

**ITEM 1 - ROLL CALL**

Present: Dennis Lentz - Chairman, Ed Cieleuszko, Christine Bennett, Carmela Braun, and Casey Snyder – Alternate.

Also Present: Abbie Sherwin, Interim Planner.

Absent: Melissa Horner (excused), (excused), Bill Olsen – Alternate (excused).

Voting members: Dennis Lentz, Ed Cieleuszko, Christine Bennett, Carmela Braun, and Casey Snyder – Alternate.

**ITEM 2 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ITEM 3 – MOMENT OF SILENCE**

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

There was no public input.

**ITEM 5 – REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES**

Mr. Cieleuszko moved, second by Ms. Braun, to approve the minutes of May 7, 2019, as amended.

**VOTE**

**4-1**

**Motion approved**

**ITEM 6 – OLD BUSINESS**

**A. 291 Harold L. Dow Highway (Map 37, Lot 2-1) PB19-6: Site Plan Review – An application to request a Change of Use from Cold Storage to Non-profit Medical Marijuana Dispensary. The applicant is proposing to convert the rear Storage Building to a Medical Marijuana Cultivation and Processing Facility. Applicant is Alex Ross (Mailing address: 291 Harold L. Dow Highway, Eliot, ME 03903). Property is located in the Commercial/Industrial District.**

**Received: April 10, 2019**

**1<sup>st</sup> Heard: April 16, 2019**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Hearing: May 21, 2019**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Hearing: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Public Hearing: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Site Walk: \_\_\_\_\_**

**Approval: \_\_\_\_\_, 2019**

Mr. (Ken) Wood, Attar Engineering, the applicants, Mr. (Dana) Brearley and Mr. (James) Folan, and Mr. (Peter) Paul, property owner, were present for this application.

Mr. Wood clarified that he did change the application today, changing the name of the engineering firm from Ross Engineering, who had submitted the application, to Attar Engineering; that after your initial visit with Mr. Ross, we are handling the project now. He said that he would give a summary of the application and then would ask that, hopefully, the PB would find the application complete, schedule a Site Walk and the Public Hearing. He said that this is a building on the Northern Pool & Spa property:

- 5,000 square-foot warehouse building at the back
- In the C/I District, with small portions in the Limited Commercial District.
- Not proposing any change in impervious area
- Site Plan shows back warehouse – Building #2
- Security fence – perimeter
- Sufficient parking – annotated, paved out front, gravel out back
- Wastewater system has adequate capacity
- Adequate water supply
- No issue with the Fire Chief's comments
- No change in drainage
- Lot coverage is at 10.7%

He added that we approached this as we did with the National Wrecker application – an amendment to an approved Site Plan, and we included the past approval in the application. He said that this is the first time we've done this kind of application so he has spent a lot of time with the applicants and he thinks they have their stuff together; that they certainly know what they're doing, they have the process down, they have the odor control system down, which the summarized in the application. He added that he has submitted the lease and the applicant's caregiver cards.

Mr. Lentz confirmed that Mr. Wood had a new letter, too; that you went from the 7 to the 13.

Mr. Wood agreed, saying that Mr. Brearley can explain that in greater detail, if you like; that it had to do with the term 'dispensary' in our definition.

Mr. Lentz said that that was one of the PB's questions.

Mr. Brearley said that, similar to applications from Mr. Pope and Mr. Shaw, in the Land Use Table we have the option for non-profit dispensaries; that years ago the State released a certain amount of licensing for non-profit dispensaries and that is actually a separate entity from the caregiver model. He explained that, similar to Mr. Pope, we are caregivers; that the only box that was cannabis-related was the non-profit cannabis dispensary; that we are caregivers asking to cultivate and process on the particular property.

Ms. Braun asked if they were licensed by the State.

Mr. Brearley said yes; that copies of their licenses is what Mr. Wood submitted.

Mr. Wood said that the difference between their operation and the dispensary is that the public doesn't come to them, they deliver their products.

Mr. Brearley said yes; that caregiver law currently requires that you have to, unless you have a dispensing location like Mr. Pope, deliver to the patients that need the product; that when they get an order from a patient, they package and it deliver it to that patient; that the patients don't come to them.

Ms. Braun asked if patients had to show them a prescription from a medical doctor.

Mr. Brearley said yes, explain that what happens is a person sees a medical doctor, they have to fall within a certain requirement by Maine's medical standard to qualify to be a patient, and we would act as a pharmacy except it's a pharmacy that has to deliver.

Mr. Wood said that he thought, by the definition, they are actually dispensing but they are supplying the product to their patients; that it's not just on-site.

Mr. Brearley said that State Caregiver Law mandates that we must deliver the product unless we have an approved dispensary by the local municipality.

Ms. Braun asked if there was any sort of security when they are delivering the product to prevent robbery, etc.

Mr. Brearley said that he hasn't heard of any robbery cases in the State of Maine, yet. He added that, regarding safety, we don't carry much product or much cash.

Ms. Braun asked what kind of insurance they had.

Mr. Brearley said that we will have general liability; that he would give the PB a copy of that.

Mr. Wood added that a lot of the insurance requirements are spelled out in the lease.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if their licenses were limited to a certain number of patients.

Mr. Brearley said that it used to be; that as of December 13<sup>th</sup> the caregiver laws changed to purchasing licenses on a plant count and, then, you can satisfy however many patients your number of plants can do.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if that was based on the plant canopy or plant number.

Mr. Brearley said it was the plant number currently; that there has been a rumor that it will change to canopy at some point but he personally doesn't think that will happen.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if the shop the applicants envision, here, meets the requirements of the license.

Mr. Brearley said that that was correct.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if there was room for business growth in that facility or are you tapping it out.

Mr. Brearley said that, with what he and Mr. Folan designed, it is currently at capacity.

Mr. Folan said that the change to plant amount will allow us to utilize a lot more surface; that potentially, as far as expansion goes, we'll just have higher yields of product, with a much larger number of plants; that your surface area grows with the change of canopy.

Mr. Lentz asked them to talk about security a little bit.

Mr. Brearley said that we'll have a fully-integrated camera system, floodlights outside the building or spotlights, something that won't be intrusive to neighboring parcels; that there will be the fence that the Police and Fire Departments will be able to unlock.

Mr. Lentz said that the compound is fenced in its entirety.

Mr. Brearley said yes, and gated.

Mr. Wood said that it's shown on the Site Plan, with a knox box. He added that, years ago, we did a similar, larger facility in York before York adopted an ordinance; that he believes this facility has at least equal, if not more, security plus enhanced odor controls compared to the York facility.

Mr. Lentz asked about the septic system.

Mr. Wood said that the septic system is for up to 30 employees (HHE-200 Form submission); so, between the Northern Pool & Spa employees and the applicant's employees, there aren't 30 employees. He added that, right now, we have proposed a separate septic tank (1,000 gal) and pump to the existing field; that they may opt to put in their own field but, right now, there is sufficient capacity.

Ms. Bennett asked if that was for both the employees and the operation.

Mr. Wood said yes.

Mr. Lentz asked what goes into the building and what comes out.

Mr. Folan said that we will start out with seeds, grow them, then harvest cannabis in the building; that we will be removing that dry cannabis product from the building, as well as processed materials.

Mr. Lentz asked about waste.

Mr. Brearley said that there will be very little.

Mr. Folan said that we will also have grow medium, soils, etc., which we recycle everywhere we can; that as far as waste goes, if we do end up having excess waste in terms of weed matter we have a plan to combine, 50/50, with inert material and, up to that point, by all waste standards that is considered regular waste. He added that what also applies for that inert material is food waste so we are looking into ways of working with that and figure out if we can reuse that waste; but, minimal at best.

Ms. Bennett asked if they could demonstrate where the dumpster is and whether it will be locked.

Mr. Wood pointed to the existing dumpster on the Site Plan.

Ms. Bennett said that she would have to check the code but she believes that has to be within the fenced perimeter of the facility and have that be locked.

Mr. Wood said that, in that case, we will add a dumpster.

Ms. Bennett said that we have a memo from the Interim Planner discussing visible screening from the public, asking if that fence will be impervious or can you see through that fence.

Mr. Wood said that right now it's just designed as a regular chain-link fence.

Ms. Bennett asked if the public driving down Route 236 will be able to see the facility.

Mr. Wood said that, if you look at the photographs in the application, that's what you see; that the photos show the street seen and the rear building. He added that he thought that Ms. Sherwin's comment might have been in relation to additional screening that might be needed in the front yard setback from Route 236.

Ms. Sherwin agreed.

Ms. Bennett asked for the whole parcel and not just for this intended use for the back portion.

Mr. Wood said that he didn't think it was a requirement when Mr. Paul received his site plan approval; that we can certainly put some supplemental plantings there. He added that, if you look at those photographs, the rear building doesn't have a lot of visibility from Route 236 because most of it is shielded by Mr. Paul's current building.

Ms. Bennett asked if they could describe their odor control mechanisms.

Mr. Folan said that we will use granulated carbon canisters; that we will have four in each corner of the room, which will turn over the air in the room anywhere from five to ten times per minute, which is almost the standard of hospitals. He added that it will also be sealed so it will be hard to have odors outside.

Mr. Lentz said that he hoped certainly none beyond the lot lines.

Mr. Folan agreed.

Mr. Lentz asked about signage.

Mr. Wood said that we have proposed a sign board based on Article 10 of the ordinance because, now, there will be two businesses on-site; that the ordinance allows two different signs if they are less than 100 square feet, he believes.

Mr. Lentz said that he read that would be no descriptive of any type that would lend somebody to know that that's a marijuana facility, asking the applicant to take that into consideration.

The applicant agreed.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked about the amount of traffic that would be coming into and out of the facility.

Mr. Folan said that one of the ways we cultivate is through genetic cloning, explaining how they did that; that we start with seeds (hand-carried) and, at that point, no plants would be coming in or going out of that facility.

Mr. Wood said that he addressed traffic in the cover letter; that we have 48 trip ends per day on two shifts and an additional six delivery trips; that on Route 236, by the 2016 and 2013 MDOT Count 17,000 vehicles per day, he doesn't think the additional 54 trips per day entering and leaving Route 236, versus 17,000 vehicles per day is going to be detrimental.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if that was Mr. Wood's assumption or is it actually within some bounds of the highway department that 54 trips is not going to be bothersome.

Mr. Wood said that you can certainly run it by the DPW Director but he's pretty sure, with 32 years of practice, that putting 54 trip ends per day added to a road of 17,000 vehicle per day isn't a lot. He added that, if we are talking about MDOT standards, his first threshold would be 100 PCE's (passenger car equivalents), which is 100 trips per hour; that these are 54 trips per day. He also said that there is no change in the entrance and the applicant doesn't come anywhere near any threshold for requiring an MDOT Traffic Movement Permit.

Mr. Lentz confirmed that they saw the Fire Chief comments.

Mr. Wood said that they did; that Ms. Sherwin was kind enough to send it over and we have no issues with the Fire Chief's comments; that we will resolve then with the Fire Chief and will send him a revised plan on access to the front entrance and we'll hopefully have an approval comment from the Fire Chief prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Lentz said that there were a couple of requested waivers, asking if the PB wanted to discuss those now. He added that the justification for the Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan is that the "existing site is stable regarding erosion and sediment control and no new disturbance is proposed."

**Ms. Bennett moved, second by Mr. Cieleszko, that the Planning Board, in considering PB19-6, waive §33-127(11) Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.**

**VOTE**

**5-0**

**Motion approved**

**Ms. Bennett moved, second by Mr. Cieleszko, that the Planning Board, in considering PB19-6, waive §33-127(12) High-intensity Soils Report.**

**VOTE**

**5-0**

**Motion approved**

The PB scheduled a Site Walk for June 4 at 4PM.

Mr. Lentz asked how the PB found the site plan.

**Ms. Bennett moved, second by Mr. Cieleszko, that the Planning Board consider the Site Plan for PB19-6 complete.**

#### DISCUSSION

Ms. Bennett said that we are waiting for some revisions from the Fire Chief memo.

Mr. Cieleszko said that we are not going to see that in the Site Plan because the applicant is meeting rules from the Fire Department, not necessarily our ordinances; that as long as we have the specification that the applicant has to meet the standards, as the Fire Chief explains them, that is between the Fire Chief and the applicant.

Ms. Bennett said that it will affect the Site Plan.

Mr. Lentz said that the applicant won't get a building permit until he's met those application requirements.

Ms. Bennett said that we can give the applicant the nod that we see that this complies with the ordinance, per se, but the Fire Chief has asked for some modifications to the Site Plan.

Mr. Wood suggested that the PB find the application complete and the Site Plan meets the intent of the ordinance but you're really not approving the Site Plan; that he assumes the PB will approve the Site Plan after the Public Hearing; that by that time we would have those changes to the PB.

DISCUSSION ENDED

Ms. Bennet modified her motion

**Ms. Bennett moved, second by Mr. Cieleuszko, that the Planning Board consider the Site Plan for PB19-6 complete, as submitted this evening.**

**VOTE**

**5-0**

**Motion approved**

The PB scheduled a Public Hearing for June 18.

NOTE: Mr. Cieleuszko said that he will be getting back on the 18<sup>th</sup>, so he may not be present that night.

### **B. Adult Use Marijuana Ordinance Revisions**

Mr. Cieleuszko said that he really liked, from the Cannabis Committee, the add-on section to the licensing sign-off; that it was the kind of indemnity that he wanted the Town to have in regard to this.

Discussion regarding the definition of 'Public Facility'.

Mr. Lentz said it is controversial.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that that's the part, when that gentleman was talking about not using that rule because it would negate any businesses ever starting.

Mr. Lentz said that he talked with people and, clearly, the intent when they did that was for public places such as ball fields and parks, not roads.

Mr. Cieleuszko read the definition (§1.2 Definitions): "Public facility means any facility, including, but not limited to, buildings, property, recreation areas, and roads, which are owned, leased, or otherwise operated, or funded by a governmental body or public entity."



Mr. Lentz said that, with that definition, on Route 236 there is absolutely no place that a retail store could operate.

Mr. Cieleuszko said yes, according to that definition. He added that he looks at it as that it is sort of urgent that we get that addressed as a definition in our next ordinance amendments.

Mr. Lentz agreed.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that it was ill-conceived when written. He suggested that maybe they meant driveway, and he could handle that, a driveway to a public facility like lot lines to a public facility but including all roads is just incredible. He added that there is no reason to have 'public facility' defined that way.

Ms. Bennett said that we could consider excluding 'roads' from 'public facility'.

Mr. Lentz said that, if you Google it, all those definitions, to include 'roads', are all over Google.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that this is our ordinance.

Mr. Lentz asked if we should change the ordinance or the definition.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that he thinks the intent is to protect places of public interest from whatever these businesses are classified as, though they aren't classified yet; that it's a unique business model that everybody's come under the impression that we have to protect town halls, the dump, every town facility where families go or people and kids can go, parks, and things like that. He said that he doesn't believe it was ever meant to be near a road, stopping it near a road.

Mr. Lentz asked what constraints were used in the ordinance around strip clubs, nude facilities.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that it was the same constraints and the same lack of looking carefully at the ordinance.

Mr. Lentz said that 'public facility' is there, too.

Mr. Cieleuszko said yes.

Ms. Bennett said that she was looking at our ordinances where 'public facility' occurs and exempts 'public facilities' that are inconsistent with the application of our code. She added that it also names 'public ways' when it comes to any road; that maybe we could put some clarity in our definition that says it's a 'public facility' but not a 'public way' – does not include a 'public way'. She said that she understood the intent to these in that there may be members of the public who do not want to have to go by, or come within

proximity to, a marijuana facility, for whatever reason; that that's their prerogative and we should allow them to be able to enjoy public property, if this is offensive to them in some way, shape, or form. She said that 'public facility', to her mind, meant a structure or property and 'public way' means a road.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that he can see this being fixed by just removing "and roads"; that when you include roads, you're covered with "which are owned, leased, or otherwise operated, or funded by a governmental body or public entity.", which includes every street in Eliot and that is a killer. He added that if you leave off 'roads', it gives the protection intended, he believes.

Ms. Sherwin asked if the PB was discussing modifying the definition as it appears in §1 of the entire set of ordinances or just as it appears in the proposed marijuana establishments ordinance.

Mr. Lentz said that he thought it should be both; that §33-189 does have 'public facility' and when we did the "retail", he thinks we just copied that over.

Ms. Sherwin said that she would be in full support of changing the definition to eliminate the term 'roads' in the marijuana ordinance but she would caution against doing it in the general definition because there might be implications for that term for other ordinances for the Town.

Mr. Lentz asked for clarification.

Ms. Sherwin said that, similarly to what Ms. Bennett was saying, something about how 'public facilities' don't necessarily be maintained to the same standards that other facilities would; so, there's an implication there that anything that's owned and operated by the Town doesn't necessarily have to meet the same standards as a private facility. She added that, by eliminating 'roads' from the general definition that applies to all of the Town's ordinances, then there might be some unintended fallout from that.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that that was a good point.

The PB agreed.

Mr. Lentz asked if we wanted to change 'and roads' in the retail definition.

It was agreed that they could change that in this draft ordinance without it affecting the timing for possible approval of this proposed ordinance.

Mr. Cieleuszko suggested that the definition in the medical marijuana ordinance has to be changed, asking if they are currently using §1.2.

Ms. Sherwin said that there is no separate definition in that section.

Mr. Lentz asked if the PB was in favor of eliminating 'and roads' in this draft.

Ms. Bennett said that what she thinks we're doing is changing §33-189 (c): "A dispensary or registered primary caregiver facility may not be located within 500 feet of the property line of an existing public or private school, residential property, childcare facility, place of worship or public facility.". She asked if we wanted to wordsmith that now, suggesting adding 'excepting public ways' or 'not to mean public ways'.

Mr. Lentz said that it works but it's clunky.

Ms. Bennett agreed. She suggested 'any public facility except public ways'.

The PB agreed.

Mr. Lentz said that he has all the changes that Selectman Murphy sent.

Ms. Goodwin made copies for the rest of the PB and agreed to update the draft with Mr. Murphy's changes for the PB to review.

Mr. Lentz asked to discuss the **Cannabis Committee Key Findings** document.

Mr. Ciesleszko said that, on the last page in the licensing, they recommended language (indemnity clause) making sure the Town wasn't liable for any damage, or anything, because of the license; that if federal or State law changes, the Town can't be held responsible for helping them get their business together; that it was a nicely-written article.

#### **#1 – cultivation in other than C/I Zones.**

In prior discussion, there was no talk about outdoor growing in allowing in other areas but growing all indoors (greenhouses).

Mr. Ciesleszko said that he doesn't like it, still, because he would like to see a couple of these businesses up-and-running and no odors.

Ms. Braun agreed.

Mr. Lentz said okay.

#### **#2 market will self-regulate number of recreational storefronts**

Mr. Ciesleszko said that he thinks that's just saying that they like the way we have it written right now to have no caps and let the market work it out.

Mr. Lentz said that he doesn't have any thoughts about changing what we wrote.

Mr. Cieleuszko said no; that he thinks we've hashed that out.

**#3 – without State-sharing revenues, allowance of recreational stores will cost the Town money.**

Mr. Lentz said yes and no.

Ms. Bennett said that she thinks that's speculative because we don't know yet whether it's going to cost the Town more for this type of store.

**#4 – consideration for allowing delivery of recreational cannabis.**

Ms. Braun said that she disagreed with this; that she doesn't think this is a good idea, at all. She explained that you would be taking it right to the person, and supposing that person is already beyond, isn't that just adding to it, which could cause another issue. She said that, if you do deliver, what happens around security; that someone getting it that's not supposed to get it is pretty high on her list.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that he agreed with Ms. Braun wholeheartedly; that the storefront is the bar, sort of; that you have to look at that person and know he's not inebriated and, with somebody in their house, their reasoning that they might smoke it on the way home doesn't bode well, at all, for the safety of this product. He added that he didn't even want to envision that and, if that's the problem, then he's voting against it.

The PB agreed that they did not like this one.

**#5 – local application process done like a new liquor license.**

This is something that the PB recommended, as well.

**#6 – same umbrella of rules for all tiers of applicants seems unfair to smaller growers.**

Ms. Braun asked why we would have different sets of rules.

Mr. Lentz said that the State regulates the rules based on the amount of stuff one is growing; that there are tiers of growth.

The PB agreed that they said that there is only one tier.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that we capped capacity of our Town at the smaller level; that it is one set of rules for that cap.

The PB agreed they liked the lower level; that they could always raise it.

**#7 – not recommend "lottery" type selection system; should be merit-based.**

Ms. Braun asked what they meant by that.

Mr. Cieleszko said that it has to do with which application gets through but he wasn't sure where that came from, explaining that, if there are five licenses, have everybody put their applications in a hat and we'll draw to see who gets it out of the hundred people who have applied. He added that this is talking about growth, a wait line; that if there's a wait line, it should be merit-based explaining that, if we had a cap on licenses, then we should have that cap doled out by merit of the company instead of just a lottery where we pick a number. He said that it doesn't have any bearing on the way we do business, here; that we look on each one individually and whoever puts in the application first gets their shot. He said that he's heard this before and businesses are sometimes developed this way, in a lottery system; but, it's not part of our rules, it's not envisioned in our proposed ordinance, and it's a moot point by the Cannabis Committee.

**#8 – local fees based on true cost of license; concern for black market impact.**

Ms. Bennett said that she thought this was a good point and definitely something to consider; however, we aren't setting the license fee so that is not a consideration for this Board; that that would be the SB.

The PB agreed.

**#9 – track down black market operations and force licensing or shut down.**

The PB fully endorse this.

**#10 – State application process fully vets facilities, reducing local need to inspect.**

The PB was in agreement with this statement.

**#11 – locally have “information-forward” approach to education/advising users of risks of cannabis.**

Ms. Bennett asked who would be doing this.

Ms. Lemire said that Mr. Lee said the businesses would be doing that.

There was discussion regarding whether to mandate this in the ordinance, or not.

Mr. Cieleszko said that his only reservation in mandating this, such as education seminars, is that this would be unenforceable locally.

The PB agreed that the State should be handling the education piece, along with the businesses, not a local Town piece.

**#12 – screening locally for financial capacity.**

Agreement that this was not something the PB should be involved with.

**#13 – fully integrated monitoring system of all sellers, amounts, etc. to thwart being able to get more than allowed.**

The PB agreed they had no jurisdiction regarding this.

**#14 – banking regulations limit number of financial institutions doing business with medical marijuana providers.**

The PB agreed they had no jurisdiction regarding this.

**#15 – require indemnification statement for licensees.**

Mr. Cieleuszko said that this should be used in full.

Ms. Bennett agreed that this was very substantive and beneficial for the Town.

The PB agreed that this should be used as part of the licensing procedure and would like to encourage the SB to incorporate it.

Mr. Lentz discussed **agricultural tourism proposal**. He said that he talked with Ms. Goodwin this week and still wasn't sure what Mr. Widi wants from the PB; that Ms. Lemire sent out some minutes that came from the SB meeting when Mr. Widi spoke.

The rest of the PB did not have a copy and it was explained that this was sent to Mr. Lentz to see if the information would help to clarify and, if so, it could be forwarded to the rest of the PB. It will be forwarded to the rest of the PB.

Mr. Lentz read portions of the proposal: "The purpose of this ordinance is to promote the viability of farms and ranches, while protecting and maintaining the town's rural character and preserving farmland. Agritourism presents a unique opportunity to combine aspects of tourism and agriculture to provide a number of financial, educational, and social benefits to tourists, producers, and communities. Agritourism gives producers an opportunity to generate additional income and an avenue for direct marketing to consumers.....". He further read the definition: "an activity at an agricultural operation where the general public is allowed or invited to participate in, view, or enjoy the activities for recreational, entertainment, or educational purposes." He said that Mr. Widi is looking for an ordinance.

Ms. Bennett asked if we knew why.

Mr. (Bob) Pomerleau said that this is a proposal from Mr. Widi, who owns a farm on River Road; that he presented to the SB a concept about agricultural tourism, which would allow him to expand his business beyond just selling product.

Ms. Bennett asked if Mr. Widi felt constrained by the current ordinances.

Ms. Lemire said that they don't really allow it; that the only thing we have is a mass gathering ordinance; for example, if he had an apple-picking day and people coming in and out all day long, there is really nothing in our ordinance that addresses something like that.

Ms. Bennett said like the tractor-pulling.

Ms. Lemire said exactly; that the Raitt Farm is one of the examples that he used.

Ms. Bennett asked if he would like to do this on a more regular basis.

Ms. Lemire said yes, adding he also suggested birthday parties or to educate them about how the farm is run, for examples.

Mr. Lentz asked if he would do this on his farm.

Ms. Lemire said yes.

Ms. Sherwin said, for clarification, that Ms. Goodwin did reach out to Mr. Widi and ask him to provide an overview about what he wanted to discuss with the PB; that he sent along a draft ordinance that he has prepared. She read the email that Mr. Widi sent back: "I'm looking for the PB's input and/or approval to proceed with what I've written. I've sourced it from dozens of other agritourism ordinances around the country and spoken with other farmers in Town, so, hopefully that will be quick and easy. When I spoke to Dana, this is the schedule he laid out: pitch idea to SB to see if there was interest (He noted that that was done and approved unanimously in April.), get PB input an approval, then send it off to the lawyers, public hearing, back to SB for final approval to put on the ballot, then lastly, to put it on the November ballot." She added that what she thinks he's looking for from the PB is input on a presentation that he's going to deliver on the draft ordinance language that he's prepared; that she knows he has been in contact with Mr. Lee about it.

Ms. Bennett asked if we could do this at the next meeting.

Mr. Lentz said that this would be something for the administrative meeting.

The PB agreed to invite Mr. Widi to the June 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **ITEM 7 – NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

**ITEM 8 – CORRESPONDENCE**


There was no correspondence.

**ITEM 9 – SET AGENDA AND DATE FOR NEXT MEETING**

The next regular Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for June 4, 2019 at 7PM.

**ITEM 10 – ADJOURN**

There was a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting at 8:18 PM.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dennis Lentz, Chair**  
Date approved: 6/6/19

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary