

ITEM 1 - ROLL CALL

Present: Dennis Lentz – Acting Chair, Ed Cieleszko, and Christine Bennett – Alternate.

Absent: Jeff Duncan - Acting Chairman, Larry Bouchard, Greg Whalen, Melissa Horner – Alternate,

Voting members: Dennis Lentz, Ed Cieleszko, and Christine Bennett – Alternate.

Mr. Lentz said that, before we start the meeting, he wanted to say that the PB made a conscious decision to hold this meeting because we know we're backed up; that as messed up as the PB has been in the process, lately, even though we suspected many people would be travelling and off to spend time with their families and on vacation, and that is the case; so, out of seven there are three Board members here, tonight, and we'll get through this. He added that, because we've made people wait, we've upset people and, so, he thinks it's important we try to get through tonight and everyone really agreed with that. He apologized, on behalf of the PB, to those that have been pushed off and had to wait; that we are in the process of making some improvements, asking everyone to give us another month, or so, and he thinks we'll be right back on track. He said that, without opposition from his colleagues, he will be the Chair for this evening.

There was no opposition.

Mr. Lentz said that, to form a quorum, we need three regular voting members and he appointed Christine Bennett as a voting member for tonight to have the needed quorum. He welcomed Ed Cieleszko as the newest regular member. He added that we have some help with us tonight – Lee Jay Feldman, Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission and Becca Lower, Land Use Administrative Assistant.

ITEM 2 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM 3 – MOMENT OF SILENCE

ITEM 4 – REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES, AS NEEDED

It was decided to review minutes at the December 5th meeting.

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

There were no decision letters tonight.

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

A. PUBLIC HEARING – and continued review of an application for Site Plan Review to construct a commercial structure containing eight (8) commercial/retail units at 290 Harold L. Dow Highway. Applicant is Peter Paul (mailing address: PO

RECEIVED
JAN 17 2018
BY: Wendy Rawski,
Town Clerk

Box 694, Eliot, Maine 03903). Owner is AMP Realty Holdings, LLC (mailing address: c/o Northern Pool & Spa, 291 Harold L. Dow Highway, Eliot, Maine 03903). Property can be identified as Map 37/Lot 20 and is located in the Suburban Zoning District. (PB17-8)

Received: July 1, 2017

1st Heard: July 18, 2017

Public Hearing: November 21, 2017

2nd Hearing: September 19, 2017

Site Walk: N/A

Approval: November 21, 2017

Mr. (Peter) Paul (applicant) and Mr. (Thomas) Harmon (representative, Civil Consultants) were present for this application.

7:06 PM Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Harmon said that this is a proposed commercial project, across from Northern Pool & Spa on Route 236 (York Woods).

12,000 square feet of commercial office space

70 parking spaces

On-site well and septic

Septic sized for 400 gallons and can be expanded to approximately 1,600 gallons

Existing, current Maine DOT entrance permit

Approval coming from Maine DEP

Landscaping in front

Loading dock in back

Building is one story

One section will be 2-story

Mezzanines in portions of the building, not closed spaces

Center building will be 2 stories

Concrete block construction in center portion (fire & life safety)

Wood construction elsewhere

Mr. Harmon said that the applicant would like to get started on the project this winter; that the applicant has crews slowing down from his swimming pool business and this is an opportunity to keep a number of people on for the winter. He added that we are looking for approval with the condition that any building permit will require a Maine DEP Stormwater Permit; that it has been approved but is still waiting for signatures.

Ms. (Jessica) O'Donoghue, Wildbrook Lane, asked what kind of businesses they saw going in there.

Mr. Paul said maybe a real estate office, massage, insurance, a small retail business; basically, just commercial rentals; that he has been approached by a couple of people looking for retail space.

7:11 PM Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Lentz asked if we have gotten anything back from Fire or Police or Public Works, as far as the impact of it.

Ms. Lower said no.

Mr. Lentz said that we would need to do that.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if there was employee parking in the back as part of the 70 parking spots.

Mr. Harmon said yes; that the parking is basically scattered around the site.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if the all the building fronts are in the crotch of the building structure.

Mr. Harmon said yes; that when you come in, you come in at the front of the building and there are parking spots in the front.

Mr. Cieleuszko said, to confirm, these are set up retail so there's not like a big garage door.

Mr. Harmon said that there are only pedestrian entrances; that at the rear of the building there is a loading dock, so there might be a double door, but that's it; that there is no drive-in, no garage doors.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if all the dock area was paved.

Mr. Harmon said yes. He added that you can see the ponds around the outside; that those are the stormwater treatment and they are there because of the pavement and the building.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if the waste water system foresees...

Mr. Harmon said that, right now, we are approximately 400 gallons; that he backed that off about 15 gallons/person and approximately 30 people could come in with that. He added that there is room to quadruple the size of that.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if the existing system could handle that or would the applicant have to make additions to it.

Mr. Harmon said that we would make additions if we quadrupled it but, at this, time we intend to put in the 400 gallons.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if the land could take that perk for the whole amount.

Mr. Harmon said yes.

Ms. Bennett said that she didn't see the loading dock on the plan.

Mr. Harmon said that, on the plan, you will see where the pavement comes out along the back of the building, on the north side; that it would be along there because that gives the opportunity for trucks to pull in and back up to it.

Ms. Bennett asked if that was near the dumpster.

Mr. Harmon agreed.

Ms. Bennett asked if the applicant had completed the lighting plan for the property.

Mr. Harmon said that that would be on the building, part of the building.

Ms. Bennett asked about plantings.

Mr. Harmon said that they have plantings; that one of the things we did when we first came in, we talked about landscaping and that is indicated on the plan.

Mr. Lentz asked if there was a new curb cut.

Mr. Harmon said no; that that is a DOT permitted entrance form the York Woods business and it works for this project.

Mr. Lentz said that the applicant did correct the parking spaces and the landscaping is on there now. He asked if Mr. Harmon could talk a bit about bio-retention filters.

Mr. Harmon said that that is the stormwater treatment system (DEP) and one of the things is circled because we changed those from the first submittal; that DEP changed the method of lining those; that they now want liners on them, so those will be lined with polyethylene liners so it doesn't go back into the ground; that it actually gets collected at the base and goes back out onto the ground, just like it did before it started. He added that there is one in each corner.

Ms. Bennett asked about signage.

Mr. Harmon said that we will meet existing code and come in to the Code Enforcement Office for this type of thing.

Mr. Cieleszko said that he has only a partial package and asked if everything was good with abutters.

Mr. Harmon said that that was all done with the initial review.

Ms. Lemire said that the very last piece in the minutes for this application said, "The PB **agreed by consensus** that the application is complete pending submittal of the additional material before the public hearing."

Mr. Lentz agreed that that was done. He asked for the pleasure of the PB.

Mr. Cieleszko moved, second by Ms. Bennett, that the Planning Board approve PB17-8, as presented, with the following conditions of approval:

1. The property may be developed and used only in accordance with the plans, documents, material submitted, and representations of the applicant made to the Planning Board. All elements and features of the use as presented to the Planning Board are conditions of approval and no changes in any of those elements or features are permitted unless such changes are first submitted to and approved by the Eliot Planning Board.
2. The permit is approved on the basis of information provided by the applicant in the record regarding the ownership of the property and boundary location. The applicant has the burden of ensuring that they have the legal right to use the property and that they are measuring required setbacks from the legal boundary lines of the lot. The approval of this permit in no way relieves the applicant of this burden. Nor does this permit approval constitute a resolution in favor of the applicant of any issues regarding the property boundaries, ownership, or similar title issues. The permit holder would be well-advised to resolve any such title problems before expending money in reliance on this permit.
3. The applicant authorizes inspection of premises by the Code Enforcement Officer during the term of the permit for the purposes of permit compliance.
4. The applicant shall obtain approval from the Maine State Fire Marshall Office prior to the start of operations.
5. Applicant will submit approved Maine DEP Stormwater Permit prior to the issuance of a building permit.

VOTE

3-0

**Acting Chair votes in the
affirmative**

Mr. Lentz said that the application stands approved and there is a 30-day period from which the PB decision can be appealed by an aggrieved person or parties – move forward but move forward cautiously.

B. PUBLIC HEARING – and continued review of an application for a home business permit to establish a retail shop selling wool, patterns, books, and supplies at 303 Beech Road. Owner/applicant is Kathryn Spellacy (mailing address: 303

Beech Road, Eliot, Maine 03903). Property can be identified as Map 38/Lot 20 and is located in the Suburban Zoning District. (PB17-10)

First Heard: August 15, 2017

Site Walk: Not required.

Public Hearing: November 21, 2017

Second Hearing: November 21, 2017

Final Approval: November 21, 2017

Ms. Kathryn Spellacy was present for this application.

7:22 PM Public Hearing opened.

Ms. Spellacy clarified that her address is 303 Beech Road and she has a barn that is actually 299 Beech Road; that there was a prior business in there – real estate appraisal office -so she hasn't changed any square footage other than to add a driveway and parking areas. She said that she would be open on Friday and Saturday; that she teaches classes with usually no more than 4 to 5 students at a time; that she does sell wool, has an online pattern business, and sells yarn, books, threads, rug hooks, scissors, etc.

Ms. (Rosanne) Adams, Goodwin Road, said that, previously, in addition to the business at that address there was an apartment and she wondered if that was going to be continued.

Ms. Spellacy said yes; that she has a tenant, he has an assigned parking space, and there are five other spaces for retail.

7:26 PM Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Cielezsko asked if there were boundaries between 303 and 299 Beech Road.

Ms. Spellacy said no; that it is surveyed for one lot and 299 is for the tenant for mailing purposes.

Discussion clarified access to tenant parking and that the shop has four parking spaces.

Dimensions were added to parking spaces. The shop sign will be located on the barn.
\$50 balance paid.

Mr. Cielezsko discussed his concern regarding whether the application met the dimensional standards for a Home Business as it applies to the primary structure.

Mr. Feldman clarified that the lot, itself, is non-conforming and that would not preclude the applicant from moving forward with the business, provided the setbacks are met.

Mr. Cieleuszko moved, second by Ms. Bennett, that the Planning Board approve PB17-10, as presented, with the following conditions of approval:

1. The property may be developed and used only in accordance with the plans, documents, material submitted, and representations of the applicant made to the Planning Board. All elements and features of the use as presented to the Planning Board are conditions of approval and no changes in any of those elements or features are permitted unless such changes are first submitted to and approved by the Eliot Planning Board.
2. The permit is approved on the basis of information provided by the applicant in the record regarding the ownership of the property and boundary location. The applicant has the burden of ensuring that they have the legal right to use the property and that they are measuring required setbacks from the legal boundary lines of the lot. The approval of this permit in no way relieves the applicant of this burden. Nor does this permit approval constitute a resolution in favor of the applicant of any issues regarding the property boundaries, ownership, or similar title issues. The permit holder would be well-advised to resolve any such title problems before expending money in reliance on this permit.
3. The applicant authorizes inspection of premises by the Code Enforcement Officer during the term of the permit for the purposes of permit compliance.

VOTE

3-0

**Acting Chair votes in the
affirmative**

Mr. Lentz said that the application stands approved and there is a 30-day period from which the PB decision can be appealed by an aggrieved person or parties – move forward but move forward cautiously.

**C. Continued review of an application for Site Plan Review to establish a boat storage, retail, and repair operation at 100 Harold L. Dow Highway.
Applicant/owner is Douglas Anderson of Toro Properties, LLC (mailing address: 224 Pleasant Street, Eliot, Maine 03903). Property can be identified as Map 23/Lot 12 and is located in the Commercial/Industrial Zoning District. (PB17-21)**

**Received: October 6, 2017
1st Heard: October 17, 2017
Public Hearing: N/A
2nd Hearing: November 21, 2017
Site Walk: N/A
Approval: November 21, 2017**

Mr. (Douglas) Anderson was present for this application.

Mr. Anderson said that this is currently a used car facility with repair and we want to add boat repair, storage, and retail. He added that, at the last meeting he had, the PB had

asked him to provide the survey for the LOMA exemption, showing the right-of-way, flood boundaries, and the six parking spaces.

Mr. Lentz clarified that the applicant does have an approved amendment from FEMA and that what we asked for was to have detailed drawings to go along with that amendment, relative to wetland in that area; that the SFMA has reduced the size of those wetlands and is now delineated on here and we can see where they have moved those lines to. He said to Ms. Lemire that he had a note on this from last time that we considered this an administrative change.

Ms. Lemire said yes.

Ms. Bennett confirmed that she had that, as well.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that, on his plan, it looks like the applicant has two structures in the back.

Mr. Anderson said that those are structures he has been in conversation with Ms. Pelletier about wanting to build; that she said that, if he's thinking about it, put them on the plan and that will be addressed at the meeting. He added that Ms. Pelletier is not here, anymore, the discussions kind of fell apart, and he doesn't know if he can bring them up and talk about what he wants to put there in the future, and get approval, or if it needs another application.

Mr. Lentz clarified that this is the plan, as presented, and if he intends on other structures going in there, he has to go through the CEO to get a permit.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that the buildings are not part of the applicant's current application.

Mr. Anderson said no.

Mr. Lentz clarified that the CEO would direct him to the PB, if that was needed. He asked the PB if they were in agreement that this is an administrative change, with the follow-up that the applicant has done.

Mr. Feldman added that the use the applicant is proposing is less innocuous than the recycling operation that would have been there; that they are all in the same vein and all within the administrative minimal change he would concur with.

Ms. Bennett moved, second by Mr. Cieleuszko, that the Planning Board approve PB17-21 as an administrative change to an existing conditional use permit on the subject property, with the same terms and conditions applied.

VOTE

3-0

**Acting Chair votes in the
affirmative**

There was discussion regarding whether this decision could be appealed.

Mr. Feldman said that this administrative change could be appealed to the BOA but that would be more of an administrative appeal rather than an appeal to the PB's approval; that it would be a determination as to whether the determination was correct.

Mr. Lentz said that the application stands approved and there is a 30-day period from which the PB decision can be appealed by an aggrieved person or parties – move forward but move forward cautiously.

D. Application for a Request for Planning Board Action to amend a previously-approved site plan (PB17-1) by establishing a non-profit medical marijuana caregiver operation in the existing 30' X 150' structure located at 495 Harold L. Dow Highway. Applicants are Hughes & Kristin Pope (mailing address: 43 Creek Crossing, Eliot, Maine 03903). Owner is The Flower Company Properties, Inc. (mailing address: 483 Harold L. Dow Highway, Eliot, Maine 03903) Property can be identified as Map 53/Lot 6 and is located in the Commercial/Industrial Zoning District. (PB17-9)

Received: July 1, 2017

1st Heard: July 18, 2017

Public Hearing: September 19, 2017

2nd Hearing: September 19, 2017 (Tabled while applicant pursued BOA waiver)

Site Walk: N/A

Approval: November 21, 2017

Hughes and Kristin Pope were present for this application.

Mr. Lentz clarified that the Hughes have been before the PB twice and that this is not to be confused with the marijuana legislation going through the State house right now; that they are not asking us to be able to grow marijuana, as they are permitted and licensed; that what they're asking for is to be able to change the location from where they do business, today, to another location, asking the applicant if he was correct.

Mr. Pope agreed that he was correct.

Mr. Lentz invited the applicants to explain where they are in this process; that at the last meeting we waived one of the requirements and sent the applicants to the BOA to see what they had to say about the other. He asked the applicants to bring the PB up-to-date.

Mr. Pope that we were at the BOA a few nights ago and, prior to that, we were here with two issues at hand; that one was Mr. Galen's property, which is 505 Harold Dow Highway, and that was sorted out in our first meeting here; that the second issue was about the Pubic Works property across the street from 495 Harold Dow Highway, which is where Ms. Pope and he would like to have their business. He added that because it is a horseshoe-shaped property the far end of the horseshoe left us in compliance with the

existing ordinance, which is 500 feet (502 feet), but the short end of the horseshoe, which is directly across the street from them, that currently has piles of debris and things as the Town is doing some work moving earth, and such, and the dimension was, as he recalled, 347 feet; that our request to the BOA was a 50% reduction, which would give us relief in the form of a dimensional waiver, not a variance, and we were approved on that 4-1. He clarified that the person who voted it down wasn't saying he wasn't supportive of what we wanted to do but not supportive of the 50% reduction; that he wanted a 30% or 35% reduction. He said that the reason we asked for a 50%, and not 30%, was that not knowing exactly what space we would need in the future (we use dirt to grow our plants and that takes a lot of space) and, not knowing if we would need to use some of that buffer between the Public Works and existing building, it seemed like a good idea to do that in advance. He added that we are back here, tonight, asking for approval, with the recommendation of the BOA.

Mr. Lentz said that, for Mr. Cieleuszko's benefit, we have been through this several times and there were two issues, one of which we resolved and the other that they resolved at the BOA.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that he had some questions to get him up to speed. He asked if they would have outdoor gardens.

Mr. Pope said no, indoor.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that, currently, to keep that 500 feet, the applicant has room to expand his building.

Mr. Pope said that there is no plan to expand the building.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that this application is for an existing structure.

Mr. Pope said yes.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that it was an aside for the additional room the applicant got from the BOA, that you might be able to expand later.

Mr. Pope said should we ever need it.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked about the water system.

Mr. Pope said that they were working with the owner on that; that he hopes to be recycling the water; that there's no synthetic, chelated salt in it, so, some sort of resin filter so that we can actually re-use that water; that that's our goal.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if they had a current business with indoor gardening, right now, somewhere else.

Mr. Pope said yes.

Mr. Cieleszko asked about issues with abutters.

Mr. Pope said that they had one issue with an abutter; that he happens to be an older gentleman who apparently, through word of the landowner that he would be renting from, does not have a problem with what he is doing; that that issue was worked through.

Mr. Cieleszko asked of the PB that the record shows that there was no actual abutter that complained; that this was a family member.

Mr. Lentz said that there is a letter in the file.

Ms. Bennett reviewed the checklist. It was determined that the applicant should provide a site plan, 11X17 format, and indicate what the land uses are and who the abutters are.

Mr. Pope said that he believes that was submitted; that all of the abutters were on the map.

It was determined that there were 10 packets, with full-sized plans, previously submitted.

Mr. Feldman said that it was his understanding that this applicant had been before the PB on several occasions and that they went to the BOA for their variance and that was the last issue that really needed to be addressed. He added that his email conversation with Mr. Pope the other day was simply that this PB could approve this conditionally upon that variance being recorded in the Registry of Deeds; that that was the last issue, as he understood, that needed to be put to bed.

Mr. Lentz said that there was one other that he thought should be a condition – the State Fire Marshall; that the Fire Chief has brought that up in a letter. He added that he had nothing else.

Ms. Bennett moved, second by Mr. Cieleszko, that the Planning Board approve PB17-9, as presented, with the following conditions of approval:

1. The property may be developed and used only in accordance with the plans, documents, material submitted, and representations of the applicant made to the Planning Board. All elements and features of the use as presented to the Planning Board are conditions of approval and no changes in any of those elements or features are permitted unless such changes are first submitted to and approved by the Eliot Planning Board.
2. The permit is approved on the basis of information provided by the applicant in the record regarding the ownership of the property and boundary location. The applicant has the burden of ensuring that they have the legal right to use the property and that they are measuring required setbacks from the legal boundary

lines of the lot. The approval of this permit in no way relieves the applicant of this burden. Nor does this permit approval constitute a resolution in favor of the applicant of any issues regarding the property boundaries, ownership, or similar title issues. The permit holder would be well-advised to resolve any such title problems before expending money in reliance on this permit.

3. The applicant authorizes inspection of premises by the Code Enforcement Officer during the term of the permit for the purposes of permit compliance.
4. The applicant will receive a permit from the State Fire Marshall.
5. The applicant will submit a copy of the variance recorded in the Registry of Deeds.

VOTE

3-0

**Acting Chair votes in the
affirmative**

Mr. Lentz said that the application stands approved and there is a 30-day period from which the PB decision can be appealed by an aggrieved person or parties – move forward but move forward cautiously.

E. Application for a Shoreland Zoning permit to install a boat slip system at 20 Old Cottage Lane. Applicant is Peter Spencer (mailing address: 415 US Route 1, Site 6, Freeport, Maine 04032). Owners are Paul and Kristine Nadeau (mailing address: 13 Madison Avenue, Kingston, NH 03848). Property can be identified as Map 50/Lot 5 and is located in the Shoreland Zoning District. (PB17-23)

Received: July 1, 2017

1st Heard: November 21, 2017

Public Hearing: _____

2nd Hearing: _____

Site Walk: N/A

Approval: _____

Mr. (Peter) Spencer (Waterman Marine) was present for this application.

Mr. Spencer said that this request consists of a fixed pier, which is 6'X42', joined by a seasonal ramp of 45'X4' leading to two 8'X20' floats, arranged in a perpendicular fashion with the short side parallel to the shore so that it stretches out into the river; that it would be capped off by a 12'X30' seasonal float at the end. He added that we have made application for permits from the Maine DEP for a Tier III application for the structure going into the intertidal zone; that we have also received a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE), both copies of which should be in the PB's files. He said that the last requirement that we have is to appear before the PB to obtain the approval of the Town for a conditional use permit for this structure.

Mr. Cielezsko asked if the State used this drawing to okay the dock system.

Mr. Spencer said absolutely; that this is standard procedure in the marine construction business; that the ACE did the same.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if the floats were always in the water.

Mr. Spencer said no; that they are seasonal and come out.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if they hit the mud at low tide.

Mr. Spencer said that the first one from the ramp will likely sit on mud floats - have skids on them and be elevated from the mud; that the second one he thinks should be in water.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if they were posted so the whole thing won't lay in mud.

Mr. Spencer no; that there are skids on the bottom that keep the float off the substrate.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if that was included in the damage area.

Mr. Spencer said that that was correct; that it was included in our application. He added that the skids are 4'X8'.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if the large outcrop was a rock.

Mr. Spencer said yes; that it's a very large boulder – about 10 feet across and 4½ feet high and we are going to use it.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if there were any planned changes to the front yard.

Mr. Spencer said no; that there is a 4'X6' on-ramp, which will go in at right angles to the hill joining the pier.

Mr. Lentz asked about frontage on the water.

Mr. Spencer said that it is 120'; that we are 60' feet from one side and 54' from the other, pretty much in the middle. He added that we are well-within the riparian lines and have no issue with that.

Mr. Lentz asked if they were clearing trees.

Mr. Spencer said no; that they were taking down nothing and they were not moving vegetation.

Ms. Bennett asked if the abutters were notified in their ACE application.

Mr. Spencer said yes; that they all received notice by certified mail.

Mr. Ciesleszko said that there is a missing abutter on the submitted plan; that whoever's land is across from the circle is actually an abutter.

Ms. Bennett asked if they would provide the list of abutters that accompanied their ACE application, as that would be useful for our files.

Mr. Spencer asked if this would require a public hearing.

Ms. Lemire said yes.

It was agreed the abutter's list would be needed for the public hearing.

Mr. Spencer said that there is a copy of the abutters and the certified mail in the application to the MEDEP, which we filed with the Town.

Mr. Lentz asked Ms. Lower to make sure we have that.

Ms. Lower agreed.

Ms. Bennett said that, if it's not too much trouble, could the applicant add on to the plan the abutter across the circle (south), given that that is the way we define an abutter.

Mr. Spencer agreed.

The Public Hearing was scheduled for December 19th. It was agreed that there was no need for a site walk.

ITEM 7 – DISCUSS STATUS OF OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS

There was discussion regarding submission of Notice of Decision letters going forward.

There was also discussion regarding outstanding applications:

PB17-16

PB17-19

PB17-20

ITEM 8 – CORRESPONDENCE AND PLANNING ASSISTANT, AS NEEDED

Mr. Lentz discussed the **Sylvester memo**. He said that Mr. Sylvester is right and we are wrong; that we had scheduled a site walk for a Saturday morning and there were only two people that showed up. He added that Mr. Sylvester wrote a scathing letter and reminded us that we wasted his time, as well as ours. He said that he thought we ought to get Mr. Sylvester back as soon as we can and he thinks this should be passed on to Mr. Duncan, when he's back, as it was addressed to him; that Mr. Sylvester is looking for a response.

Ms. Lemire asked if they were going to re-schedule the site walk.

Mr. Lentz said that they will wait until Mr. Duncan is back.; that Mr. Sylvester is looking for the PB to waive that.

The PB agreed that a site walk should be done; that this will be discussed at the next meeting on December 5th.

Ms. Lower said that Mr. Sylvester notified her that he may be attending the next PB meeting.

Mr. Lentz said that, when we have a **posting for a public hearing**, he would love to see the receipt that comes back from the newspaper that tells us that it went in and when. He added that he thought that should be a standard part of our packets.

Ms. Lower agreed.

Mr. Cieleuszko added that registered letters should be part of that, too.

The PB agreed.

Ms. Lower said that what she did, for the time being, for this is that she just printed out what the newspaper had and she has the email correspondence between her and the newspaper; that next time she will request if we could somehow receive their receipt of this.

Mr. Lentz asked that the date it was published is on the bottom.

Ms. Lower said that that was correct; that you can find them in the files.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked, for clarification, on abutter lists and receipts, that only goes out once at the beginning and it's the abutter's responsibility to keep in touch for the rest of any other action.

Mr. Lentz said yes.

Mr. Feldman said that, not knowing what the PB had received in the past or what you want to receive in the future – that you've certainly asked for some things tonight and we can take care of that going forward – he doesn't know if you have ever received **memos regarding the projects**; that he doesn't know what his time commitment is because he does six other towns but, if he has the ability, he can prepare a memo for the PB going over the project and any issues that might pop up. He said he will see what he can do, going forward; that that's what he does with the other communities he works for; that there's some sort of project description that kind of outlines it for you, any issues, and then any recommendations on next steps or recommendations for suggested conditions of approval.


Mr. Lentz agreed that that would be helpful.

ITEM 9 – SET AGENDA AND DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

The next regular Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for December 5, 2017 at 7PM.

ITEM 10 – ADJOURN

There was a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 PM.



Denny Lentz, Acting Chair
Date approved: 12/19/2017

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary