

**MINUTES**  
**FREEPORT PROJECT REVIEW BOARD**  
**FREEPORT TOWN HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2019**  
**6:00 p.m.**

**PRESENT:** Guy Blanchard, Ford Reiche, Vice Chair, Adam Troidl, Drew Wing and Caroline Pelletier, Interim Planner

**EXCUSED:** Geralyn Campanelli, Gordon Hamlin and Suzanne Watson

**CALL TO ORDER:** Following technical problems, Vice Chair Reiche called the meeting to order at 6:17 p.m. and noted what would be considered this evening.

ITEM I: Informational Exchange

a) Update on Staff Approvals.

Ms. Pelletier advised that Rodeway Inn has multiple buildings and they are adding a small connector between two of their buildings. On their main entrance they are tweaking their two doors with alterations that fall under the threshold for staff review. We have new signs on Main Street. Levi's will be locating in the former Bass Building and will replace the existing signage. She has had some parking recalculations come in for Petrillo's on Depot Street, Jameson Tavern at 115 Main Street and two others she is currently working on for Bow Street and Main Street. The Board will see another couple come next month. So far it has been a couple spaces at a time. Next month she suspects the Board will see a reduction based upon the new standards and will probably result in a reduction of 100 parking spaces for the owner.

b) Discussion of upcoming meeting schedule.

Ms. Pelletier noted the Board has had a steady flow of applications. She wanted to confirm the next two meetings and that the Board didn't have conflicts around the holidays. The third Wednesday in November would be November 20 and the third Wednesday in December would be December 18. She does not feel the Board has the flexibility to add a second meeting in those two months so the Board will go back to standard rules of order and procedure. Board members agreed that those two dates looked good. Mr. Troidl noted that a site walk is scheduled on October 23<sup>rd</sup>.

ITEM II: Approval of the minutes from the Wednesday, September 18, 2019 Project Review Board meeting.

Ms. Pelletier advised that the Minutes will be on the agenda next week.

ITEM III: Reviews

**Granite Park Subdivision – Conceptual Review**

The applicant is presenting conceptual plans for a five lot, Open Space Subdivision. Two of the lots/units are existing and will be located on Wood Thrush Lane. A new road off US Route One is proposed for the three additional units. Open space is required. Zoning District: Medium Density B (MD-B). Tax Assessor Map 20. Lots 4 & 4-1. Granite Park, LLC., applicant and owner; Thomas Greer, Walsh Engineering Associates, Inc.

Ms. Pelletier explained that this is a unique situation in that two houses are already existing. Creating three units or lots within a five-year period triggered the need for subdivision review which pulled those two existing houses into review. The two existing houses are served by an existing driveway. We don't have standards for driveways but we do have standards for subdivision roads which is anything more than two units. The applicant is proposing three new lots with a new road off of U.S. Route One. It is an open space subdivision residential. They do have an open space requirement but their calculations were a bit off on the plan but they are still providing an excess of what they need. They will clean it up when they come in. Our Town Engineer raised a bit of concern about some wetlands that were

previously identified on the site. The applicant will comment on that and the Board can look at. The Board did receive correspondence today from the Fire Chief saying that due to the proximity of hydrants, he will not require sprinklers. This is conceptual and a minor subdivision so they come for concept, will do the site walk and will make changes if necessary and will come back for concept. They will then do the final approval. They did not ask for any waivers. They are small lots, just over 20,000 sq. ft. and will have wells and septic. Does the Board want to require a hydrogeologic assessment or is it not concerned about it? At this point, it would be something to talk about. It is in the watershed of urban impaired streams They have been working with Adam Bliss on stormwater plans.

Vice Chair Reiche pointed out that this has already been divided twice and asked why was it not a subdivision. Ms. Pelletier explained that they had only two but when they wanted to split it again, it triggered subdivision. Instead of doing one more, they decided to do five because that is what the calculations allow. It is on two lots now.

Tom Greer from Walsh Engineering advised that he has been working with Ms. Pelletier and Mr. Bliss. He displayed a plan and pointed out the watershed they are dealing with. There is a fair amount of water that comes down through their site, down through some gullies and then it goes across the railroad tracks which are behind their site. He displayed an enlargement of the whole site and pointed out that their project is tucked in over on the righthand side. He also pointed out the two existing houses that Ms. Pelletier talked about and the existing driveway. He pointed out where they would be coming in on the righthand side. All of the soils are highly erodible. They have been working to make sure that they don't create any more gullies. He then displayed an enlargement of the three lots. The buildings will be put in so that they are solar oriented and potentially net zero homes. The applicant owns the existing two homes and will own these three as rental homes. From one of the original concepts they submitted, they tweaked the angle a bit in order to be more efficient for the solar orientation. As a result of that, the septic test pits they did didn't work out so they need go back and do another round of test pits but all of the soils along the back boundary line will be able to be passed. He feels stormwater is a big deal on this subdivision and feels it is the major issue in terms of review. He has been working with the Town Engineer and explained what they are planning. The two existing homes will have some regrading to collect the water behind them. A pipe will be run into the gully and they will put riprap on the bottom to make sure it is stable. He pointed out another one that would have a riprap outlet to make sure it is stable. Erosion control on those will be critical because of the highly erodible soils that are there. They will require a NRPA Permit and with positive comments from the Board tonight, he noted they would be filing that shortly with the DEP to make it happen. Under the Town's delegated authority, stormwater review and management all happens at the Town level so the Town will be issuing what would be the DEP Permit for stormwater management on this.

The turnaround they proposed with the hammerhead met the Fire Chief's requirements so they feel they are in pretty good shape there. They looked into extending public water but the cost was prohibitive. They pitched the whole road 16 feet to the right to avoid the swale that runs along by the driveways where they pick up all the water. They pushed the road over as far as they could in order to minimize the amount of cutting they would have to do on site. They have two small packets of wetlands and the Board will find them distinctive on the site walk. There are cinnamon ferns that are very dense and green. In 2007 there was some additional wetlands mapping done then but their soils scientist did not agree with that map and put a smaller map. The Board will see during the site walk why he didn't do it. Their calculations according to Ms. Pelletier are not right but they will go through them and make sure they work out. He displayed the subdivision plan and explained that they feel they placed the homes where they are best suited. Underground power and cable with on-site wells are being proposed.

Mr. Wing asked where the nearest abutters are located. Mr. Greer pointed them out and explained that they can pick up all their stormwater but not affect the neighbors next door. Mr. Wing asked how wide the roadway is. Mr. Greer indicated it is a 50-foot right-of-way with an 18-foot-wide road. Mr. Wing pointed out that this is really a small subdivision but the applicant is building a substantial road. He could see this being more appropriate for a gravel road and wonders how much difficulty it has caused in stormwater management or otherwise on the site. Mr. Greer advised that making the road smaller would certainly help with some of the stormwater management. That said, he is not sure

the Fire Chief wants to drive down anything narrower so he feels he will fight that battle if the Board makes it smaller. Mr. Wing asked if it would be paved. Mr. Greer noted they could leave it gravel but the issue with the gravel is to make sure it gets regraded regularly to make sure the water goes to the right side and doesn't flatten out over time. It creates other issues with erosion from rain and more maintenance of ditch lines and the like. There is not a lot of difference in the stormwater management. The sizing of the filter would remain the same.

Mr. Wing did not know how other Board members felt about it. This is one of the things the Board does that is perhaps a little overkill at times in terms of the road standards and what it drives. Sometime it is not appropriate for the size of the subdivision. He does not know if the owner has a preference to consider something that is not as expensive to build. Mr. Greer noted he and the applicant would take this under advisement and if they think reduced standards will work, they will come back with a waiver request unless the remaining Board members tell them they are not interested in granting a waiver for that. Mr. Blanchard noted that since these will be rental properties, it might be more desirable to have a road to attract folks. The standard is there for a reason when you have more than one house to provide a road. Jonathan noted that he is certainly open to that because he feels the less carbon the better. Ms. Pelletier suggested asking the Town Engineer to weigh in on this if the Board wants to explore it. Vice Chair Reiche advised that it would be helpful to know how much flexibility is possible and the Board would be better informed after the site walk. He asked the Board about a hydrogeologic assessment and Mr. Wing advised that he does not feel one is necessary for a single owner in a small subdivision. No other Board member indicated the need for one.

Mr. Troidl brought up landscaping. The existing two homes that are there, particularly the one closest to Route One does not really address Route One at all and maybe over time plants will grow in and we won't see it. He asked what is being cut there and what will be planted. Mr. Greer explained that they will only be cutting in order to get the houses in. Opening up the area to sunlight will allow the undergrowth to fill in. Mr. Greer noted that the Board would be able to see what is there during the site walk.

Ethel Wilkerson of 2 Larue Drive mentioned her greatest concern is that the stormwater that will be displaced will cross over Route One and end up in their yard. She hopes it stays on the other side of Route One. Mr. Greer pointed out how all the water ends up going into the culvert under the railroad tracks and she should be safe. John Wilkerson mentioned that there was discussion about a driveway being gravel, asked if the original driveway is paved or gravel. Jonathan advised that the original driveway was paved for the two existing houses.

Vice Chair Reiche thanked the applicants and pointed out that the site walk is scheduled one week from today at 5:15 p.m. The public is invited to attend.

---

**Cigri Subdivision – Subdivision Amendment – PUBLIC HEARING- THIS ITEM HAS BEEN TABLED AT THE REQUEST OF THE APPLICANT.**

---

**Cofrin / Logan Residence – Dock and Shoreline Stabilization**

The applicant is seeking approval of a Site Plan Amendment for a dock replacement and shoreline stabilization at 53 Bartol Island Road. Since this parcel is in the Island District, Site Plan Review is required by the Board. Zoning District: Island District (ID) and Shoreland Area (SA). Tax Assessor Map 20, Lot 89A. Gladys G. Cofrin and Daniel Logan, applicants and owners; Tim Forrester, Atlantic Environmental, representative.

Ms. Pelletier explained that if a parcel is in the Island District, anything you do pretty much requires that you come to the Board for a Site Plan Amendment. In this case they are applying for a dock system. The Ordinance also says they must meet the standards of the Coastal Waters Ordinance which is typically not an Ordinance the Board is involved in. As part of this application, they are proposing to stabilize the bank and they are doing a cut which requires removing extensive vegetation so under State Shoreland Zoning, when they hit a certain threshold of re-vegetation, State Law says they have to come before the Planning Board or in this case, the Project Review Board. She noted that our Ordinance

has not been adequately updated in terms of Shoreland Zoning. It is an ongoing project but we still have to go by the standards in place. Before the Board is a Staff Report that has three sets of findings, the familiar site plan ones, the standards of the Coastal Waters Ordinance and going through that, the Board will find lots of reference to Coastal Waters and the Harbor Master because they did review this first. Then the Board has the Shoreland Zoning standards which have the opinion and review of the Codes Enforcement Officer that come into play. Also, before the Board tonight is a revised set of plans. We went through the application and there were two pieces to it. They had a haul-out that they were proposing to remove the float and store it off site but you can't store that down in the lower area of the shore setback. That needed to be removed from the plan and that has been done. They also met on site with the Code Officer about their re-vegetation and the original approval was not adequate so they have gone back and added significantly more area of vegetation going 25 feet back and then another 10 feet of no-mow area. The Code Officer has not had time to go through the plan so there is still a condition proposed that he sign off on that. If the Board is comfortable and they need to add more vegetation, they could do that with Mr. Adams okaying it. They received their DEP approval within the last day or so. It was sent to the Board earlier today. The findings pretty much under landscaping and a couple under the Shoreland have been changed and track changes to note the changes to the buffer plan.

Vice Chair Reiche disclosed that he is the next-door neighbor to the applicant. Under the Board's Rules and Procedures, he needs to disclose that. He has reviewed that Ordinance and all the conditions that could cause him to have a conflict that would disqualify him. He found that he is not disqualified and is not looking to recuse himself. He noted that anyone on the Board wants to put it to a vote, it can be done. There was no interest from Board members to put it to a vote.

Vice Chair Reiche asked if the Board had any questions. Mr. Blanchard advised that the questions he had about the vegetation have been addressed today and hopes with Code Enforcement looking at that, it will be fine. The applicant did not have anything extra to provide.

- a. **Preservation of Landscape:** The landscape shall be developed in such a manner as to be in keeping with the character of the surrounding neighborhoods and in accordance with good development practice by minimizing tree and soil removal, retaining existing vegetation where desirable, and keeping any grade changes in character with the general appearance of neighboring areas. If a site includes a ridge or ridges above the surrounding areas and provides scenic vistas for surrounding areas, special attempts shall be made to preserve the natural environment of the skyline of the ridge. Existing vegetation and buffering landscaping are potential methods of preserving the scenic vista.

*The project consists of the removal of an existing dock and the construction of a new dock which will include a pier, ramp and float in a new location and provide access on an all-tide basis. Approximately 175 linear feet of shoreline stabilization will also occur with the project. This will result in the top of the bank being cut back about 10 feet, for a 1:1 slope. At the top of the new stabilized area will be buffer planting for a depth of 25 feet with an additional 10-foot no-mow buffer. The plantings will consist of native vegetation including shrubs, ground cover, native plants, and trees being installed in 25' x 25' plots. The Codes Officer met with the applicant on site, but should still review the final revegetation plan (in accordance with the revegetation requirements of Shoreland Zoning). A proposed condition of the approval is that the applicant obtain approval from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer for the final plan for the revegetation of the buffer, to allow the applicant to supplement the proposed buffer plan, if required. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- b. **Relation of Proposed Buildings to the Environment:** The design and layout of the buildings and/or other development areas shall encourage safety, including fire protection. Proposed structures shall be related harmoniously to the terrain and to existing buildings and land uses in the vicinity which have a visual relationship to the proposed buildings. Visual compatibility, not uniformity with the surrounding area, shall be emphasized. Special attention shall be paid to the scale (mass), height and bulk, proportions of

the proposed buildings, the nature of the open spaces (setbacks, landscaping) around the buildings, the design of the buildings (including roof style, facade openings, architectural style and details), building materials and signs.

If the structure is in the Design Review District, the Project Review Board shall incorporate the findings of the standards or the Design Review Ordinance in its Site Plan Review findings.

*The parcel is not within the Freeport Design Review Districts. No new buildings are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- c. **Vehicular Access:** The proposed layout of access points shall be designed so as to avoid unnecessary adverse impacts on existing vehicular and pedestrian traffic patterns. Special consideration shall be given to the location, number, and control of access points, adequacy of adjacent streets, traffic flow, sight distances, turning lanes, and existing or proposed traffic signalization and pedestrian-vehicular contacts. The entrance to the site shall meet the minimum sight distance according to MDOT standards to the greatest extent possible

*No changes to vehicular access to the site are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- d. **Parking and Circulation:** The layout and design of all means of vehicular and pedestrian circulation, including walkways, interior drives, and parking areas shall be safe and convenient and, insofar as practical, shall not detract from the proposed buildings and neighboring properties. General interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, service traffic, drive-up facilities, loading areas, and the arrangement and use of parking areas shall be considered.

*No changes to parking and circulation are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- e. **Surface Water Drainage:** Adequate provisions shall be made for surface drainage so that removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties, down-stream conditions, or the public storm drainage system. The increase in rate of runoff in the post development condition shall be held to a zero or less percent of the predevelopment condition unless an engineering study has been performed as described in Section 529.2 above. On-site absorption shall be utilized to minimize discharges whenever possible. All drainage calculations shall be based on a two-year, ten year and twenty-five-year storm frequency. Emphasis shall be placed on the protection of floodplains; reservation of stream corridors; establishment of drainage rights-of- way and the adequacy of the existing system; and the need for improvements, both on-site and off-site, to adequately control the rate, volume and velocity of storm drainage and the quality of the stormwater leaving the site. Maintenance responsibilities shall be reviewed to determine their adequacy.

*No changes to surface water drainage is proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- f. **Utilities:** All utilities included in the site plan shall be reviewed as to their adequacy, safety, and impact on the property under review and surrounding properties. The site plan shall show what provisions are being proposed for water supply, wastewater, solid waste disposal and storm drainage. Whenever feasible, as determined by the Project Review Board, all electric, telephone and other utility lines shall

be installed underground. Any utility installations above ground shall be located so as to have a harmonious relationship with neighboring properties and the site.

*No changes to utilities are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- g. Advertising Features:** The size, location, texture and lighting of all exterior signs and outdoor advertising structures or features shall not detract from the layout of the property and the design of proposed buildings and structures and the surrounding properties, and shall not constitute hazards to vehicles and pedestrians.

*No signs are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- h. Special Features:** Exposed storage areas, exposed machinery installations, service areas, truck loading areas, utility buildings and structures, similar accessory areas and structures, shall be subject to such setbacks, screen plantings or other screening methods as shall reasonably be required to prevent their being incongruous with the existing or contemplated environment and the surrounding properties.

*There are no special features associated with this project. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- i. Exterior Lighting:** All exterior lighting shall be designed to encourage energy efficiency, to ensure safe movement of people and vehicles, and to minimize adverse impact on neighboring properties and public ways. Adverse impact is to be judged in terms of hazards to people and vehicular traffic and potential damage to the value of adjacent properties. Lighting shall be arranged to minimize glare and reflection on adjacent properties and the traveling public. For all proposed lighting, the source of the light shall be shielded and the light should be directed to the ground, except in the case of ground sign lighting. In the Village Commercial 1 and 2 Districts, lighting for pedestrian walkways and adjacent public sidewalks shall also be provided.

*No new lighting is proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- j. Emergency Vehicle Access:** Provisions shall be made for providing and maintaining convenient and safe emergency vehicle access to all buildings and structures at all times.

*All public safety department heads have reviewed the plans. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- k. Landscaping:** Landscaping shall be designed and installed to define, soften, or screen the appearance of off- street parking areas from the public right(s)-of-way and abutting properties, to enhance the physical design of the building(s) and site, and to minimize the encroachment of the proposed use on neighboring land uses. Particular attention should be paid to the use of planting to break up parking areas. The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practical, by minimizing tree and soil removal, retaining existing vegetation where desirable, and keeping any grade changes in character with the general appearance of neighboring areas. Landscaping shall be provided as part of the overall site plan design and integrated into building arrangements, topography, parking and buffering requirements. Landscaping may include trees, bushes, shrubs, ground cover, perennials, annuals, plants, grading and the use of building and paving materials in an imaginative manner.

*Approximately 175 linear feet of shoreline stabilization will also occur with the project. This will result in the top of the bank being cut back about 10 feet, for a 1:1 slope. At the top of the new stabilized area will be*

*buffer planting for a depth of 25 feet with an additional 10-foot no-mow buffer. The plantings will consist of native vegetation including shrubs, ground cover, native plants, and trees being installed in 25' x 25' plots. The Codes Officer met with the applicant on site, but should still review the final revegetation plan (in accordance with the revegetation requirements of Shoreland Zoning). A proposed condition of the approval is that the applicant obtain approval from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer for the final plan for the revegetation of the buffer, to allow the applicant to supplement the proposed buffer plan, if required.*

*Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**I. Environmental Considerations: A site plan shall not be approved unless it meets the following criteria:**

- (1) The project will not result in water pollution, erosion or sedimentation to surfacewaters;**
- (2) The project will not result in damage to spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird and other wildlife habitat;**
- (3) The project will conserve shoreland vegetation;**
- (4) The project will conserve points of public access to waters;**
- (5) The project will adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater;**
- (6) The project will protect archaeological and historic resources;**
- (7) The project will not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or maritime activities in the Marine Waterfront District.**

*The parcel is within the Shoreland Zone but not within the Marine Waterfront District. Approximately 175 linear feet of shoreline stabilization will also occur with the project and will stabilize the bank which is eroding. A revegetation plan for the top of the bank was included with the proposal with a proposed condition of approval that the Codes Enforcement Officer sign-off on the final planting plan. The applicant did make application to the Coastal Waters Commission and was granted approval by the Commission for this project on 08/14/19. The applicant has also applied to the Maine Department of Environmental Protection for an NRPA Permit and to the US Army Corps of Engineers for a permit, both for the 2 sf of wetland impact from the pilings needed to support the pier. The NRPA permit is also required for the shoreline stabilization. The approval from the MDEP was granted on 10/11/19. The applicant did obtain approval from the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, dated 06/27/19, stating that "...there will be no historic properties affected by the proposed undertaking..." Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance.**

**Float ("Project") Standards:**

The design, location and scale of all float projects are subject to approval by the Freeport Coastal Waters Commission under the following guidelines. **NOTE: Approval from the Freeport Waters Commission does not relieve the applicant from the responsibility of obtaining approval from other town, state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed float.**

- 1. The project shall be no larger in dimension than is consistent with the conditions, use and character of its surroundings; it will not adversely affect water use by adjacent properties; and will remain in general harmony with that of existing activities in adjacent areas within the Freeport Coastal Water Commission's jurisdiction. The property for which the project will be constructed shall have a minimum of 60 feet of water frontage. The length from the highest annual tide water mark shall not exceed 125' and must be completed within two years of final approval.**

*The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 08/14/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster. The property on which the project is located on has in excess of 60 feet of water frontage. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- 2. The project must not unreasonably interfere with customary or traditional public access ways to, or public trust rights (fishing, fowling, and navigation) in, on, or over the submerged lands; unreasonably interfere with fishing or other existing marine uses of the area; unreasonably diminish the availability of services and facilities necessary for commercial marine activities; and unreasonably interfere with ingress and egress or riparian owners. Project may require accommodations such as steps or pier elevations allowing passage over or beneath the structure.**

*The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 08/14/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster. The Board is not aware of any issues regarding accessways, marine uses, commercial marine activities or ingress and egress of riparian owners. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- 3. The project will not pose hazard to navigational channels, nor pose a hazard to navigation by obscuring visibility or by the display of distracting lights or reflective material. If appropriate the float will display appropriate warning lights to aid in navigation and public safety at the discretion of the Harbor Master, the US Coast Guard, or the Army Corps of Engineers.**

*The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 08/14/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster. The Board is not aware of any issues regarding hazards to navigation and warning lights were not required as part of that approval. An application has been submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- 4. The project will not encroach into, interfere with, or pose a hazard to: municipal or federal navigational channels; existing mooring or berthing areas (commercial and recreational); public access, public rights of way, public and private launching ramps in any Freeport Coastal Waters.**

*The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 08/14/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster. The Board is not aware of any issues regarding navigation channels, existing moorings or berthing areas or public access. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- 5. The project will be developed on soils appropriate for such use and construction so as to control erosion.**

*Approximately 175 linear feet of shoreline stabilization will also occur with the project and will stabilize the eroding bank. A revegetation plan for the top of the bank was included with the proposal with a proposed condition of approval that the Codes Enforcement Officer sign-off on the final planting plan. The applicant shall follow the DEP Best Management Practices for Erosion Control during construction and an erosion control plan has been included in the submission and shall use a contract that is certified in erosion control by the DEP. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*



6. **The project will not cause water quality or other coastal resources to be degraded including developed or natural beach areas, marshes, grasses and wildlife habitats.**

*Approximately 175 linear feet of shoreline stabilization will also occur with the project and will stabilize the eroding bank. A revegetation plan for the top of the bank was included with the proposal. The new dock will provide all tide access so the structures will no longer be sitting on the mud during lower tides. Based on this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

7. **The project shall not significantly impact fisheries or shellfish harvesting. Prior to approval applications may be reviewed by the Shellfish Commission.**

*The Coastal Waters Commission granted approval for the project on 08/14/19 and the proposal has been reviewed by the Harbormaster/Marine Resource Conservation Officer. The Board is not aware of any issues regarding the impact on fisheries or shellfish harvesting. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

8. **Registration and Identification will be required on all ramps and floats.**

*The applicant is aware that the float will need to have proposed identification as required by the Harbormaster. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**Conclusion: Based on these facts the Board finds that this project meets the criteria and standards of Article XIII of the Coastal Waters Ordinance.**

<p><b>Proposed Findings of Fact: Chapter 1000.15.B: GUIDELINES FOR MUNICIPAL SHORELAND ZONING ORDINANCES - Piers, Docks, Wharves, Bridges and Other Structures and Uses Extending Over or Below the Normal High-Water Line of a Water Body or Within a Wetland, and Shoreline Stabilization</b></p>
---

- (1) **No more than one pier, dock, wharf or similar structure extending or located below the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland is allowed on a single lot; except that when a single lot contains at least twice the minimum shore frontage as specified in Section 15(A), a second structure may be allowed and may remain as long as the lot is not further divided.**

*The project consists of the removal of an existing dock and the construction of a new dock which will include a pier, ramp and float in a new location and provide access on an all-tide basis. There will only be one dock on the property. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- (2) **Access from shore shall be developed on soils appropriate for such use and constructed so as to control erosion.**

*Portions of the existing shoreline were previously stabilized with riprap and an additional 175 linear feet of shoreline stabilization will also occur with the project and will stabilize the bank which is eroding. The pier will be supported with pilings that will be set in the upland and pinned to the riprap. The float will be stored outside of the Shoreland Zone setback. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**(3) The location shall not interfere with existing developed or natural beach areas.**

*No existing developed or natural beaches have been identified in the submission. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**(4) The facility shall be located so as to minimize adverse effects on fisheries.**

*The submission noted that “the project has been reviewed by the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, the Department of Marine Resources, US Fish and Wildlife, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and there were no concerns identified regarding the project.” Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard will be met.*

**(5) The facility shall be no larger in dimension than necessary to carry on the activity and be consistent with the surrounding character and uses of the area. A temporary pier, dock or wharf in non-tidal waters shall not be wider than six feet for non-commercial uses.**

*The parcel is in the Island District which allows “one pier, dock or wharf may be maintained on each Island or lot of record existing as of January 1, 1979.” The proposed dock will replace an existing one which will be removed. The ramp will not be wider than six feet. The structure will not be located in non-tidal waters.*

*Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**(6) No new structure shall be built on, over or abutting a pier, wharf, dock or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland unless the structure requires direct access to the water body or wetland as an operational necessity.**

*The project consists of the removal of an existing dock and the construction of a new dock which will include a pier, ramp and float in a new location and provide access on an all-tide basis. No new structures are being built on or over the dock. Based upon this information, the Board finds this standard has been met.*

**(7) New permanent piers and docks on non-tidal waters shall not be permitted unless it is clearly demonstrated to the Planning Board that a temporary pier or dock is not feasible, and a permit has been obtained from the Department of Environmental Protection, pursuant to the *Natural Resources Protection Act*.**

*The structure will not be located in non-tidal waters. The applicant has applied to the DEP for applicable permitting. Based upon this information, the Board finds this standard has been met.*

**(8) No existing structures built on, over or abutting a pier, dock, wharf or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland shall be converted to residential dwelling units in any district.**

*The project consists of the removal of an existing dock and the construction of a new dock which will include a pier, ramp and float in a new location and provide access on an all-tide basis. No new structures are being built on or over the dock. No residential units are proposed. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**(9) Except in the General Development Districts and Commercial Fisheries/Maritime Activities District,**

**structures built on, over or abutting a pier, wharf, dock or other structure extending beyond the normal high-water line of a water body or within a wetland shall not exceed twenty (20) feet in height above the pier, wharf, dock or other structure.**

*The project consists of the removal of an existing dock and the construction of a new dock which will include a pier, ramp and float in a new location and provide access on an all-tide basis. No new structures are being built on or over the dock. Based upon this information, the Board finds this standard has been met.*

- (10) Vegetation may be removed in excess of the standards in Section 15(P) of this ordinance in order to conduct shoreline stabilization of an eroding shoreline, provided that a permit is obtained from the Planning Board. Construction equipment must access the shoreline by barge when feasible as determined by the Planning Board.**
- (a) When necessary, the removal of trees and other vegetation to allow for construction equipment access to the stabilization site via land must be limited to no more than 12 feet in width. When the stabilization project is complete the construction equipment accessway must be restored.**
  - (b) Revegetation must occur in accordance with Section 15(S).**

*Approximately 175 linear feet of shoreline stabilization will also occur with the project. This will result in the top of the bank being cut back about 10 feet, for a 1:1 slope. At the top of the new stabilized area will be buffer planting for a depth of 25 feet with an additional 10-foot no-mow buffer. The plantings will consist of native vegetation including shrubs, ground cover, native plants, and trees being installed in 25' x 25' plots. The Codes Officer met with the applicant on site, but should still review the final revegetation plan (in accordance with the revegetation requirements of Shoreland Zoning). A proposed condition of the approval is that the applicant obtain approval from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer for the final plan for the revegetation of the buffer, to allow the applicant to supplement the proposed buffer plan, if required.*

*Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

- (11) A deck over a river may be exempted from the shoreland setback requirements if it is part of a downtown revitalization project that is defined in a project plan approved by the legislative body of the municipality, and may include the revitalization of structures formerly used as mills that do not meet the structure setback requirements, if the deck meets the following requirements:**
- (a) The total deck area attached to the structure does not exceed 700 square feet;**
  - (b) The deck is cantilevered over a segment of a river that is located within the boundaries of the downtown revitalization project;**
  - (c) The deck is attached to or accessory to an allowed commercial use in a structure that was constructed prior to 1971 and is located within the downtown revitalization project;**
  - (d) The construction of the deck complies with all other applicable standards, except the shoreline setback requirements in section 15(B); and**
  - (e) The construction of the deck complies with all other state and federal laws.**

*No decks are proposed with this proposal. Based upon this information, the Board finds that this standard has been met.*

**Proposed Motion:** Be it ordered that the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact and Site Plan Amendment for Gladys Cofrin and Daniel Logan, at 53 Bartol Island Road (Tax Assessor Map 20, Lot 89A), for shoreline stabilization and dock replacement, to be built substantially as proposed, plans dated 06/18/19, revised through 10/15/19, finding that it meets the standards of the Section 602 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance, Article XIII of the Coastal Water’s Ordinance, and the standards of Chapter 1000.15.B of the State of Maine Shoreland Zoning regulations, with the following Conditions of Approval:

- 1) This approval incorporates by reference all supporting plans that amend the previously approved plans submitted by the applicant and his/her representatives at Project Review Board meetings and hearings on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated conditions.
- 2) Prior to any sitework, the applicant obtain any applicable permits from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer.
- 3) The applicant obtain applicable approvals from the US Army Corps of Engineers prior to applying for any permits from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer.
- 4) The applicant obtain approval from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer for the final plan for the revegetation of the buffer, to allow the applicant to supplement the proposed buffer plan, if required for compliance with State Shoreland Zoning requirements for revegetation associate with shoreline stabilization.

**MOVED AND SECONDED:** That the Board accept the proposed motion as read and written in the proposed Staff Report. (Blanchard & Wing) **VOTE:** (4 Ayes) (3 Excused-Campanelli, Hamlin & Watson) (0 Nays)

---

**Denney Block Freeport, LLC – Site Re-development**

The applicant is seeking final approval for a redevelopment project at 56 & 58 Main Street. A new structure between the two existing structures is proposed. Site Plan Review and Design Review are required. The applicant received approval from the Freeport Town Council in May 2015 for a Contract Zone for the property. Design Review District I – Class B & C properties. Zoning District: Village Commercial I. Tax Assessor Map 11, Lots 110 & 111. Denney Block Freeport LLC, applicant and owner; Kevin Nice, EBI Consulting, representative.

Ms. Pelletier provided background information on this project that came before the Board in 2015. They received approval for a contract zone and that agreement was executed and recorded. It had certain conditions that the project before the Board today has to comply with or incorporate into their design. The design was conceptually acknowledged or accepted by the Project Review Board, the Planning Board and the Council at that point in time. At the previous meeting, this Board did take action and found that the proposed design in front of you was consistent with what was previously approved. The other part of this project that the Board already acted on is that it requires demolition of a portion of a Class B building which is the Vineyard Vines building. The Board took care of this at the August or September meeting. Before the Board this evening we have typical zoning for the Village Commercial I, which we have not seen a lot of new development there. She will walk the Board through some things that come into play in that particular district. The Board also has the added layer of the contract zone which is essentially another zoning layer on top of the underlying zoning. In the Contract Zone there were some provisions for landscaping along Mill Street, they had to add some seating as well as a seating area along Mill Street. They had to add an elevator and some signage for the elevator. Some of those things are unknown but they have a tenant which they have disclosed. The exact signs are not known but when the tenant comes back for signage, they will also come back for signs if it triggers review for signs directing people to the elevator. The Board has a revised Site Plan before you tonight that does show the added seating area along the Mill Street façade between those existing steps, the building and the road. Because they increased the impervious area up there to get the seating in, they did have a small area behind the building that they had to add impervious pavers to meet the impervious coverage limitations of the

Ordinance. The Board also received a detailed landscaping plan and a cut sheet of the planters. This is in Design Review and the Board needs to look at the standard. This is in the village and they don't have parking on site. Their calculations show that they need approximately 16.2 parking spaces. She explained how the measurements are estimated. They hope to be able to provide parking through the leased parking pool. They have another property in Freeport they are affiliated with that they hope to provide their parking from so they will work out those details typically as a condition of approval since the numbers need to be fine tuned but they would enter those spaces in the leased parking pool and then go through the same shared parking system like everyone else in town. Access to the site is existing. There is a shared loading dock to the rear of the property behind this property and the abutting Freeport Village Station. Today they got their signoff from Maine Water. They are still waiting for signoff from the Freeport Sewer District so that would be a proposed condition of approval. Adam Bliss did sign off on stormwater. He did recommend a minor change to their maintenance plan which will be a proposed condition of approval. Mr. Bliss questioned whether or not they were triggering any kind of amendment to the existing Site Location of Development Permit from the DEP on the abutting property. They did submit some documentation from their attorney noting how that wasn't triggered. They submitted cut sheets of the lighting, mostly gooseneck style full cut off meaning you can't see the source of the light. They do require Design Review approval and she will let them go into the building details on that. One other condition Ms. Pelletier wanted to point out to the Board that as part of the Contract Zone there was a condition that they actually have three parcels here and they need to be merged. It makes sense that they have not merged them yet because if they are not going to do the project, the second they merge them, they will lose some of the non-conforming status that they have such as coverage and some requirements like that. Their attorney drafted up an agreement so that if this is approved before they get the building permit, they will do the formal recording to merge this into one project. That is a condition there.

Mr. Troidl mentioned parking and asked if they already recalculated the two existing buildings assuming they would go down. Ms. Pelletier advised that they have not asked for a recalculation of their two existing buildings. She pointed out that all three are grandfathered and it wouldn't benefit them. She mentioned another change in the Parking Ordinance, if you have a vacancy for twelve months, you then have to conform. The applicant gave her some documentation today for their file. They have been using the downstairs of that building pretty regularly so now they have a little vacancy but the intent is that they will be seasonally full. They don't foresee any other portions of this building having to be brought into conformity at this point, although they do have some vacancies in the neighboring building. If they hit that twelve-month threshold, they will have to bring it up to conforming standards.

Kevin Nice of EBI Consulting mentioned that the late information the Board received was clarifications of things they submitted with the application. He thought it would be good to go through pieces of the project and run through how they are looking at this and what they turned in. He displayed a plan showing the Vineyard Vines side elevation and explained what piece of the building would come out. Based on the demo plan, they are pulling it back to the original building and saving the windows in the existing extension and reinserting them into the new portion of the wall. He pointed out the existing brick wall. The signage has been approved. There is no intention to bring the storefront windows to the ground level around the corner as they are on the addition. They don't match the front and right now inside the building, it is a blank wall all along. While they are pulling windows back and they will be operable in the future, they will be false windows for this tenant. It is glazing but the windows are not open on the interior. That would be an existing condition at this point. At the point in time when the tenant changes over, these windows would be available for use. He noted the existing doors and mentioned that they would be providing a new window at the lower level where there is an existing bay window that gets cut back.

Mr. Nice displayed a new board showing the materials and noted they are the same materials they presented previously. They went back and changed the windows to divided lights with exterior mullions, a bridge and interior mullions so they could maintain the energy rating they needed for the windows. They made those changes and included changing the bridge section of the building to the panels that they have elsewhere in the building and then picked that up on the back portion where the elevator is. The extension which is the bridge again to the existing brick Denney Building is panelized on its facades. He displayed a board showing the façade opposite and the same set of stairs and railings which are attached to the building. Shingles and wood lap siding are all wood details. He pointed out the door to the lower level tenant and a window. He pointed to the exterior exit escape from each of the levels. They included details on how they are doing trim

and in the Board's packets, they have details of the windows, door frames and gooseneck lighting. They are planning to use the existing granite stairs and matching the railings of the existing stairs with the railings for the exit stair. All of the lighting is being attached to the buildings. Mr. Nice explained that they got their landscape plan updated.

Mr. Blanchard brought up the alternate elevation that was developed for the stair area. Mr. Nice explained that the alternate elevation would add in false windows and pick up some of the rhythm of the street. They did make some changes on the back side and the front side to pick up more detailing. Their preference would be their original submission and they are hoping to get approval today and this was entered as an alternate.

Mr. Blanchard noted his concern is that they are creating this alley between the buildings where there is not a lot of light coming in. It is basically creating long stretches without any openings. He doesn't want people to be turned off from using that access point because it looks dark down that way. With the false windows, it adds a little more visual interest and people might not feel it is an area they shouldn't go down. He wants the public to know that this is an access point for them. Mr. Nice believes it can be done with signage and they will come back with signage. He is expecting that there will be acknowledgment of a public elevator so people can see there is an elevator but they don't have it yet worked out. On the windows, the reality is that even if they were open, you can't see into them because it is a narrow space.

Mr. Blanchard feels the side facing Main Street is successful and the rear elevation is successful as well but there is something missing in the alley. Mr. Troidl added that if the windows don't go in now, they never will go in.

Mr. Troidl brought up landscaping. Ms. Pelletier mentioned it has been five years since the original contract went in and that sidewalk has already been replaced and is in the right-of-way so it doesn't come under the purview of the Board. They would need to do the other portion that has not been replaced as part of their obligation with that Contract Zone. They could work it out with the Council and Public Works so it is a condition. They actually show some planters out there in front of their building and a couple of supplementals. Another change that was approved by the Council was in front of the Vineyard Vines Building, an accessibility ramp was approved so they can't put plantings anymore where they have the ramp. We are not going to make them take out an ADA ramp to put in some plantings. She mentioned there is a cut sheet in the Board's packets for stand-alone planting pots which were included today. Mr. Troidl noted they don't show bistro tables or a seating area at the top of Mill Street. Ms. Pelletier explained that the Board needs to decide whether or not they are meeting the requirements of the Contract Zone. Mr. Troidl noted the Board could leave it to the Town Council to decide what kind of planting they want there. Vice Chair Reiche mentioned he would be okay with that.

Ms. Pelletier had a conversation with the Town Attorney and essentially, by the Council approving it, it added an extra layer of zoning and so it is up to the Board to determine, as you did with the building, that these standards have been met. She suggested that the Board look at the two carefully since it has been a while and the Council did approve that ADA ramp in front of that one building and we have already repaired a portion of the sidewalk.

Mr. Troidl advised that when he looks at 1-D tonight's plan in front of the Board would be fine but when he looks at the included sketch, it has planting areas on it. If that is what the Town wanted at the time, we don't have it. Ms. Pelletier suggested the applicant clarify on their site plan how they are meeting that requirement in the Contract Zone.

Rick Meek from Sebago Technics explained that with the limitations with the alleyway and the building, they would be happy to look at other planters but there is no room to provide additional landscaping within the property's footprint. Mr. Troidl pointed out that there would have to be an agreement between the Town and the owner to allow those plantings in the right-of-way. Ms. Pelletier added that since the drawing in the Board's hands, the building has changed. Originally the whole thing was going to be connected but now it is not. They have that 6-foot pedestrian walkway. Mr. Nice advised that they are okay with working with the Town. They are rebuilding the sidewalk anyway and will work with the Town to figure out what planters make sense. They are okay with this as a condition. Mr. Troidl advised that he is comfortable leaving the condition the way it is written and it is up to the Council to do what they want to do. If other Board members aren't, he is fine with that as well. Ms. Pelletier suggested adding a condition under #4-b "Complete the reconstruction of the sidewalk and install new planters" to get the wording on record. She mentioned that the street trees

referenced have already been removed by the Town since they were not in good health. She feels it would be good to read the motion and clarify what drawings are being approved. Mr. Nice explained EL-1 Alt dated 9/25 and EL-2 Alt dated 8/28.

Ms. Pelletier answered questions for Board members. Mr. Troidl offered to read the motion.

**MOVED AND SECONDED:** Be It Ordered: That the Freeport Project Review Board approve the printed Findings of Fact, Design Review Certificate and Site Plan Amendment for Denney Block Freeport, LLC for a building addition and associated site improvements at 56-58 Main Street (Tax Assessor Map 11, Lots 110 and 111), to be built substantially as proposed, site plan set revised through 10/16/19 and handed out at today's meeting and architectural plan set revised through 09/25/19 including the following two drawings: EL-1 Alt dated 9/25 and EL-2 Alt dated 8/28 finding that it meets the standards of the Freeport Design Review Ordinance and the Freeport Zoning Ordinance, with the following Conditions of Approval:

- 1) This approval incorporates by reference all supporting plans that amend the previously approved plans submitted by the applicant and his/her representatives at Project Review Board meetings and hearings on the subject application to the extent that they are not in conflict with other stated conditions.
- 2) Prior to any work on the building, the applicant obtain a building permit from the Freeport Codes Enforcement Officer.
- 3) Prior to any site work, or a building permit being applied for, the applicant do the following:
  - a. Enter into a Maintenance Agreement for a Stormwater Management System with the Town of Freeport, to be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, with yearly stormwater reporting to the Town of Freeport being required.
  - b. Establish a performance guarantee in the amount to cover the cost of all site work associated with the project, in the amount of \$75,000.00 and in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney. The performance guarantee shall cover the cost of all site work, including the road, landscaping, erosion control, and stormwater management etc. Along with the performance guarantee, a non-refundable administrative fee of 2% of the performance guarantee, in the amount \$1,500.00, be paid.
  - c. Establish an inspection account, in the amount of \$1,500.00 for inspection of the site improvements by the Town Engineer.
  - d. The developer have a pre-construction meeting with the Town Engineer.
  - e. At the time that a building permit is applied for, the applicant pay a Pavement Maintenance Impact fee to the Town of Freeport based upon the size of the proposed structure and the impact fees effective at such time.
  - f. The applicant obtain a written capacity letter from the Freeport Sewer District with a copy being forwarded to the Freeport Planning Department.
  - g. In accordance with the contact zone approved by the Freeport Town Council on 05/05/15, the three parcels of land containing the three existing buildings will be merged into one parcel, with a deed to be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds.
  - h. Submit a copy of the revised Maintenance and Housekeeping plan to incorporate the changes suggested by the Town Engineer, in his memo dated 10/9/19, to be reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer.
- 4) Prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued, the applicant will do the following:
  - a) Obtain applicable approvals and permits for directional signs to the elevator from all building entrances.
  - b) Complete the reconstruction of the sidewalk in front of the building with first obtaining any required approvals from the Freeport Department of Public Works and the Freeport Town Council to meet the requirements of Section 1-D of the Contract Zoning Agreement.
  - c) The applicant submit final floor plan drawing and square footages for the determination of the amount of required parking. Once the determination is made, the applicant will need

to provide parking in accordance with the Town of Freeport Traffic and Parking Ordinance, Article V: Leased Parking Standards and/or Section 514.B.7 of the Freeport Zoning Ordinance. (Troidl & Wing) **VOTE:** (4 Ayes) (3 Excused-Campanelli, Hamlin & Watson) (0 Nays)

ITEM IV: Review of parcels to possibly include in the Freeport Design Review District Historic Inventory Project and discussion of next steps.

Ms. Pelletier explained that the Board got the inventory quite a while ago but has been too busy to find time to go through it. There were some parcels identified. When they did the A and B buildings, we asked them to flag C buildings when they saw any that were out there. They did flag a couple of other parcels. She made reference to a map and a copy of the property records cards. We have some funding available and we could use this same consultant if the Board wants to do these to get them all done now so when we move forward in the next few months working towards updates, we will have all the information and consistency. She offered to walk through the parcels.

She mentioned the Friendly's Building on Main Street that is classified as a Class B but the original structure got moved somewhere else in Freeport so this is a replica. They flagged it as something that shouldn't be a "B" but is something the Board would want to look at. It did get inventoried. There are also two properties on West Street over the railroad tracks on the right that are beyond the boundaries of the District which the consultant said could be inventoried for possible inclusion. Ms. Pelletier asked if the Board wanted to get into this at this point. Those three might be the easiest ones to talk about.

Mr. Blanchard feels that if we inventory those, we would need to look at the whole neighborhood to be inclusive in Design Review and he doesn't believe that is where we want to go just yet. Vice Chair Reiche didn't feel it made sense. There was agreement to not pay to have those two properties inventoried. Mr. Blanchard feels the former Friendly's Building falls outside of the recommended period of significance that they came up with for the District so he doesn't see a reason to look at it. It's a good replica.

The big yellow house at the corner of West and South Street has a Class C designation and has been inventoried within the last ten years. Mr. Blanchard feels it should be inventoried.

On Bow Street there is a building that Wilbur's Chocolate is in that is currently a Class C building and will be on the Board's agenda next week. They flagged that property. Mr. Blanchard feels it is worth a look.

The real estate office at the corner of Middle and School Streets was flagged. It has a stone veneer on the foundation. Mr. Blanchard feels it should be inventoried.

Ms. Pelletier mentioned that when you cross School Street, there are three parcels near each other. The one closest to Main Street looks like it is entirely in Design Review but the next two get cut off so portions of those parcels are in Design Review. They are 17 School Street, 29 School Street and 2 Royal Avenue. It was decided to include them.

Ms. Pelletier clarified that the Board does not want to do anything with 147 Main, we are not going to have them do anything with the two on West Street that are not in the District. We will get a price to get the rest of them inventoried if it is within budget, with the same requirements and information that we had them include before.

Mr. Blanchard mentioned that the consultant's proposal gave the Board a number not to exceed 120. Ms. Pelletier feels they are great to work with.

---

Ms. Pelletier pointed out that the Planning Board had their last meeting and talked about the workshop. Everybody was happy with the productivity and conversation that came out of that. They are all on board to get a working group going and to move forward having this working group work on looking at updating Design Review, updating the Overlay and



coming up with what kind of product we would want to come out of that process. They would then bring it to the Council and Planning Board for feedback and then we would move forward with that. At this point we would have a meeting with the Chair of this Board and the Planning Board and make up the composition. The thought was two members from the Board, two members from the Planning Board. FEDC offered to participate. Council will have some turnover with the election so she feels we should wait until after that takes place and work with the chairs and get the Working Group going. It will be a few months before they come back to the Planning Board. This Board has dug into Design Review quite a bit. There was an old outline on what the new Design Review Ordinance should look like. Mr. Blanchard feels it is worth discussion.

---

Ms. Pelletier pointed out that Election of Officers will be on next week's agenda.

ITEM V: Persons wishing to address the Board on non-agenda items. - None

ITEM VI: Adjourn.

**MOVED AND SECONDED:** To adjourn at 7:50 p.m. (Wing & Troidl) **VOTE:** (4 Ayes) (3 Excused-Campanelli, Hamlin & Watson) (0 Nays)

Recorded by Sharon Coffin