

## **ITEM 1 - ROLL CALL**

Present: Dennis Lentz - Chairman, Ed Cieleuszko, Christine Bennett, Melissa Horner, Casey Snyder – Alternate.

Also Present: Doug Greene, Planner.

Voting members: Dennis Lentz, Ed Cieleuszko, Christine Bennett, Melissa Horner, and Casey Snyder (appt).

## **ITEM 2 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

## **ITEM 3 – MOMENT OF SILENCE**

## **ITEM 4 – 10-MINUTE PUBLIC INPUT SESSION**

There was no public input.

## **ITEM 5 – OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Development of Town Marijuana Ordinances**

Mr. Lentz said that he understands that we probably have a June target. He asked the Planner to go through his Memo for the PB.

The Planner said that the first page is a historical summary as a reference. He added that this is somewhat mind-numbing, looking at all the ordinance templates; that he looked at South Portland and Sanford most specifically in trying to develop this; that, as he had noted, there are so many different formats that these ordinances take, framing things differently, highlighting things differently; so, he tried to put together a logical sequence that would be easy to use, easy to read, and easy to refer to. He said that, with South Portland, they have a rationale, a licensing section, and he has kind of been conceiving where these are going to fit into our code, and how; that there is, then, the performance standards that he is assuming would go into our zoning section. He added that he used 'cannabis' as the catch-all term, here, because that's the plant and marijuana is really a derivative of that; that the purpose and authority laid out the rationale for the authority at the Town and State level of where we get our ability to act. Regarding definitions, some he has a handle on and some not so much; that he was hoping that the cannabis crowd would be here this evening to lend their 'two cents' to some of these definitions. He said that he's having some difficulty distinguishing between medical marijuana versus retail marijuana; that he doesn't know if we need to be concerned about that in the zoning if we're treating all marijuana the same; that he's guessing we could treat them all the same, unless it's home use, which he has called out later in that section of the performance standards. He added that there's a non-profit medical marijuana care-giver and all sorts of other fine points and he's trying to find a way to easily, succinctly categorize these things and apply some rules and regulations to those. Regarding 'prohibited activities', etc., he

said that he hasn't filled out all of these categories, in detail, but really just broken out the headings, which include licenses required, license classes - which seem to be based on size and that will require further scrutiny, whether it is a storefront, a retail space that has X number of square feet (1,000 versus 3,000), or a grower (1,000 versus 10,000 under cultivation) and figuring out those distinctions and classes, which will have some bearing on the associated fees. He listed the rest of the topics of who would be responsible for licensing procedures and renewals and other legal inclusions required – licensing fees, applications, expiration and renewal, denials/suspensions/revocations, transferring ownership and changing locations, operating requirements, violations and penalties, appeals, severability, other laws, and effective date. He said that, under Performance Standards, that was where he tried to distinguish between home cultivation and commercial cultivation, processing and storage, and that's where he had left off in development.

Mr. Cieleuszko ask what the copyright protections are to work done by South Portland, are we liable to them, at all, or can we take their ordinance and put Eliot on it and call it good.

The Planner said that that's a legitimate question; that he assumed we could pick pieces of the ordinances that we found adequate for our purposes; that his understanding is that, at the end of this before we even put this in front of the SB, we would get a legal review.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that he was thinking regarding why do all the work; that he liked South Portland's ordinance. He clarified that there are some issues because they have a different form of government but there are sections that are fairly well done and it looks like they had attorneys, they had everyone involved in this, and that's a really complete document for them and it could be a great help to us. He said that he didn't want some attorney to tell us, when we're almost done, that we can't just use someone else's work without compensation; that he thinks that's a question that needs to be answered.

Mr. Lentz said that he assumed that we would be using Southern Maine Regional for a lot of our questions as we go through this; that, maybe, that's a legitimate question for them right off the bat.

Ms. Bennett said that her understanding is that all ordinances like this are part of the public domain; that we don't put a copyright on our own ordinances and she knows that MMA often puts forth guidance to look at different towns. She added that we copy at our own peril, too, as they could be making a mistake or may not have the overview or it just may not be the perfect fit for our community.

The Planner agreed that some was applicable and some was not, as they have a much bigger area and far greater distinctions than we would need; that he will certainly put that to Southern Maine or even MMA.

Mr. Lentz said that he thought that, at our last meeting, some of us said that South Portland was very good, and he would have no objection to using South Portland as a draft, at least, for Eliot.

Mr. Cieleszko said that, with a new eye, he finds the South Portland ordinance to be pretty well done, reiterating that they have a different form of government and that adjustments would have to be made to fit Eliot. He asked if there was a consensus on limiting the number of licenses because he knows that a couple of the towns said one only.

The Planner said that he thinks that was about dispensaries, specifically.

There was discussion on this as it applies to retail stores.

Mr. Cieleszko said that he thought that the market should be playing that game, not our ordinance; that where it can be is fine but not how many it can be; where and how close to each other, how close to other things, those are all certainly important aspects of it but the actual number of businesses is just asking for kickbacks and trouble; that there needs to be some market pressure. He added that we have to fill in a lot of blanks on what has been presented, tonight, and we just got this; that it's a great working model to start with and he is very comfortable if we can use South Portland.

Ms. Bennett agreed; that it would be good for us to flesh something out and, if there is consensus about South Portland's ordinance being one that would work in our community, then why don't we go through the process of adapting it our circumstances; then start to get some input from the AURCC (adult use retail cannabis committee) and then start the public hearing process if we're going to set a June goal.

Ms. Horner said that she was comfortable using the South Portland code as a jump-off, that she thinks it's missing some stuff.

Mr. Lentz agreed.

Ms. Horner added that she would encourage everyone to look at the ordinances from Massachusetts she sent because those are living, breathing, working ordinances and, so, they might have some things in there that any of these Maine examples don't because she feels a lot of them are geared toward the medical marijuana side, which we already have standards and ordinances for. She said that she thought working with the AURCC is the way to go. She discussed that a piece of this isn't just selling it at the store, like going into a 7-Eleven, but the businesses that can make things from the marijuana for medical marijuana stores and for retail environments. She added that the other part of this is cultivation, like growing broccoli and also selling it to the freezer food people, pizza people, etc.; that that is a whole other piece that she doesn't feel we've talked about, asking if those things would be prohibited until we figure it out or if we are literally throwing all of this together and, not that it's up to us, but you've got to think of these places as food manufacturing; that they're making candy and oils and all sorts of breads

so, it's not only retail, but also bakeries, etc. She said that it's something to think about, if we're going to allow that, because that could get a little muddy; that if we're going to allow someone to grow marijuana in Eliot for the producers that are making the oils and gummies that can then sell them recreationally, are there rules about where they can grow this outside, as an example, and she doesn't know where we fall into that.

The Planner said that he has gone at this with the thinking that cannabis is everything, so, from the seedling to the end product; the he assumes that it's all a controlled substance that we need to have regulations for and, until we do, we can't open it up.

Ms. Horner agreed, saying, in which case, our ordinance would protect us; that if someone wanted to grow 40 acres in the C/I Zone, it would be slim pickings to do that.

The Planner agreed that that was a good point.

Ms. Horner reiterated that our ordinances can protect us unless we wanted to have the conversation, and she's not saying that we should or she does, but that's a great example – is there an exception for somebody that wants to grow 40 acres of marijuana.

The Planner said that that could be potentially outside the C/I Zone.

Mr. Lentz said that he thought a lot of that depends on the definition, too; that if you look at the State definition, "*Marijuana establishment means a cultivation facility, a products manufacturing facility, a testing facility, a marijuana store or a marijuana social club licensed under this chapter.*" He added that if you look at just a marijuana store, it says, "*Marijuana store means a facility licensed under this chapter to purchase adult use marijuana, immature marijuana plants and seedlings from a cultivation facility, to purchase adult use marijuana and adult use marijuana products from a products manufacturing facility and to sell adult use marijuana, adult use marijuana products, immature marijuana plants and seedlings to consumers.*"; that if you are talking about a store, the store is buying everything; that if you're talking about an establishment, it's everything.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that last time we talked a little about 'vertical analysis and tracking' of a product from seed to sale and, with that, we might need some differentiation between the four aspects; that one, social clubs, he thinks is banned, and we might have to separate our definitions in our ordinance for cultivation, using South Portland, who split cultivation and production and sales; that regarding businesses, might we control whether one business can do part of it or can one business do all of it; that that would be part of our responsibilities to the ordinance.

Mr. Lentz said that Mr. Cieleuszko brought up one good thing that he had questioned regarding a social club, and we don't think that's there, should that be under prohibition, as a statement, to say it would be prohibited.

Mr. Cieleuszko said yes, because it's defined in the State law; that it sounds like it's within our rights to opt in to retail marijuana and medical marijuana but we can also, while opting in, ban social clubs; that that runs across all the rules that we've seen from Sanford to South Portland and even in Massachusetts.

The Planner said that that was a question he has, as well, in whether the Town wants certain aspects of marijuana establishments – just retail, no cultivation, or no processing but cultivation and retail; that he doesn't know if the Town has the authority to pick-and-choose.

Mr. Lentz asked if that meant there would be a specific permit issued by the Town for each one of those.

The Planner said that that was the way he was going at this; that there were specific licenses for the type of activity at the particular scale you want to do it; that that may be another question for MMA. He added that he assumed they can craft however they want; that they can set up their zoning and licensing however they wish.

Mr. Lentz said that he would imagine that, under Home Rule, as long as it is more restrictive than the State, he thinks we're okay to do that, from what he's read.

Ms. Horner said that she thinks the tier system that South Portland has makes a lot of sense; that it's also a way to restrict things because we can make the ordinance more adaptable to each tier. She added that she also read something along the lines of, and something she likes, Eliot residents needed to be an owner or involved with an aspect of the business; that that was really great because that was a way to keep out what they don't want, like these huge, established companies from other parts of the country coming in with their money and basically blast people out of the water; that she doesn't know if that's legal but, if that is allowed, something like a residency rule.

Mr. Lentz asked Mr. Snyder how he felt about using South Portland.

Mr. Casey said that he thought it would be very helpful to have a template to work off of. He asked if, regarding the residency rule, is that above-and-beyond the two-year residency clause that's built in to a lot of these things or is that the clause the Planner is referring to.

The Planner said that it could be; that he can't remember the wording, exactly, as it's been a while since he has read that section.

Mr. Snyder said that he thinks South Portland has a great blueprint to operate from; that he thinks looking at Massachusetts would also be helpful. He added that, regarding the differentiation of cultivation, storefront, establishment, he thinks it might have been brought up before about what the cost benefit analysis is of each, how might the Town benefit and how may it not. He asked what revenue the Town might receive, if any, from various elements of this process; that these are all questions that would be helpful in

terms of better understanding what Eliot may be subject to as it relates to additional expenses that may stem from the legalization of marijuana.

The Planner said that he has reached out to the Fire Chief and Police Chief to get their feedback on those kinds of impacts.

Ms. Horner said that she thinks it was in the Northampton ordinance that they were charging the people a percentage of their sales every year to cover that; that it was like a community give-back program, such as holding educational classes.

Ms. Bennett said that she didn't think municipalities could levy a sales tax.

Ms. Horner said that it's an impact fee and that can be done. She added that, regarding traffic, we would need our police officers out there handling traffic for them then they should be paying for that; that then, if our police officer is busy so we might need another officer to be hired, in which case that's an impact fee to our Town because it's not okay, to her, for a private business to take away from the taxpayers.

The Planner said that that was kind of like a host community agreement; that he had read that and subsequently read something to the effect that you can't charge a fee that's an unreasonable cost to them and not tied to some specific impact; that there is some wiggle room to the degree of how you define those impacts.

Ms. Horner said exactly; that she thinks the police officer example is very reasonable. She added that she has heard that, if you don't opt in as a town, you don't get the tax share; that if you do, then it gets split among all the towns that opted in.

Ms. Bennett agreed that there would be a pooling of the State license fees.

Ms. Horner asked if we knew what those numbers are, yet.

Mr. Snyder said that there are numbers imbedded in all these things but the question will be which town approves what in terms of to what extent, asking if we need to approve all three tiers if we opt in or just one or two; does that differentiate what kind of revenues we might be part of with the sharing agreement; that the tax rate differs based on the level or tier of this process – size and distribution.

Mr. Lentz said these are good questions, good conversation. He added that he wanted to go back to the beginning and asked what we are trying to accomplish here; that if we are looking at South Portland, they are talking about marijuana establishments; that some of these others have different titles and the Planner has chosen to call it cannabis. He asked if it's all of that if we're trying to regulate or control; that he's not sure what the right word is. He added that the State is calling it Adult-Use Marijuana, period, so he is confused, he thinks – what are we trying to regulate.

The Planner said that he found that somewhat confusing, as well, which is why, if you talk about adult-use, does that mean medical or does that just mean for recreational adult-use. He added that he was trying to work back from the broadest umbrella and, then, narrow it down so there is a logical progression and you can understand how you got there. He said that he was assuming that we would be controlling anything cannabis, whether it was industrial hemp or marijuana.

Mr. Lentz said that he wasn't disagreeing; that he doesn't know the answer and he is struggling with it.

Ms. Bennett said that she appreciated going broad but she thinks that may be going into uncharted territory within the State of Maine, at this point; that she thinks the State has gotten so far addressing marijuana and it hasn't...as we've seen in other states, they are beginning to look at hemp, even though it's part of cannabis.

Mr. Lentz commented that there are a lot of tentacles to this.

Ms. Bennett said yes; that this could have some unexpected consequences when we start to define cannabis in advance of any definitions at the State level; that being the umbrella of hemp, CBD, and other things that maybe, at this time, we should just stick to marijuana.

Mr. Lentz said keeping adult-use marijuana.

Ms. Bennett said exactly; that we already have medical marijuana established in our ordinance, suggesting they tackle this piece of the adult-use and, as we expect, we will probably be talking about hemp and CBD, as well, and maybe that's when we start to make a broader cannabis...

Mr. Lentz suggested going a bit further, asking if we are going to talk adult-use marijuana, are we going to talk marijuana establishment as the State defines it, which is the whole, or is it that retail marijuana store and elimination of social clubs; that that kind of narrows the framework down a little bit.

Mr. (Robert) Pomerleau said that social clubs are prohibited by State law; that it's not part of the marijuana law.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that, regarding that question, he thinks just saying retail store is not enough; that he thinks a goal is tackling the three that are left, which are cultivation, manufacturing (processing), and selling, and whether it's all in one place or separate entities. He added that he thinks South Portland does a fairly good job at that. He added that, in looking at Sanford, Sanford has a lot of holes; that South Portland is tight and he thinks if we adjust it to our form of government and make the changes necessary for our Town, we'd be good using that as a framework; and their premise – use every bit of their definitions and their frame, would all be backed up by statute and that's a good start right

there. He said that they don't use cannabis and, so, he agrees we should drop the word cannabis.

Mr. Lentz said that Mr. Cieleuszko has a proposal and asked if we can all agree with that, for the time being, that we sue the South Portland in its entirety (template) and whittle it down from there.

Mr. Cieleuszko agreed as long as the question of whether we can, or not, is answered quickly.

The PB **agreed by consensus** to use the South Portland ordinance(s) as a template for Eliot.

Ms. Bennett said that we had other conversations that were good, here, as far as impact fees, tiered fees, understanding how this will play out with the State, asking if that is something that the AURCC (cannabis committee) could research and give answers to the PB about.

Mr. (Brigham) Pendleton, AURCC member, said that we could explore that.

Ms. Bennett said that if the committee, looking at this sort of single issue, could help to educate us about that; that we will obviously be having a number of conversations about it but it would be great if the AURCC could track this and, then, make recommendations to us.

Ms. Horner said that, until it's State law, we can put anything in our ordinance; so, it might be good to just throw it all at the wall, so-to-speak, until the State says no and, then, just take it out.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked, regarding June, is that when the State law comes into effect.

Mr. Lentz clarified that that's the target to get it on the June ballot for the voters.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that that requires it to be done (including public hearings) and written by March.

Mr. Lentz agreed.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that he would like to give that a shot and come back at the next workshop with something on paper using South Portland as a template.

Mr. Lentz said that we can ask the Planner to do that for the next workshop and, in the meantime, if PB members haven't read through the State law, he suggested they do that; that it answers some of those questions we had tonight. He added that how we pull those questions into what we're going to do with South Portland is going to be kind of the trick, he thinks. He reiterated that Title 28-B (State law) is a pretty good document to read.



Ms. Horner said that she feels like that should just be our ordinance; take away medical marijuana dispensaries and just say performance standards for adult-use marijuana.

Mr. Lentz said that he thinks that will come as we go through that document.

Mr. Pendleton said that the adult-use marijuana, he believes, is the State language and the reason it is their language, if he's not mistaken, is because their umbrella is big; that they're talking personal use, growing, etc.; so, when they're talking adult-use, they're talking the entire spectrum of retail. He added that our focus, if he's not mistaken, is just on the vertical having to do with recreational.

Mr. Lentz asked if establishments would be where Mr. Pendleton thought we should be.

Mr. Pendleton said that it would just be that vertical of recreational because he thinks medical is pretty well established and we already have medical facilities producing and distributing; that he thinks the terminology should stay with recreational, not adult-use, because adult-use is broader.

The Planner asked if we would run into a problem in trying to craft zoning, as doesn't the zoning need to capture the medical as well as the recreational.

Mr. Lentz said that we pretty much have medical in the zoning; that we may want to consider something else.

Mr. Pendleton said that you may already have something from zoning for the growth and manufacturing of that that you might be able to leverage for recreational growth and manufacturing.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked when we could get a copy of the final version of the State law.

Mr. Lentz said that the final version is due in the summer of 2019.

After discussion, Mr. Cieleuszko asked for a copy of the final bill that the State is working with (LD1539).

The Planner said that he will ask the MMA; that their sheet, here, does say that the State licensing of adult-use marijuana won't begin until at least the summer of 2019.

Mr. Snyder asked when we were meeting with the AURCC.

It was agreed that that meeting would be January 8, 2019.

Mr. Snyder asked what we want to make sure we get accomplished in that discussion and what we walk away from that meeting with so that we're better equipped to move forward with our next steps.

Mr. Lentz said that he thinks, if the Planner can get a decent draft of what we said we were going to use; that, perhaps, that's what we would want to share with them, at that point.

Mr. Pendleton said that he had that you were discussing the questions about whether, or not, you can opt-in and define within your own ordinance what pieces and parts of the businesses interested in allowing in the Town; and, then, how that might impact some of the cost structures and what kind of tax share that could possibly capture. He added that they will take a look at host agreements.

Mr. Pomerleau said, regarding the residency issue, the State law requires residency in the town where you are home cultivating. He added that he believed the State was moving toward some sort of Maine affiliation; that that will be part of what the State will do in their licensing requirements and nothing that this Board will have any impact on. He said that, the way he reads this, the State will license all retail aspects of retail marijuana to include cultivation, manufacturing, testing and, then, the municipality may regulate each and every aspect of that as they choose to do so. He added that he believes you could exclude manufacturing; that you can certainly limit the number of retail outlets. He reminded the PB that the advisory vote for the Town asked them if they would approve retail marijuana if limited; that if you go down a direction going against the question you asked them, he thinks the PB will get a lot of negativity. He added that he doesn't think the Town will be supportive of the 'wild, wild west' of retail marijuana shops out there and will want to see some limits.

Discussion regarding the straw question including retail being limited to the C/I Zone and limiting the number, as well.

Ms. Horner said that distance limitations, etc. will limit the number and location of stores, anyway.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked that any information/input be submitted early enough for the PB members to read and absorb ahead of the next meeting.

## **ITEM 6 – NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Stormwater Awareness Review**

The Planner said that this is just a regular update for anyone to make sure, be they old or new in the various capacities, that they are aware of the regulations.

### **B. Planning Board Submission Deadlines for 2019**

The Planner said that we have not updated that, yet; that the reason this came into question was not the deadlines but the wording, in that it led applicants to believe that, if they submitted in this timetable, they would necessarily be heard and we didn't want that to be the impression. He added that, once the application is submitted, it needs to be

vetted and, once it's approved, it has to meet minimum guidelines, but it's the next available hearing that it would be scheduled for. He reiterated that it just needs to be tweaked a little bit so that it is a more accurate reflection and doesn't give unrealistic expectations. He said that he will bring it back with a change in wording.

Mr. Ciesleszko suggested it could reference the completed checklist, which could be the demarcation point for when an application is scheduled.

Mr. Lentz said that he and the Planner have had that conversation a few times regarding what is a sketch plan, what is a site plan, why do we have a sketch plan, how do the two tie together, when is it ready to come in to the PB, or how much of it is complete; that he thinks we have a pretty good understanding.

The Planner agreed; that as he was giving that further thought today, if everything is prepared and ready, a sketch plan (if not a complicated job) could be heard and a decision rendered that evening. He added that his experience with sketch plans is that it is an opportunity for an unusual project or something that's going to require lengthy deliberation and don't necessarily have a complete application; that they don't typically have all those answers and don't want to even invest that much until they get some preliminary feedback to see if it is a worthwhile or feasible project.

Mr. Lentz said that, to him, there is a checklist and that checklist is based on the ordinance; that there's a point in that checklist when the majority has been answered and the documentation is in a packet, and that's the time it should come to the PB; that he wants the information here for the PB so they can deliberate and ask their questions.

Mr. Ciesleszko said that he thinks, in general, Mr. Lentz summed it up; that he likes it. He added that, with the sketch plan, on a simple project, it would be money-saving for the applicant and it would be within our bounds to not force someone to spend the bank on a little shed or something that shouldn't cost as much as we are trying to make it cost. He added that the site plan ends up being the finished, okay'd sketch plan, the next phase.

Ms. Bennett said that she recalls having a conversation with Ms. Prescott about this; that she chaffed at having a sketch plan then site plan, as this seemed unwieldy for the applicant; that in Ms. Prescott's experience, the sketch plan process was conducted by the Planner and applicant. She agreed with Mr. Ciesleszko in his description of a simple project, having the Planner work with the applicant and come to the PB with a sketch plan that is essentially a site plan, using the checklist, then we could probably go through it in one night.

Mr. Ciesleszko agreed; that he thinks that has worked well in the past and the only time we've been messed up is when we were presented an incomplete package; that he saw the frustration in the audience when we were presented a 'napkin' plan without being told it was a 'napkin' plan. He added that, if we handle it as it was just described, it would work, and has worked.

The Planner asked if the site plan was a must for every projector would that be for a more troublesome or complicated project.

Mr. Lentz said that is when you start to talk about those more difficult projects and you can't visualize, even looking at a drawing, what they are really saying – elevations, boundaries, that kind of stuff, and the public asks questions that raise more questions a site walk would clarify; that he thinks it's critical for a lot of them.

Ms. Lemire reminded the PB of the application that basically had two different site plans choices.

The PB agreed that they didn't want to see that kind of thing.

Ms. Horner said that she didn't mind the sketch plan because interpretation of our ordinances is different, even by the architects that do it all the time and, so, she thinks it's okay to throw us under the bus; that all of us working together to try to figure something out for the applicant is going to be a lot easier to swallow than hearing it from the Planner.

Mr. Lentz added that one size doesn't fit all and you have to use your head a little bit.

Ms. Horner said that she would prefer to see applications that use engineers more fully complete before they come to the PB.

#### **ITEM 7 – REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES**

**Mr. Cieleuszko moved, second by Mr. Snyder, to approve the minutes of December 4, 2018, as amended.**

**VOTE**

**5-0**

**Motion approved**

#### **Notice of Decision for PB18-12**

Mr. Lentz discussed having a little different process for this one as it bounced around a bit; that we had a change that Ms. Lemire sent to the Planner; that we thought it wouldn't be a bad thing to have the Planner see it before it comes to the PB; that Ms. Lemire agreed to send them to the Planner and then the Planner can approve and bring them in here.

Ms. Lemire said that she just wanted to make sure, especially with complicated applications, that the PB has enough time to review Decision letters; that we're working hard to get these approved at the following meeting.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if this regarded the shed that Unit #1 wanted that was added.

Ms. Lemire said yes; that it showed up in the final site plan.

The Planner said that the tricky thing is, and what Ms. Lemire pointed out, is that it wasn't read into the meeting through discussion; that he had discussed it with Civil Consultants and because it wasn't a large addition and didn't affect the site plan, he didn't think it warranted further discussion so he didn't bring it up at the meeting, but it's a matter of process.

Mr. Cieleszko said that there is no change and we are accepting it because they are being held to that final plan and it happened to have that building on it that we didn't discuss.

The Planner said that that's correct.

Mr. Cieleszko said that he was comfortable with that.

Ms. Lemire suggested having applicable prior case numbers included for future applications similar to this.

**Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Ms. Horner, that the Planning Board accept PB18-12, approved December 4, 2018, as written.**

**VOTE**

**5-0**

**Motion approved**

## **ITEM 8 – CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

## **ITEM 9 – UPDATES**

## **ITEM 10 – SET AGENDA AND DATE FOR NEXT MEETING**

There was discussion to clarify the agenda being for January 8 (not January 1) and January 15; that the first one would be a regular workshop meeting and the second meeting would be to hear applications.

Ms. Horner asked if we could do the minutes first at the January 8 meeting so that we can focus on the workshop discussion.

The PB agreed to make an exception for the January 8 meeting.

The next regular Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for January 8, 2019 at 7PM.

**ITEM 11 – ADJOURN**

There was a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting at 8:29 PM.



**Dennis Lentz, Chair**

**Date approved:** 1/8/2019

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary**