

SEP 06 2016

July 19, 2016  
7:00 PM

Wendy Rawski  
Town Clerk

**ITEM 1 - ROLL CALL**

Present: Steve Beckert – Chairman, Jeff Duncan, Larry Bouchard, Greg Whalen, Dennis Lentz, Melissa Horner – Alternate.

Also present: Kate Pelletier, Planning Assistant.

Absent: Christine Bennett – Alternate (excused).

Voting members: Jeff Duncan, Larry Bouchard, Dennis Lentz, and Greg Whalen.

**ITEM 2 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ITEM 3 – MOMENT OF SILENCE**

**ITEM 4 – REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES, AS NEEDED**

Mr. Lentz moved, second by Mr. Bouchard, to approve the minutes of July 12, 2016, as written.

**VOTE**

**3-1 (Mr. Duncan abstained)  
Chair concurs in the affirmative**

**ITEM 5 – REVIEW “NOTICE OF DECISION” LETTERS, AS NEEDED**

**Sturgeon Creek Enterprises amended site plan (PB16-4)**

This will be reviewed at the next meeting.

**ITEM 6 – PUBLIC APPLICATIONS OR PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS TO BE CONSIDERED**

**A. Shoreland zoning application to establish a 9,300 sq. ft. outdoor, seasonal boat storage area at 235 Main Street. Applicant/owner is Great Cove Boat Club (mailing address: 225 Main Street, Eliot, Maine 03903). Property can be identified as Map 2/Lot 3 and is located in the General Development Shoreland Zoning District. (PB16-12)**

Mr. Greg Mahanna and Mr. Adam Baker were present for this application.

Mr. Mahanna said that we have two parcels, 225 Main Street and 235 Main Street, and 225 Main Street is the marina; that 235 Main Street is a residential parcel with three structures on it, a single-family home, a cottage, and a barn. He added that the most northeasterly part of that lot abuts Main Street and the marina; that there is currently a driveway there of mixed gravel and hardscape and, then, there is what people would call a front yard, which is a wet, grassy area. He said that we would like to expand our boat storage area onto 235 Main Street, approximately 9,300 feet of affected space; that

we've worked with Easterly Surveying, the DES, and the Eliot Planning Department to establish the area shown on the map. He explained that that area would be excavated to remove clay that is there and improved to be a solid surface that would support boats on stands; that we established that the pertinent area is 75 feet, or more, from the wetlands that are further to the west, which is a requirement of the Maine DES. He added that the plan also shows the 75-foot setback from the mean high water mark; that they are bound by the 70% non-vegetative coverage because the parcel in question is divided between General Development and Resource Protection and we are well below that, as is shown in the notes. He concluded that, basically, we are going to take a grassy, wet, and driveway material right now and turn that into matching surface coverage that we currently have in the boat storage area next to it. Mr. Mahanna added that we are completely renovating the 3-bedroom house and improving its appearance from the street. Regarding stormwater, there are notes on the plan and included a single page summary (Easterly Surveying) of how the storm drainage will be affected by everything we're doing; that it would be negligible.

Mr. Duncan said that, based on Mr. Mahanna's comments, he understood that the 3-bedroom house is not currently occupied.

Mr. Mahanna said that that was correct; that it was occupied until the spring, at which time we ceased the lease to the prior tenant; that it will be used as a rental property once it is renovated and will be rented as a single-family, three-bedroom home.

Mr. Duncan asked about the current driveway access to that house.

Mr. Mahanna said that it was currently the left-hand side of the hashed, improved area and the future driveway access would be Seabreeze Lane to the east.

Mr. Duncan said that the proposed revisions to this property, in the applicant's mind, would not affect the usability of that structure.

Mr. Mahanna said that it would not.

Mr. Whalen commented that Lot 3 is a separate lot, not combined with the applicant's adjacent property.

Mr. Mahanna said that it is a separate property, with its own address, and the marina parcel is a separate property, with its own address; that they are both owned by the same entity – the marina.

Mr. Whalen asked Ms. Pelletier if this entire combined two parcels would be treated as a marina.

Ms. Pelletier said no, just one parcel with a couple of houses on it.

Mr. Whalen said that he is trying to ascertain whether or not this is not being treated as a marina, which is an allowed use in this zone, asking where in the land use table does it allow for this type of use for this type of property.

Ms. Pelletier said that this is the General Development District; Chapter 44 §34.

Mr. Whalen asked if there had ever been an attempt by the property owners to combine these lots into one.

Mr. Mahanna said no; that he thinks they didn't do it to avoid the legal fees.

Mr. Beckert asked MS. Pelletier how the ordinance addressed that; that he thought that when two lots came under the same ownership, they became one lot.

Ms. Pelletier said that that was only if they are non-conforming.

Mr. Duncan asked if you are going to start combining a use across a property line, aren't you, in effect, removing that property line.

Ms. Pelletier said no; that there's nothing that says they can't have parking on another site, as long as it's within 100 feet of the marina. She added that it's just boat storage and, if you want to call it its own land use, you can call it that, if you like.

Mr. Whalen said that, looking at 44 §34, the use (marina) is certainly allowed; that he is just concerned that outside storage doesn't fall under any other categories and wanted to make sure, before going too far, that this thing is teed up properly.

Ms. Pelletier said that it would just be an extension of what's on the other side of that property line; that, for all intents and purposes, it is one large tract of land.

Mr. Whalen said that that's the problem – it's a stand-alone lot and not combined with the property next door; that irrespective of who owns the property next door and what the use is, he doesn't think it automatically conveys over; that it may very well.

Mr. Duncan said that it seemed to him that we are taking what is a residential lot, even though it's a rental as opposed to an owner, and combining a business and residential activity on that same lot.

Ms. Pelletier clarified that, if they were to swap the lot lines around and make it so that it was on the same lot, then we wouldn't be having this discussion.

Mr. Duncan said that he wouldn't. He added that the question is can we do that, acreage-wise, for what would be the remaining lot (1+ acre), asking what the lot size was for this area.

Ms. Pelletier said that it was one acre.

Mr. Duncan said that that would satisfy his concern.

Ms. Pelletier asked Mr. Mahanna if that was a possibility.

Mr. Mahanna said that, for the record, we would, if it's required, combine the lots.

Ms. Pelletier asked if he could make it so that you just change the lot lines around.

Mr. Mahanna clarified that the PB is suggesting that we annex and just combine the 9,300 square feet with 225 Main Street.

Mr. Duncan said that was correct.

Mr. Mahanna said that he sees no issue with that, at all; that that's just a survey and a lawyer.

Mr. Whalen suggested eliminating the lot line entirely.

Mr. Mahanna said that he was asking for the PB's preference; that he would do either. He added that that would negate his ability to, in the event of an emergency, sell the residential parcel because it would be part of the marina. He said that we are run by a board, just like you, and he doesn't want to make a decision for somebody 30 years from now.

Mr. Whalen asked if the marina was a condominium.

Mr. Mahanna said that it is not, it's a boat club.

Mr. Whalen suggested the applicant discuss it with legal and determine the best approach; that he thought the suggestion was much cleaner, at least from this side of the table, if it were a part of the adjacent marina property.

Mr. Mahanna asked if he was saying just the improvement area.

Mr. Whalen agreed.

Mr. Mahanna said that he would be happy to bring in a new drawing for that.

Mr. Beckert said to remember to maintain at least an acre on the residential side.

Mr. Bouchard said that his question was what that would do to the existing lot; did they have enough frontage to separate that, as suggested.

Ms. Pelletier said to make sure they are not creating something that is non-conforming.

Mr. Mahanna agreed. He asked if there would be a setback issue regarding the proximity of the single-family home to the storage area.

Ms. Pelletier said that, if it's a side lot line, you need 20 feet; that if it's a front property line, you need 30 feet. She suggested he play around with that and, if the applicant needs to, shorten the parking lot a little bit to meet that; that it's not by very much that they are short.

Mr. Duncan asked Ms. Pelletier asked, by our definitions, would Seabreeze Lane would qualify for qualifying a house as having frontage.

Ms. Pelletier said no; that that's a private road and, so, would not qualify; not unless we did a back lot.

After further discussion, it was the consensus of the PB that the applicant go back to his board to annex the required amount of acreage to combine the lots (for the marina) via a lot line adjustment.

Mr. Mahanna said that he would come back with a new modified survey.

The PB agreed, saying that legal approval could be a condition of approval.

The PB agreed to have this on the August 2<sup>nd</sup> agenda, if the applicant met the deadline requirements.

**B. Request for Planning Board Action to revise a previously approved subdivision by dividing the lot located at 241 River Road, creating one (1) additional house lot. Applicants/owners are William and Wendy Gilbert (mailing address: 241 River Road, Eliot, Maine 03903). Property can be identified as Map 19/Lot 88 and is located in the Suburban Zoning District. (PB16-13)**

William and Wendy Gilbert, and Mr. Ryan McCarthy (Tidewater Engineering & Surveying), were present for this application.

Mr. McCarthy said that the previously-approved 3-lot subdivision was from 1977 and the lots created were relatively large; that the Gilberts lot is 14 acres and the other two lots 10 acres and 5 acres. He added that we are proposing a lot division of the Gilbert parcel, splitting off a 2-acre lot, with the remaining portion 12 acres. He said that the proposed lot meets all the requirements and dimensional regulations by Eliot ordinance; that it will be serviced by an on-site septic system, which design is included in the PB's packets. He added that it will also be serviced by the Kittery Water District and that there is a letter from Kittery Water District included, as well. He said that the driveway coming onto River Road meets the site distance requirements. He explained that part of the original subdivision plan from 1977 included a deed restriction that prevented further subdivision of any of the lots; that, typically for larger subdivisions, this is a covenant that is addressed by the association, so the board or association has the authority to

waive the requirement or make changes. He said that with this being a small, 3-lot subdivision, a lot of times this type of restriction is actually put on the plan, itself; that because this was a PB approved plan and that restriction is on the plan, itself, you as a PB, have the authority in this case to decide whether or not to waive the deed restriction for the scenario here. He added that this is a family subdivision and the whole purpose of splitting off this lot is for their son and daughter-in-law; that it's very important to them to live directly beside their parents so that the two families can actually support each other, given their current situation. Additionally, he said that there was actually a house located in the area where we are proposing to put a house that was recently demolished; that it was a 5-room cabin with two bedrooms, a living room, kitchen, and bathroom, with a septic system; that this proposed use would maintain the historical use of the lot, itself; that we are just conveying out 2 acres from the parcel. He added that we have included an architectural rendering of what the house will look like; that, in his opinion, it is a very nice looking house and believes it will fit very well with that area of Town along River Road; that it's a farmhouse-style house with a farmer's porch on the front and the back. He said that, regarding the deed restriction, we do have support from the other two owners of the original subdivision, giving letters of support from the owners to the PB tonight.

Mr. Beckert said that, where this is a modification to an existing minor subdivision, we need to do the sanity check.

Ms. Pelletier said that this is just a plan revision after approval and is under Chapter 41 §182; that it's pretty simple. She added that they just need to obtain final approval of a revised plan showing the lots affected and re-recorded at the Registry of Deeds; that he's covered all his bases, legally, by having the owners sign off on removing that restriction; that you could have a public hearing, if you choose, but you are not obligated to.

Mr. Whalen said that, regarding the deed restriction, the only problem he sees with this application, from his perspective, is that deed restriction with us moving forward, as far as the PB is concerned. He added that his observation, without the ability to determine, off the plan, as to how the deed restriction language got put on the plan in the first place; whether, in fact, that was initiated by the PB, at the time, or the subdivider at the time required that to be put on is a matter, for this Board, still unknown; that for clarification purposes, moving forward, he would think it would behoove the applicant to have that deed restriction removed from amongst the current owners; that we've received the letters, so there is concurrence by all the abutters/property owners that there is a waiver to that. He added that whatever legal format that ought to take in order for that to be waived he thinks ought to be done prior to presentation to this PB so that that is clarified so that, then, we don't have to make a decision as to how it got there in the first place and that the PB had the authority and the right to remove that deed restriction.

Mr. McCarthy said that he could address that; that he did go back and look at the PB minutes from 1977; that it was not the request of the original owner but a condition that was put in place by the PB members at that time. He added that part of the reasoning was that they did mention was that they didn't feel there were soils suitable to support a

septic system, which would restrict how many lots you can have; that we had a soil scientist go out there and there are areas on the Gilbert property that can support a septic system. He reiterated that, in the meeting minutes from 1977, you will see that the PB at the time was the one who placed the restriction and, therefore, you as the PB, have the authority to remove it. He said that, regarding having the deed restriction removed prior to presentation to the PB, there is a legal expense in that, so we would like to make sure that, you as the PB, in his opinion have the authority to remove it, is willing to do so before we go through all the legal expense of removing it from all three parcels. He suggested that, maybe, the PB could make their approval contingent on having that deed restriction from the deed, itself.

Mr. Duncan said that he shares the same concern that Mr. Whalen has; that he is not trying to guess what the PB in 1977 had in mind, but there is a restriction that exists. He asked Ms. Pelletier if she could speak to the PB's ability to modify that restriction.

Ms. Pelletier said yes; that according to State law you have to approve this modification in order for the applicant to record it and to record the deeds that will remove that restriction; that it's all part of the same process and all needs to happen concurrently; that the PB is just part of that process. She added that she is familiar with the process and the applicant is doing everything he is supposed to be doing.

Mr. McCarthy said that we have consulted with an attorney, Dan Thornhill, who advised us the same thing.

Mr. Beckert said that the comment of making it a condition of approval that the restriction be removed from the deeds and the deeds recorded in Alfred and copies of those deeds be provided to the Town, if the PB so desires that to be a condition of approval.

Mr. Duncan said that he would feel more comfortable agreeing to some waiving or removing this restriction if we have a public hearing and we don't have anyone objecting to it; therefore, he would recommend we have a public hearing on this matter.

Mr. Bouchard asked what this does to the other lots when this is removed.

Ms. Pelletier said that that's why they all have to agree to it; that if they don't, then it has to go to court and a judge would have to decide on it, if they really wanted to push it but, where they are all in agreement, they have met their legal obligation.

Mr. Duncan said that, to Mr. Bouchard's question, it would be possible for the other two lots to subdivide in a similar manner, if they chose to do so, if that restriction is removed.

Ms. Pelletier agreed, because the restriction applies to the entire subdivision.

Mr. McCarthy agreed; that there are two options, the PB could remove it completely and, in that situation, if someone wanted to divide their lot, it would still need to come before the PB because it's part of a previously-approved subdivision, so you still have the authority to approve or deny that application; that the second option, which is the preferred option, is to waive for this situation, here, which gives you the authority to look at it on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Bouchard said that, then, it would behoove us to deny somebody else's request for subdivision.

Ms. Pelletier said that he has the plans to back it up, though; he has a soil scientist saying that what we thought before was inaccurate.

Mr. Beckert said that, in the last 30 years, the soil conditions have changed and the State has changed their requirements.

Ms. Pelletier agreed; that she would say that, if someone else brought you the same compelling evidence, that you would consider that just the same as you would this request.

Mr. Bouchard said that he leaned toward Mr. Duncan's comments about their lots – if we can find out if they fully agree on it – so that going into the public hearing this is what he would like to see.

The PB **agreed by consensus** to have a public hearing. The Public Hearing was scheduled for August 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Whalen asked, regarding the deed restriction, if we could get a legal opinion from the Town attorney.

Ms. Pelletier said that she supposed we could but, really, it says all over the PB materials from MMA that the PB has no authority to interpret deed restrictions or make judgements on deed restrictions; that those are all civil matters that are handled by someone who isn't this PB. She added that she would not recommend spending money on something like that; that she can give the PB what the MMA PB Manual says on the matter, which is written by attorneys.

Mr. Duncan said that it seems to him that what we are doing is interpreting this restriction by considering its removal; that, otherwise, we would say it can't be done because the restriction imposed no further subdivision.

Ms. Pelletier clarified that all the PB is doing is considering removing it from the plan; that you have no say over what comes off or on a deed; that that's the only thing this Board has the authority to do – is to remove it from the plan.



Mr. Beckert said that, if our minutes from 1977 show that the Eliot PB requested that that be added to the plan, then the 2016 Eliot PB can certainly remove it from the current plan.

Ms. Pelletier said that she can pull the minutes of that meeting for this PB.

Mr. Beckert said that, if they were put there by no other legal authority other than the Eliot PB, then this current Eliot PB has the authority to remove it.

Mr. Whalen said that he is not convinced that that's the case; that the minutes may say that they applied that as a condition of approval but where in the minutes does it say that, at a future date, the PB may, on its own volition, remove the deed restriction; that these lots were purchased after the deed restriction was imposed and he knows we have letters, here that state the owners are not in opposition but he is not convinced this PB has the authority to remove or waive this restriction.

Ms. Pelletier said that if there's no reason restrict somebody's ability to use their property then why do it; that just because the PB did it because they thought the soil was bad, then, if it turns out the soil isn't bad, then there is no longer a reason to restrict that property owner from using their property.

After further discussion, the Chair recommended that the PB review the pertinent 1977 PB minutes to see if the PB acted and put that restriction on their of their own fruition and why before spending money on legal counsel.

Ms. Pelletier will make copies of the pertinent minutes and pertinent portions of the MMA Planning Guide for the PB's review.

Mr. Whalen asked if there was a reason why the lot did not extend down to the waterfront.

Mr. McCarthy said that we kept it out of the Shoreland Zone. He added that we are really trying to streamline this process and limit the amount of meetings we have to attend, so, if you do find that you do concur that the 1977 PB put that restriction on there, we just want to try to avoid coming back, again, to get a legal opinion from the attorney, just do it all at once.

Mr. Beckert said that that was fair enough.

### **C. 2017 allocation building permits for new residential dwelling units per §29-5**

- a. Review input from Department Heads on rate of growth.**
- b. Decide on the recommended number of growth permits to allocate for new residential dwelling units in 2017.**
- c. Schedule public hearing on recommended allocation of growth permits.**

Mr. Beckert said that input from the departments was included in our packets. He asked Ms. Pelletier if we had input from the Sewer Department.

Ms. Pelletier said no, nor from the Fire Department, yet.

Mr. Beckert said that we have to decide on what we're going to recommend, if we're going to recommend a new number of growth permits to be allocated in 2017 or if we're going to stay with the State minimum requirement, per the ordinance; that the PB has to announce their decision prior to July 30<sup>th</sup>; that we can hold a public hearing any time after that because there won't be a vote on that until at least November.

Mr. Lentz said that, from the input from department heads, it appears to him that, if the number stays under 50, there don't seem to be major impacts. He added that, if we go by the State statute, we are around 23, so that's our low number; that if he takes the number of homes that were actually built in the last 20 years, the average evens out to somewhere around 24 or 25 and it doesn't appear to him that we've outgrown that State statute number by very much.

Ms. Pelletier agreed that the mean is just about 23 for the last 10 years, but is that because there were not enough growth permits.

Mr. Lentz agreed; that he hadn't even gone there, yet, but was just trying to set a basis for discussion.

Mr. Bouchard said that, after looking at the reports, he believes we could set a higher number of permits, in the area of 30, to help relieve some of the pressure on the property owners that are waiting long periods of time to obtain permits.

Mr. Lentz asked why he picked the number of 30.

Mr. Bouchard said that he was trying to go halfway in between 50 and the 25; that 50 seems to be the area where the departments seem to think they are going to start seeing a lot of increased work; that he would be interested in a formula from someone.

Mr. Beckert said that the formula came out last year at 29.5, or so, when we reviewed that last 34 years; that we took into account the 7 times over 34 years that we hit the maximum; that that is why we recommended 30, that it was not just a number pulled out of mid-air but was based on facts and figures on what actually happened in Town over 34 years.

Ms. Horner said that, regarding the number 30, we are just asking for 7 more, because it would be 23 regardless of what we do.

Mr. Beckert said yes; that the minimum, by State law, is going to be 23 and that number cannot change – go lower.

Mr. Whalen asked Ms. Pelletier how long it would take for us to get up to 30 if we just allow the formula to apply to subsequent years.

Ms. Pelletier said that that is hard to figure out from what Mr. Murphy did because it doesn't have to take into account the fact that the 10-year average includes elderly housing; that Mr. Murphy's calculations only included the number of growth permits that were allocated instead of the number of new houses that were built, so, those numbers would be a little off. She added that she could roughly predict that but not tonight; that she would have to go back because it's all over the place, certainly, in the last couple of years.

Mr. Whalen said that the purpose being that each year, henceforth, excepting another recession of some magnitude, the permits were maximized. He asked if we would be anticipating, if it were 21 this year, 23 next year, 25 the following year and, at the fifth year out, reach the number of 30.

Ms. Pelletier reiterated that the calculation isn't based on just the number of growth permits allocated each year; that it can sometimes be double that because it's based on the number of new homes that were constructed; that that number can fluctuate greatly; that this year we have already had 64 houses built, or permits issued for 64 units this year, and we only have 20 growth permits. She added that she thinks that, if it continues to be this restrictive, that number will continue to be inflated by elderly housing.

Mr. Bouchard agreed.

Mr. Beckert said that, as of our meeting last week, we were at 38 on the waiting list and asked if that had changed.

Ms. Pelletier said that that is still the same.

Mr. Lentz said that 10 of those are non-subdivision.

Mr. Duncan said that he didn't necessarily have a problem recommending something that might be higher than 23; that certainly the analysis that we've gone through from the past says 30 seems to be the reasonable number; that he was wondering, since the Town rebuffed that number last year, at what point are we going to be asking the same questions and getting it turned down; that that's not to say it will be turned down this year.

Mr. Bouchard asked Ms. Pelletier how many of the 64 were elderly.

Ms. Pelletier said 46.

Mr. Bouchard said that people are going to continue to do what they need to do and we could put ourselves (this Town) in dire straits years down the road if it's all elderly housing.

Mr. Whalen asked what the process would gain or lose by either not recommending a different number to allow the Town to vote on it versus not recommending it, thereby, denying that opportunity to the Town. He added that he thought that the number was so arbitrary that, at best, it was a guessing game; that if we look at from a procedural standpoint, does the PB owe the opportunity to the Town to voice their opinion, on an annual basis, and give them that right to do so, or simply deny it; that he doesn't see what we lose by giving them the opportunity. He said that, rather than for this PB to sit as judge and jury, he would rather give the Town the opportunity to voice their opinion.

Mr. Beckert agreed, saying that the Town voted on the wording changes to the ordinance and passed that; that what they defeated was the number. He added that, in the Chair's opinion, he's heard more people voice their opinions in the other direction, this year; that the number should have been increased because of the impact the number is having.

Mr. Lentz agreed and thought that, as a Board, it is wrong for us to use this Board to tend to restrict land use and what people can do with their land – if they have the opportunity to sell it or build on it, they have it. He added that, on the other hand, he thinks it's our obligation and responsibility to make sure we're not overpowering our Town services. He said that he tended to agree with Mr. Whalen to let the people vote on it, suggesting that maybe we need to send information out with some more explanation but he is certainly in favor of increasing that number.

Mr. Bouchard said that he was in consideration of increasing the number.

Ms. Horner said that she was in favor of increasing the number because we are the Planning Board and it's our job to help plan for the future; that the bottleneck of elderly housing is something to take into consideration, as it could seriously impact the Town down the road.

Mr. Beckert asked, if the PB is recommending that the number be increased, what would be the number that we would recommend.

Mr. Bouchard moved that the Planning Board recommend a number of thirty-five (35) permits to the Town. There was no second and the motion fails.

Mr. Bouchard moved, second by Mr. Duncan, that the Planning Board recommend thirty (30) permits to the Town.

**VOTE**

**4-0**

**Chair concurs in the affirmative**

Mr. Beckert said that the PB will move forward with the recommendation of thirty, unanimously.

A public hearing was scheduled for August 16 and September 20 (45 days from the November election).

**D. Effects of the new Town of Eliot Charter (effective July 1, 2016) on Planning Board policies and procedures.**

This was postponed to a future meeting.

**ITEM 7 – DISCUSS STATUS OF OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS**

There were no action items.

**ITEM 8 – CORRESPONDENCE AND PLANNING ASSISTANT, AS NEEDED**


Mr. Duncan said that he did not renew his membership on the Conservation Commission to allow new, fresh blood the opportunity.

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

The next regular Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for August 2, 2016 at 7PM.

**ITEM 10 – ADJOURN**

There was a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting at 8:08 PM.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steve Beckert, Chairman  
Date approved: 8/2/16

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary

