, Jeff Davis, Joshua Saunders, Peter Sherr

Absent: Gerry Boivin

Staff: Carla Nixon, Town Planner, Pam Bosarge, Administrative Assistant

C. *Approval of Minutes of the November 18, 2014 meeting.*

Ms. Maloney-Kelly moved to approve the minutes of November 18, 2014.

Mr. Sherr seconded.

VOTE: 4 in favor

2 abstain (Davis, Saunders)

D. *Staff Site Plan Approvals:*

- 1. Minor Staff Approval: Maine Prep: 299 Main Street: Owner and Applicant: Mike Madore. Tax Assessor Map U11, Lot 2 in the Town Center District (TCD).***

Ms. Nixon stated this property is located next to the high school. The owner is proposing to lease the entire building to Maine Prep, a company based in Brunswick that provides test prep classes and tutoring. The project requires Minor Staff Site Plan Review because it involves the conversion of an existing approved use (residential) to another approved use (Business and Professional Services). This is a permitted use in the Town Center District.

There is no new construction associated with this project, and there are no changes to the site's entrance, parking area or landscaping.

Mr. Neagle asked to have the site application included in the Planning Board Packet. The Planning Board does not need to approve Staff Site Plan Approvals.

E. *Minor Change Approvals: None*

F. *Hearings and Presentations:*

- 1. Public Hearing: Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision Review for a 10-lot subdivision at 179 Foreside Road, a portion of Tax Map R01, Lot 2 in the Low Density Residential (LDR) district; Owner: Spears Hill, LLC. Applicant: 179 Foreside LLC. Applicant's Representative: Joe Laverriere, P.E., Fay, Spofford & Thorndike.***

Mr. Ferland stated he is an abutter to this property and asked to be recused as he did at the last meeting.

Mr. Sherr stated his firm has previously worked with members of the applicant's team. He has not worked on this project or had any conversations regarding the application and felt his previous relationship would not affect his ability to review the project.

Mr. Neagle stated he had three things to disclose:

- He recently made a donation to the Chebeague Cumberland Land Trust (CCLT) and he is a member of the organization.
- Previously he worked as an Attorney at Verrill & Dana Attorneys at Law; he has not worked there for the past ten years.
- He also disclosed that since the last Planning Board meeting he has had e-mails from staff and met with the Town manager regarding the process of this application and not the merits of the application.

Mr. Neagle stated he didn't feel any of these would affect his ability to review the application.

Ms. Nixon stated the applicant has revised the road and sidewalk design to reflect comments from the Planning Board at the last meeting. All other outstanding issues have been resolved. The DEP Stormwater permit has been received since the writing of this memo.

Mr. Neagle stated the Board had been asked its authority on reviewing the proposed town public road, (not part of this application) the Board has the right according to Chapter 250-47A of the subdivision ordinance.

Mr. Joe LaVerriere, P.E., Representative summarized the plan revisions as follows:

- Beach Drive has been revised to provide a standard travel way width 20' with 2' shoulders along both sides of the roadway for its entire length. The travel way surface will be paved from Foreside Road into the site approximately 1,050' before changing to a processed reclaimed pavement material as requested by the Land Trust.

- A pedestrian trail has been added from Foreside Road to the waterfront parcel that generally parallels Beach Drive.

- The entrance grade from Foreside Road has been reduced from 6% to 4% for a distance of 50'. The road will be lowered 1.5 feet in some places.

- Spears Hill will be 18' wide and will access eight house lots.

- The proposed roadway design will provide for a 25 mph design speed in accordance with the requirements of the Town. In order to meet minimum sight line distances along the winding road alignment, limited areas of expanded clearing have been defined to provide the 200' of minimum sight line distance for a 25 mph design speed. In addition, as requested by Town Staff drainage turnouts have been provided at 50' intervals along the steep portion (Sta 6+00 to Sta 8+00) of Beach Drive.

- In addition, Bill Bray, P.E., Traffic Engineer for the project, has prepared an updated traffic assessment for the project that includes an assessment of the anticipated traffic volume associated with the Town's public access to the waterfront beach property. The updated traffic assessment is contained in Attachment J. The updated traffic assessment will also include an assessment of the proposed access roadway improvements for providing an acceptable level of design to provide safe access to the site for the intended uses. Mr. Bray also stated the road could be even narrower; however, he supports the design which is adequate for the use.

Mr. Neagle asked if the number of trips determines the 20' width is adequate.

Mr. LaVerriere stated yes, and it could be smaller.

Mr. LaVerriere continued stating the applicant has also been working with the CCLT to provide expanded public access trails linking the existing public access trail along the site's Route 88 frontage to the waterfront parcel. As shown in Exhibit A the applicant is proposing to provide public trail access along a trail that extends along the northerly boundary of the site with connection to Town Landing Road. From the point the trail will continue in a southeasterly direction along the shoreline to connect to the waterfront parcel to be conveyed to the Town. CCLT will continue to manage and maintain the entire trail system in accordance with the provisions set forth in the existing conservation easement. The applicant is also proposing to construct a public pedestrian trail parallel to Beach Drive from Foreside Road to the waterfront parcel that will be maintained by the Town.

Mr. LaVerriere reviewed the road waiver requests as listed in Attachment G.

Roadway Segment 1A: as stated in Attachment G page 1

Mr. Sherr asked the proposed speed limit.

Mr. LaVerriere stated the road is designed based on 25 mph.

Mr. Neagle asked about the Maximum Grade at Intersection and within 75' of intersection from 3% to 4% for 50'. Did that mean that the last 25' feet would be at a 5% grade?

Mr. LaVerriere stated yes.

Roadway Segment 1B: as stated in Attachment G page 4

Mr. Neagle asked if there was an easement for the 5' wide walkway on Town property.

Mr. Davis asked for a definition of shared use on the path, will there be bike accessibility.

Mr. LaVerriere stated the walkway path is not designed as a shared use walkway; this is for pedestrian use to the Beach. Mr. LaVerriere reviewed the trails by color the blue is the 5' wide trail which will have reclaim surface; the green trail is existing today and the red trail is the extension.

Mr. Davis stated if the walkway is to be shared access with bicycles and pedestrians it is not wide enough.

Roadway Segment 1C: as stated in Attachment G page 6

Roadway Segment 2: as stated in Attachment G page 8

Roadway Segment 3: as stated in Attachment G page 10

Mr. Sherr asked if the Homeowners' Association was responsible to maintain the shoulders.

Mr. LaVerriere stated yes.

Mr. Sherr thanked the applicant for the re-design based on Planning Board's comments.

Mr. Neagle stated for the record the Board has received the following:

- A map showing there are no Vernal Pools on the property.
- A letter from the Ocean Access Committee dated 12/11/14
- A traffic report from Tom Gorrill of Gorrill Palmer Engineers regarding traffic.

- A letter from Scott D. Anderson of Verrill Dana dated December 10, 2014 representing Spears Hill LLC, the current owners of the property.
- A letter from the Town Attorney, Alyssa Tibbetts of Jensen Baird Gardner Henry. This letter is in response to the letter from Verrill Dana.
- A letter from Drummond & Woodsum in response to the letter from Spears Hill LLC.

The public portion of the meeting was opened.

Mr. Denny Gallaudet, Chairman Ocean Access Committee (OAC) stated he lives on Range Road. Mr. Gallaudet reviewed the OAC letter sent to the Planning Board and stated the OAC has hired Traffic Engineer, Tom Gorrill. We have asked Mr. Gorrill to develop a recommendation and strategies for road widths from a point near the Ferland's property to the turnaround area on the future Town owned property. We share the Board's concern and desire to insure public safety on this future beach access road. The OAC believes the original road design of a 19 foot wide, edge of shoulder to edge of shoulder road, is more than adequate for safe vehicular travel. The average car width of 6 feet and a 19 foot road width leave 2 feet on each edge and 3 feet between vehicles. This will automatically slow cars down because of the lack of a wide open highway feel to our ocean park area.

The OAC has been charged with drafting a Management Plan and Vision Statement for the property. The goal is to honor this remarkable property, and minimize human impact. The OAC is recommending limited parking at the waterfront with 2 – 3 handicapped spaces; with the goal to encourage non-vehicular access as much as possible. The letter was sent with the endorsement of all ten members of the Committee. The view corridor is important to maintain.

Mr. Neagle asked if the Committee had discussed bicycles.

Mr. Gallaudet stated no, the Committee has just begun work on a Use Matrix. The prevailing view of the Committee is to respect the unique and extraordinary property and keep it as close to its current state as possible.

Mr. Tom Gorrill, of Gorrill Palmer Consulting Engineers stated he was hired by the OAC to review the projected traffic volumes; this property will not be a Scarborough Beach. Mr. Gorrill reviewed his letter of December 10, 2014 stating a concern of a wider road will encourage faster speed. He compared the road at Mount Blue State Park which has an access road 18' wide. He recommends as a recreational park road that the road from the parking lot near Rt. 88 be a 18' travel surface with 2' shoulders and a posted at 15 mph. This section of road in Segment 1C is flat with great site lines and an area where if the road is wide people will pick up speed. Speed is directly related to road width. Bicycles were not considered for the 5' separated walkway, technically 8' is recommended for a multi-purpose use. On a recreational road bicycles could be in the travel lane. (Mr. Gorrill's entire letter and recommendation is part of the subdivision file on record).

Mr. Saunders asked if there were ten parking spaces proposed at the water.

Mr. Gorrill stated that was a draft but it appears that might change.

Mr. Neagle asked if there was a proposed parking lot that will be accessed from Beach Drive.

Mr. Gorrill stated yes.

Mr. Neagle stated we have an unresolved issue with bicycles; the idea of a narrower road being safer seems counterintuitive.

Ms. Maloney-Kelly asked the purpose of shoulders.

Mr. Gorrill stated shoulders have a number of purposes, snowplowing, and breakdowns in Segment 1C it is flat with great site view. In Segments 1A and 7 B shoulders are appropriate because of the curves in the road.

Mr. John Ferland of 2 Birch Lane asked if the blue proposed walking path could be moved to the other side of the road in the vicinity where the trail comes out of the woods to minimize impact on abutters.

Mr. Maloney-Kelly voiced concern of pedestrians crossing the road and asked Mr. LaVerriere where they would need to cross with the trail.

Mr. LaVerriere stated not quite at the woods but before the apple orchard.

Mr. Scott Anderson, Esq. Verrill Dana Attorneys at Law stated he was representing the current owners of the parcel Spears Hill LLC. He referenced his letter of December 10, 2014 requesting the following conditions:

- No portion of the 38.5 acre “common area” may be further divided or conveyed, other than to the abutting lot owner within the Property.
- The 11th lot be retained by Developers may only be conveyed to an “eligible assignee” pursuant to paragraphs 5.7 and 11 of the Easement.
- The homeowners’ association documents should incorporate by reference the rights and obligations under the Easement and each lot owner should have the right to enforce the Easement restrictions.

Mr. Neagle thanked Mr. Anderson for the interesting information however it is not relevant to review under the standards of the subdivision ordinance. (Mr. Anderson’s submittal dated December 10, 2014 can be viewed in the entire subdivision file as part of the record)

Mr. Ted Chadbourne of 50 Stockholm Drive stated he agreed all forms of traffic including bicycles, vehicles and pedestrians should be considered and voiced concern nd development of the entire parcel.

Mr. Ron Ward, Esq. of Drummond Woodsum stated he was present to represent the applicant and referenced his letter drafted December 12, 2014 as a response to Mr. Anderson’s letter. Stating Spears Hill offers flawed interpretations of the Conservation Easement embraced only by it, and then follows that up with its request for “conditions” that reflect its flawed interpretations. At most, this represents a private dispute between landowners. Our request is simply that the Board deliberations be confined to issues to be reviewed under the subdivision ordinance. (Mr. Ward’s letter to the Board of December 12, 2014 can be viewed in the entire subdivision file as part of the record).

Ms. Penny Asherman, President of the Chebeague Cumberland Land Trust reviewed her letter of December 11, 2014 which responds to the request, pursuant to the Cumberland Planning Board’s requirement, to add an additional five feet of width to the Beach Access Road and to create a pedestrian footpath. The CCLT met on Tuesday, December 9 to review this request. The board approved construction of a pedestrian footpath to accompany the Beach Access Road as proposed by the applicant. The CCLT requires that is made with permeable materials and designed and constructed to minimize erosion and disturbance to wetlands as required by the conservation easement. We also carefully reviewed the amended road configuration and analyzed it against the terms of the easement governing roadways and standards required. Following this consideration, the board determined that the additional five feet in width for the proposed road would not materially adversely impact protected resources and

conforms with the relevant easements terms, subject, however, to two conditions. One condition is that the five feet wider road be subject to any limitations and recommendations in the forthcoming archeological and historical investigation. The other is that design and construction of the wider road be subject to any requirements imposed by the Department of Environmental protections' stormwater permit. Despite this determination, it is important to note, however, that the CCLT board has a ***strong preference*** that the final configuration of the Beach Access Road be more in line with the narrower road details advanced by Gorrill-Palmer, the traffic consultants retained by the Ocean Access Committee.

CCLT has also reviewed the draft Homeowners Association Covenants and provided comments.

Mr. Neagle asked about owner of the easements.

Ms. Asherman stated the green trail on the plan exists, the red trail is proposed and the blue trail will be owned by the Town.

Ms. Maloney-Kelly asked if there had been any discussion regarding bicycles.

Ms. Asherman stated no, the easement stated non-motorized, non-mechanized vehicles and the trail is presented as a pedestrian walkway.

Mr. Neagle stated you can't ride a bike on the green trail.

Mr. Anderson, asked about including the outparcel lot on Spears Hill in the Homeowners Association.

Mr. Ward stated there have been specific conversations between lawyers and the preference of the owners was they didn't want to be part of the Homeowners' Association.

The public portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Neagle thanked the public for their valuable comments: He stated the Board had the following issues to discuss:

- Bicycles

The Board discussed the safety of the road with bikes and vehicles on the road. They agreed with the proposed road design with a 15 mph speed limit 2' shoulders and 5' pedestrian walkway and to restrict bicycles from the pedestrian walkway.

- Mr. Ferland's request to move the pedestrian walkway

The Board discussed moving the pedestrian walkway, but agreed it was not a good idea to have pedestrians cross the road to move the walkway.

- Road waivers:

The Board discussed the revised road waivers.

Mr. Sherr moved to approve the Road Waivers as listed in Attachment G of the application as revised.

Mr. Davis seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 5 in favor

Road way Segment 1A: (Sta. 0+00 to Sta. 9+25) First 200' from Foreside Road)

Shoulder width: 4' to 2'

Maximum Grade: 10% to 11%
 Minimum Tangent between curves: 150' to 15.6'
 Minimum Pavement Crown – Super Elevated
 Maximum Grade at intersection & within 75' of intersection – 3% to 4% first 50'
 and
 3% to 5% the next 25'
 Hot Bituminous Pavement: 2" reclaim or pavement
 Roadway Segment 1C – Beach Drive (Sta.10+50 to Sta. 19+36)
 Shoulder width: 4' to 2'
 Minimum pavement Crown: Super elevated
 Roadway: Hot Bituminous Pavement: Reclaim pavement
 Sidewalk - Hot Bituminous Pavement: 2" reclaim or base gravel
 Roadway Segment 2: Spears Hill Lane
 Pavement Width: 20' to 18'
 Shoulder Width: 4' to 2'
 Sidewalk: None
 Minimum pavement Crown: Super Elevated
 Maximum Grade at Intersection: 3% to 4% first 50' and 3% to 5% next 25'
 Roadway Surface: Hot Bituminous: None
 Sidewalk Sub base Course: None
 Hot Bituminous Pavement: None
 Roadway Segment 3: (Bayview Drive and Overlook Drive) private drives
 Pavement Width: 18' to 15'
 Sidewalk or Freewalk: None
 Minimum Pavement Crown: Super Elevated
 Maximum Grade at Intersection w/ 75' of Intersection: 3% to 5%
 Hot Bituminous Pavement – None

The Board reviewed the findings of fact:

Mr. Sherr moved to approve the Findings of Fact as amended.

Mr. Saunders seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 5 in favor

FINDINGS OF FACT - Chapter 250 - Subdivision of Land

1. Pollution. The proposed subdivision will not result in undue water or air pollution. In making this determination, it shall at least consider:
 - A. The elevation of the land above sea level and its relation to the flood plains;
 - B. The nature of soils and subsoil and their ability to adequately support waste disposal;
 - C. The slope of the land and its effect on effluents;
 - D. The availability of streams for disposal of effluents; and
 - E. The applicable state and local health and water resource rules and regulations;

The applicant has provided a soils report and a storm water management report; these reports have been reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer and by the Cumberland County Soils and Water Conservation Commission.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

2. Sufficient Water. The proposed subdivision has sufficient water available for the reasonable foreseeable needs of the subdivision;
The proposed subdivision will utilize public water. A letter from the Portland Water District indicating capacity to serve is on file.
Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.
3. Municipal Water Supply. The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply, if one is to be used;
The proposed subdivision will utilize public water. A letter from the Portland Water District indicating capacity to serve is on file.
Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.
4. Erosion. The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results;
The applicant has submitted an erosion and sedimentation control plan that has been reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer and by the Cumberland County Soils and Water Conservation Commission.
Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.
5. Traffic. The proposed subdivision will not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed;
A traffic study was conducted by Traffic Solutions. The report provides current traffic and crash data as well as predicting the traffic effect of the new subdivision. The report showed that there would be very low vehicle, pedestrian and bike traffic and that the new subdivision would generate 6 new trips during the morning peak hour and 7 new trips during the evening peak hour. An update to this report looked at the anticipated traffic volume associated with the Town's public access to the waterfront beach property. The updated traffic assessment also included an assessment of the proposed access roadway improvements for providing an acceptable level of design to provide safe access to the site for the intended uses.
Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.
6. Sewage disposal. The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal and will not cause an unreasonable burden on municipal services, if they are utilized;
The project will utilize public sewer. A letter from the Portland Water District indicating capacity to serve is on file.
Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.
7. Municipal solid waste disposal. The proposed subdivision will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste, if municipal services are to be utilized;
Cumberland provides curbside trash collection and recycling through a contracted waste hauler. The addition the 8 new residences will not cause a burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste.
Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.
8. Aesthetic, cultural and natural values. The proposed subdivision will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat identified by the Department of inland Fisheries and Wildlife

or the municipality, or rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline;

A survey of all existing natural resources has been made via letters to the appropriate State agencies. The Maine Historic Preservation Commission has stated that the review area itself does not contain any historic architectural resources.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

9. Conformity with local ordinances and plans. The proposed subdivision conforms to a duly adopted subdivision regulation or ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan or land use plan, if any. In making this determination, the municipal reviewing authority may interpret these ordinances and plans;

The Plan has been reviewed by the town planner, the town engineer, the town manager and town department heads. The proposed project is in conformance with the above listed plans and ordinances.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

10. Financial and technical capacity. The subdivider has adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section;

Technical capacity is evidenced by the use of the following experts: professional engineers, licensed land surveyor, licensed soils evaluator and traffic consultant.

Financial capacity has been evidenced by a commitment letter (on file) dated October 22, 2014 from Norway Savings Bank.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

11. Surface waters; outstanding river segments. Whenever situated entirely or partially within the watershed of any pond or lake or within 250 feet of any wetland, great pond or river as defined in Title 38 chapter 3, subchapter I, article 2-B, the proposed subdivision will not adversely affect the quality of that body of water or unreasonably affect the shoreline of the body of water;

This section is not applicable.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

12. Ground water. The proposed subdivision will not alone, or in conjunction with, existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of ground water;

The very low density of this 9 lot residential subdivision (on 108 acres) will not adversely affect the quality or quantity of groundwater.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

13. Flood areas. Based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps, and information presented by the applicant whether the subdivision is in a flood-prone area. If the subdivision, or any part of it, is in such an area, the subdivider shall determine the 100-year flood elevation and flood hazard boundaries within the subdivision. The proposed subdivision plan must include a condition of plan approval requiring that principal structures in the subdivision will be constructed with their lowest floor, including the basement, at least one foot above the 100-year flood elevation;

The parcel is located in Zone C- Areas of Minimal Flooding as shown on FEMA Map # 2301620017C.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

14. Storm water. The proposed subdivision will provide for adequate storm water management;

A stormwater management plan was submitted as part of the application packet and has been reviewed and approved by the town Engineer. The MDEP Stormwater Permit has been received.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

15. Freshwater wetlands. All potential freshwater wetlands, as defined in 30-A M.R.S.A. §4401 (2-A), within the proposed subdivision have been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application, regardless of the size of these wetlands. Any mapping of freshwater wetlands may be done with the help of the local soil and water conservation district.

There are no freshwater wetlands shown on the plan.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

16. River, stream or brook... Any river, stream, or brook within or abutting the proposed subdivision has been identified on any map submitted as a part of the application. For purposes of this section, "river, stream or brook" has the same meaning as in Title 38, Section 480-B, Subsection 9. [Amended; Effective. 11/27/89]

Based on a review of the plans, there appear to be no rivers, streams or brooks within or abutting the proposed subdivision.

Based on the information provided, the standards of this section have been met.

Mr. Sherr moved to grant Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision Approval for a 10-lot subdivision at 179 Foreside Road, a portion of Tax Map R01, Lot 2 in the Low Density Residential (LDR) district. This approval is subject to the Standard Condition of Approval; Limitation of Approval and the six (6) Conditions of Approval; the findings of fact as amended; and approved waivers.

Mr. Saunders seconded.

VOTE: Unanimous 5 in favor

Standard Conditions 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 minor 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.

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) 1 year 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.

Conditions of Approval:

1. That all clearing limits be flagged prior to the preconstruction conference.

2. That a performance guarantee in an amount acceptable to the Town Manager be provided prior to the preconstruction conference.
3. That a written agreement be reached with the Town on the development of the proposed pedestrian sidewalk where it crosses onto land to be acquired by the Town.
4. That the applicant reaches an agreement with Chebeague Cumberland Land Trust (CCLT) regarding its easements providing public access for the proposed walking trails on the project.
5. The 5' wide sidewalk is for pedestrian use only; and it shall be posted with a sign.
6. A recommendation for a 15 mph speed limit on Beach Drive.

Mr. Neagle stated Mr. Ferland has been a long time member of the Planning Board. His term expires on New Year's Day and last I heard he has opted not to continue serving. Mr. Neagle thanked John for his years of service, his calm demeanor and intellect; his monthly update on the tides at Eastport and his wisdom and prospective has shown at the Planning Board. I want the minutes to reflect a debt of gratitude for John and his long service. We hope you have the opportunity to continue to serve the Town in another capacity.

Mr. Ferland stated he was thinking over the course of the last six years he was trying to remember all the members he has had the privilege to serve with. I came up with fourteen names and I can't speak to all of them. I can speak to all of you and I want to say from deep in my heart how much I respect you and how much I have enjoyed serving with you. It has been a remarkable experience serving on the Planning Board. The remarkable experience is that you come into a public setting with people you don't know. You sit as a collaborative body and through discussion most of the time we arrive at the same place. I only remember one time when the Board was completely deadlocked. It is a remarkable experience to have discussion and debate with someone you didn't know previously. I may be disappointed that my request was not granted, however I have full confidence in your decision. I hope to see you again around Town. I will be in front of you as a citizen and wish you all the best with your Planning Board service. Mr. Ferland also thanked Ms. Nixon and Ms. Bosarge for their professional help with all my questions. This all works so well because of your devotion to the Committees.

G. *Administrative Matters: Sign the Mylar.*

H. *Adjournment:*

Mr. Neagle adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

A TRUE COPY ATTEST:

Christopher S. Neagle, Board Chair

Pam Bosarge, Clerk to the Board