

ITEM 1 - ROLL CALL

Present: Dennis Lentz - Chairman, Jeff Duncan, Larry Bouchard, Greg Whalen, Ed Cieleuszko, and Christine Bennett – Alternate.

Absent: Melissa Horner – Alternate (excused).

Voting members: Dennis Lentz, Larry Bouchard, Greg Whalen, and Ed Cieleuszko.

NOTE: Ms. Bennett was appointed as a voting member. Mr. Duncan will be leaving after tonight and will not be involved in any of the new decisions made with the new applications tonight.

ITEM 2 – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM 3 – MOMENT OF SILENCE

ITEM 4 – 10-MINUTE PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

There was no one from the public who spoke.

ITEM 4 – REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES

Mr. Bouchard moved, second by Mr. Duncan, to approve the minutes of September 19, 2017, as amended.

VOTE
3-0-2 (Whalen, Cieleuszko)
Chair concurs in the affirmative

Mr. Duncan moved, second by Ms. Bennett, to table the minutes of October 17, 2017, until the application name issue is confirmed.

VOTE
2-0-3 (Bouchard, Whalen, Cieleuszko)
Chair concurs in the affirmative

Mr. Cieleuszko moved, second by Ms. Bennett, to approve the minutes of November 21, 2017, as amended.

VOTE
2-0-3 (Bouchard, Whalen, Duncan)
Chair concurs in the affirmative

ITEM 5 – REVIEW “NOTICE OF DECISION” LETTERS

- **Albert (PB17-13)**

Ms. Bennett moved, second by Mr. Duncan, that the Albert Notice of Decision letter be accepted, as amended.

VOTE

3-0-2 (Whalen, Cieleuszko)

Chair concurs in the affirmative

- **Camp (PB17-5)**

After discussion, it was agreed that this letter would be held until the original application letter was done. There was also discussion regarding creating a Notice of Decision letter for every PB application decision made. It was determined that a Notice of Decision would be created for every application decision.

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

A. PUBLIC HEARING and continued review of an application for a Shoreland Zoning permit to construct a 6’X42’ timber pier with a 4’X6’ access landing, a 4’X45’ seasonal ramp, two (2) 8’X20’ seasonal floats, and one (1) 12’X30’ seasonal float located on the property at 20 Old Cottage Lane. Applicant is Peter Spencer (mailing address: 475 US Route 1, Site 6, Freeport, Maine 04032). Owners are Paul and Kristine Nadeau (mailing address: 13 Madison Avenue, Kingston, NH 03548). Property can be identified as Map 50/Lot 5 and is located in the Shoreland Zoning District and Suburban Zoning District. (PB17-23)

Received: July 1, 2017

1st Heard: November 21, 2017

Public Hearing: December 19, 2017

2nd Hearing: December 19, 2017

Site Walk: N/A

Approval: December 19, 2017

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

Mr. Lentz noted that, in our packets, we do have confirmation of a fee being paid and that it was posted in the newspaper. He added that that is what we asked for and he expects that to be in all packets from now on.

7:31 PM Public Hearing opened.

Mr. Spencer said that it is our intention to construct a dock system at 20 Old Cottage Lane, consisting of a 6’X42’ timber pier, a 4’X45’ seasonal ramp connected to two (2) 8’X20’ seasonal floats going out into the river, and capped off by one (1) 12’X30’ float at the end. He added that the float system is secured by moorings.

There was no one from the public who spoke.

7:32 PM Public Hearing closed.

Mr. Lentz said that the last time we heard this application the PB was looking for a list of abutters.

Mr. Cieleszko said that that has been completed and everybody is recorded as having letters sent to them.

Mr. Lentz said that that has been taken care of. He asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Cieleszko said that he had asked Mr. Spencer about the floats sitting in the mud last time; that the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) had identified only 2 feet...in the project description and the summary, it calls for 1,112 feet to be affected by shading of the dock system of the natural habitat and direct impact was very little.

Mr. Spencer said that that was because of the diameter of the piles.

Mr. Cieleszko asked if they (ACE) were under the assumption that those floats are not going to hit the mud.

Mr. Spencer said no; that they are talking about the structure, explaining that, if it's part of the structure, it has a fixed impact; that there is an indirect impact if the float goes up and down.

Mr. Cieleszko asked if that was their standard way of looking at it.

Mr. Spencer agreed that's to his recollection.

Mr. Cieleszko asked even if it's hitting the mud it's still just considered shading.

Mr. Spencer said that floats have skids on them, so they are elevated from the mud, and what touches the mud is the skid, itself; that skids do the same thing as posts.

Mr. Bouchard asked if the riparian lines have been addressed.

Mr. Cieleszko said that, in the last meeting, Mr. Spencer had said that there was no encroachment on the riparian lines but it doesn't show it on the grids.

Mr. Bouchard said that, normally, that's drawn up on the plans, but he guessed if the rest of the PB is good with that...

Mr. Cieleszko said that, through the rough drawing that's there, it looks like he makes it; that he's not sure that he likes it, or not; that he brought that up last time, too.

Ms. Bennett said that the applicant, on the application, had written down that there were 2 seasonal floats that were 12'X30', asking if they were 12'X20''.

Mr. Spencer said that they were 8'X20' and there is a 12'X30' seasonal float at the end.

Mr. Cieleuszko moved, second by Ms. Bennett, that the Planning Board approve PB17-23, 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. Applicant will submit a plan showing that the riparian lines requirement has been met.

VOTE

3-0-2 (Whalen, Duncan)

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.

Mr. Spencer clarified that the address was 475 US Route 1, not 415.

B. Continued Review for Planning Board Action to amend a previously-approved Site Plan by adding a 2-car garage, with office space above to the existing structure, an addition of a second driveway to the north side of the lot extending to Route 236, and the installation of a lighted sign at the same location as the previous sign located at 43 Harold L. Dow Highway. Applicant is Frank Fortunato (mailing address: PO Box 608, Eliot, Maine 03903). Owner is Amariah Properties (mailing address: PO Box 608, Eliot, Maine 03903). Property can be identified as Map 23/Lot 1 and is located in the Commercial/Industrial Zoning District. (PB17-20)

Received: October 2, 2017

1st Heard: October 17, 2017

Public Hearing: N/A

2nd Hearing: December 19, 2017

Site Walk: N/A
Approval: _____, 2017

Mr. (Frank) Fortunato was present for this application.

Mr. Lentz said that he had noted last time that the applicant needed a driveway permit.

Mr. Fortunato said that the request was for additional information was for the square footage of the total lot size and the square footage of the building, itself. He added that he guessed there was a rule that you can't build more than 50% of the land size for your building. He said that we supplied an additional letter to summarize the square footage.

Mr. Feldman agreed and said that that should be the last page of the PB's current packet; that he believes that was the piece of information that was missing for the PB from the October 17 meeting.

Mr. Bouchard asked if this was the second time the PB has looked at this application.

Mr. Lentz said yes.

Mr. Bouchard asked if these drawings was all that was provided.

Mr. Lentz said yes.

Mr. Bouchard asked what the requirements were for sizing for an application; that they seem to be going smaller and smaller and we have no setbacks, no lot lines, no measurements, no setbacks to the highway, and he doesn't know if that was picked up the last time this was looked at.

Mr. Whalen asked if there was an original site plan on file in the office.

Mr. Lentz said that he could not say; that it wasn't in his packet.

Mr. Whalen said that we often encounter this same dilemma with applications that are filed for the purpose of amending previous site plans; that they either can't be found in the file or, if they are, they are simply sketches based upon precedent of the prior application; that we are continually tasked with the challenge of determining whether or not it requires the applicant to go back and either amend the original site plan if it's actually prepared by a registered engineer or to come up with the financial requirements to prepare a new one. He added that it seems to him, at the very least, the PB should be apprised as to whether or not an original site plan existed and, if so, it ought to be part of that application.

Mr. Feldman said that, after looking, he could not find one in the file; that the only thing he's seen on this application is what the PB has in front of them.

Mr. Fortunato said that there should have been a plan submitted that had all the dimensional drawings for the lot and building; that he didn't bring it with him.

Mr. Whalen said that it is not in the packet and we never got it.

Mr. Feldman said that he didn't know what the original packet had in it as he assumed that packet would have been given to the PB in September, before he arrived. He added that, to answer Mr. Bouchard's question, §33-127 states: "The developer shall submit two originals of a site plan, drawn at a scale not smaller than one inch equals 20 feet, and ten copies reduced to 11 inches by 17 inches,".

Mr. Whalen asked the applicant if he had an original site plan.

Mr. Fortunato said yes. He showed the PB the site plan with him.

Mr. Whalen said that it is from Civil Consultants, he believes; that this project was originally developed by Dennis Smith. He added that this is a copy of the original site plan and recommended to the PB that we utilize this, moving forward, and any changes that are necessary in order to get this application approved be applied to that.

Mr. Fortunato said that he and Thermo Dynamics met recently with the proposed building, existing building, dimensions to the property line, and the highway, commenting that the PB doesn't have it and he didn't bring it with him. He asked if he should submit those drawings.

Mr. Lentz said yes; that we have to have those.

Mr. Fortunato said that he would submit them.

Ms. Bennett said that we do have a landscaping plan and wasn't sure if that was what the applicant was referring to.

Mr. Fortunato said yes.

Ms. Bennett said that it didn't have the scale required by the code nor does it have setbacks from the property lines.

Mr. Bouchard said that he cannot properly review this application with these drawings.

Mr. Feldman said that this did not require a public hearing, suggesting that, if you are willing to hear this at your next meeting, then we could get those plans to you and you would be able to take action at that meeting.

Mr. Lentz said that he would agree to that, asking if the PB members were in agreement with that.

Required documents were determined – 11’X17’ site plan (done by Civil Consultants) with a 1” to 20’ scale with dimensional measurements for property and structure; abutters list; DOT driveway permit; layout of driveway; location and any changes for the signage. There was discussion regarding timeliness of documentation prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Fortunato said that the last time, when his son was here, all we were asked for was a list of dimensions and square footage and, now, he has a laundry list to bring in and he’s not sure why.

Mr. Lentz apologized, explaining that the PB was going through some changes, administratively, and we’re trying hard to keep up; that it’s not easy right now. He added that that was not the applicant’s problem, it’s the PB’s issue that we are dealing with.

Mr. Fortunato said that he had someone drop off those plans that he guessed needed more information; that had he known that, he would have made it more complete. He asked if it needed to be done by civil engineers and not just done by an architect.

Mr. Feldman clarified that there is no requirement that a civil engineer do these plans but that we just need to have that particular information on the plans.

Mr. Fortunato asked how he would get a DOT permit.

Mr. Feldman said that the applicant needs to talk with Maine DOT in Scarborough and let them know you need a driveway opening permit; that they will direct him to the proper paperwork.

It was agreed that the applicant would be put on the agenda for January 16th.

C. Request for Planning Board Action to amend a previously-approved site plan by closing an existing carport structure to make use as a warehouse/office space on property at 16 Arc Road. Applicant/owner is Frank Fortunato (mailing address: PO Box 608, Eliot, Maine 03903). Property is located at Map 45/Lot17 and is located in the Commercial/Industrial Zoning District. (PB17-25)

Received: November 13, 2017

1st Heard: December 19, 2017

Public Hearing: _____

2nd Hearing: _____, 2017

Site Walk: _____

Approval: _____, 2017

The applicant was present for this application.

Mr. Bouchard asked if this was also a change of use.

Mr. Feldman said yes; that it is an open-sided compost building going to an office and warehouse.

Mr. Whalen asked the applicant to walk the PB through the changes being proposed.

Mr. Fortunato said that his intent was to expand 43 Dow Highway, which we just said needs more information; that 16 Arc Road became available so 43 Dow Highway is his back-up plan for the moment. He said that this property has a lot more land (8.1 acres) and 2 acres are buildable. He added that they built this carport, which is a free-standing, steel post structure with a roof on it, used for compost, explaining that they had big piles of compost from local restaurants and, once they screened it, they stored it underneath that carport. He said that he currently has a purchase & sales agreement with the owner with contingencies to clean up this mess and satisfy the Maine DEP to make it suitable to their requirements and the owner has had to submit a plan to do this. He added that, once it's clean and approved, the applicant would sign off on the agreement to buy it. He said that we are an HVAC contractor; that they would enclose the building, once cleaned up, with metal; that two bays would be warehouse and sell shop to work on stuff, a loading dock for machinery coming and going; that we service, sell, and install HVAC; that the other two bays would be office space; that that's a change of use from composting to HVAC service and sales.

Mr. Whalen said that the orange on the site plan involves the installation of a septic system, asking if there was one on-site now.

Mr. Fortunato said that there is nothing on-site – no electricity, no water, no sewer; that the previous site plan was approved for a septic system behind the structure.

Mr. Bouchard asked if we have the approved plans for that septic.

Mr. Fortunato said that it's probably on file with the previous owner.

Mr. Feldman said that that was not submitted as part of this package.

Mr. Bouchard asked if we were going to call this a sketch plan.

Mr. Feldman said yes; that the PB will need to do a site walk and a public hearing on this; that this is an initial submittal.

Mr. Fortunato said that his intent was to see if this change of use is applicable before he buys it; that if this isn't applicable, then he's not going to buy it.

Mr. Whalen said that, going back to original site plans, the applicant has presented what appears to be...it's a stamped site plan, Ambit Engineering dated back in 2013 so, again, when the agenda and application refers to 'amend a previously-approved site plan', we need confirmation that, in fact, what's in our packet is the previously-approved site plan.

Mr. Feldman said yes.

Mr. Whalen said that, with that confirmed, this and in relation to the items that have been explained tonight that have to go on here, this would be your site plan of record to be used with all of the other information that has to be on there. He asked, secondly and more importantly, did he just understand the applicant to say that you have yet to verify whether or not your use for this site is applicable per our current zoning.

Mr. Fortunato said that that was why he was here, to ask if it can be used for it.

Mr. Feldman said that it can, yes.

Mr. Whalen asked why that would not have been resolved prior to this gentleman being here tonight.

Mr. Feldman said that he didn't know; that this is an application that was left for him to deal with and he apologized. He added that that was the first thing he did when he looked at this application – check the use categories to see if it was even allowed, and it is.

Mr. Whalen said that you can confirm, tonight, that the applicant's intended use for this site is per our current zoning.

Mr. Feldman said yes, he could; that if it weren't and wasn't allowed, he certainly wouldn't have allowed it to get to the PB.

Mr. Fortunato asked if we could safely say that you are comfortable that he can use it for his intended use.

Mr. Whalen said that there are two different issues in terms of you being here this evening; that the CEO is the chief use officer, if you will, of the Town, not the PB; that once the use has been verified, the PB deals with the site review process of making certain that the documentation for the applicant's approved use falls in concert with our current zoning laws. He explained that we jump off where the use ended and now we're just dealing with documentation of the plan, itself.

Mr. Fortunato asked if he needed to submit a new site plan, even though the information on it is the same.

Mr. Whalen said yes.

Mr. Ciesleszko said that this is not an adequate layout for what you're proposing and what you're proposing might not be exactly what you get, if it doesn't fit the ordinances; that the applicant needs to supply a better, more detailed drawing of what you're proposing; that, as an example, the parking spaces are unintelligible to proceed.

Mr. Lentz said that one of the questions would be how many employees the applicant intends to have working there, as we determine the number of parking spaces needed.

Mr. Whalen said, again, in the normal course of action in these types of things it is just a recommendation; that we are not in the business, typically, of providing recommendations, per se, but since John Chagnon at Ambit Engineering prepared this original document, they've got everything on file. He added that, rather than have this duplicated by someone else, typically, your best course of action would be to go back to Mr. Chagnon at Ambit Engineering and ask him to update this for proper Board review; that he has been before this Board and is very familiar with what is required.

Mr. Feldman said that Ms. Lemire is making a copy of the information from the ordinance that would be part of that checklist that shows what needs to be on the plan.

It was clarified that Mr. Fortunato is not the owner, yet, of the property and that there is a purchase & sales agreement with the application; that the application needs to reflect who the owner is.

Ms. Bennett asked if the applicant intended to make this a retail location.

Mr. Fortunato said no; that it is strictly commercial/industrial; that we go to government jobs, industrial institutions; that we go to the buildings, service equipment, and install or replace it. He added that we sometimes bring things in to work on for the customer and have machinery coming and going.

Mr. Feldman said that, just to confirm for the PB and Mr. Fortunato, 'professional office' in the C/I Zone is a site plan review (SPR) and both 'warehousing and wholesale business facilities' is also a SPR.

It was determined that the applicant got a copy of the checklist.

Mr. Lentz said that that was generally what we go by; that if you've got that information, you should be okay.

Mr. Fortunato asked if he could keep the septic design approval where it is.

The PB said yes, if there's no change to it.

Mr. Lentz asked if the applicant was going to put in water.

Mr. Fortunato said yes, a well.

It was determined the applicant should show the well location and the proper parking.

Mr. Whalen asked if he was planning to expand the width of the driveway at all coming in.

Mr. Fortunato said that the driveway width is on the approved, original plan and he is going to stay with that.

Mr. Bouchard said that the reason for that is that the Fire Chief will be very interested in that to make sure his equipment can get in and out of there.

Ms. Lemire said that, once the application is complete, a copy of that will go to the Fire Chief for his review and comment and he will get back to the PB with that.

Mr. Fortunato said that there should be a dimension on the plan that the PB has.

Mr. Whalen said that it might be a good idea to check with Mr. Chagnon before the applicant gets too far to make sure that hasn't changed; that the Fire Chief will want a 360-degree access around the building.

Mr. Fortunato said that, maybe as of today, there is actually compost behind that building but they are aggressively removing it as we speak.

Mr. Lentz asked the applicant to let the PB know when he is ready to come back and we will get him on the agenda.

D. Application for Shoreland Zoning Permit to construct a 6'X40" fixed pier, a 3'X40' gangway, and an 8'X50' float located by moorings on property located at 252 Pleasant Street. Applicant is Riverside & Pickering Marine Contractors (mailing address: 195 West Road, Portsmouth, NH 03801). Owner is Douglas MacMillan (mailing address: 252 Pleasant Street, Eliot, Maine 03903). Property is located in the Village District and can be identified as Map 3, Lot 39. (PB17-24)

Received: _____, 2017
1st Heard: December 19, 2017
Public Hearing: _____
2nd Hearing: _____, 2017
Site Walk: N/A
Approval: _____, 2017

Mr. (Zach) Taylor, Riverside & Pickering, was present for this application.

Mr. Feldman said that he prepared a memo for the PB regarding this application but it did not make it into the packets.

Mr. Taylor said that this is a tidal docking structure off the owner's property; that there is an existing decrepit stairwell and a small docking structure on the shore, which will be removed, and you can see on the plan to the south. He added that the proposed dock will be centered in the middle of the parcel and is essentially in character with the other docking structures that are along Pleasant Avenue; that it is much smaller than the docks directly to the north, which projects quite a distance farther out into the river than the

south. He said that it was a standard, heavy duty timber design, a 6'X80' fixed pier, a 3'X40' aluminum gangway, and an 8'X50' moored float; that there would be an access ramp heading down through the break in the embankment to access the pier and, then, on the north side an access stair built so the owner can actually get down to the shoreline when needed. He said that we have submitted to Maine DEP, Army Corps of Engineers (ACE), Maine Historic Preservation Commission, and the 5 Native American Tribes; that he met with DEP on-site and they are looking to write the approval for this current design; that the ACE has approved the project.

Mr. Lentz said that he wanted the PB to take notice of the reply back from the Public Works Director. The applicant was given a copy.

Mr. Taylor commented that his understanding is that there is funding in the works and asked if they had submitted permits to DEP to do the stabilization.

Ms. Lemire that this is part of the Stormwater and they have been working on it for a while.

Mr. Taylor said that he wondered if the DPW was asking him to piggyback or is that something that needs to be added to his plans.

Mr. Feldman suggested Mr. Taylor might want to coordinate with Mr. Moulton and see what he might have for plans or information on that.

Mr. Bouchard said that it looks like the applicant will need to coordinate for that and the timing.

Mr. Taylor agreed, saying that he's seen some of the docks with new accessways down there so the preference would be to do it after Mr. Moulton is done.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that, regarding the letter from an abutter to repair a riparian line encroachment, maybe this is for the PB but that does not clear the end of the dock being too close to that riparian line; that he's assuming that the applicant has to go to the Board of Appeals (BOA) for a variance and the letter supplied in the packet would be helpful to the BOA in their decision. He added that the PB cannot offer any waiver to those. He said that the executor of that abutting property ok'd the building.

Mr. Bouchard said that he believed, under ordinance, that that's okay; that if an agreement was made and it was filed, then it's okay. He said that he would find it.

Mr. Cieleuszko asked if the applicant just needed the approval from the DEP written up and sent.

Mr. Taylor said yes, that he sent the final information that she had requested in her request for more information; that that made it sound like there was a pending approval letter coming. He added that she said she was trying to wrap it up this week.

Mr. Bouchard said that the pertinent section was 44-35 (c) (11), *“All parts of piers, wharves, floats, and pilings shall have side setbacks of at least 25 feet from riparian lines determined using the procedure described in note 4 below. If abutting property owners reach a mutual agreement regarding structures which have a lesser setback, that lesser setback may be approved if the applicant agrees to record any ensuing permit (having that agreement as a condition), in the York County Registry of Deeds.”*

Mr. Lentz said that it is allowed with that letter of consent and we should make it a condition of approval.

Mr. Cielszko discussed his disagreement and said that it still needed a variance for a dimensional standard.

Mr. Feldman said that he would disagree since it's in the ordinance; that it's pretty clear.

Mr. Taylor said that he didn't know if it mattered but he knows there are at least a couple that he's gone through the PB with this exact issue.

Ms. Lemire agreed, saying that she thinks the big deal is that it's recorded at the Registry so it's a permanent change.

It was agreed there was no need for a site walk and that the Public Hearing would be held January 16th.

Ms. Bennett asked if we should alert Mr. Moulton that we're going to have a public hearing on this; that she didn't know if the PB wanted to hear from him on that; that it is sort of a caveat emptor for the applicant, as the Town is going to be doing some stabilization there.

Mr. Lentz said that he was sure that the applicant, when he comes back, could tell us what Mr. Moulton had to say.

Mr. Taylor said yes; that he thinks he's going to work around what the DPW is doing.

ITEM 7 – DISCUSS STATUS OF OUTSTANDING ACTION ITEMS

Mr. Bouchard has a new email address.

Mr. Lentz sent an action list to the Town Manager with 12 – 13 items; that about half of those have been completed and updated. He added that, after tonight, he will write some new ones and he will keep a running list going so that you know where we are. He also discussed outstanding Notices of Decision, saying that he, personally, is not going to chase them down from a Board standpoint, that there's plenty of people to do that so he will put it on the action list for the Town Manager. He also said that there is the Sylvester Memo regarding the site walk most of us missed.

Mr. Whalen asked what was left to discuss on that letter Mr. Sylvester submitted.

Mr. Lentz said that he wanted us to waive something.

Mr. Whalen said that he wanted us to waive the site walk and he believes the PB, by consensus, did that; that he doesn't know what is remaining on that.

Mr. Lentz said that he needs to come back; that it was his understanding that Mr. Sylvester was away the last time we tried to contact him. He also said to Mr. Feldman that, looking through the minutes, there was a note there about project memos and you were going to help us with that as your time was available.

Mr. Feldman said that, going forward, he would provide memos; that he did draft a memo on this particular application (dock system) and didn't know why it didn't get to you folks but there is still time for that memo. He added that he will provide a memo to the PB for any new application going forward.

Mr. Lentz said that a couple of years ago we had asked Ms. Pelletier to create a checklist, that has been very helpful to the PB, for each of those applications just as it would be for us to look through the ordinances ourselves. He added that he didn't know about anyone else but it was a tremendous help and asked if we could get back doing that again.

Mr. Cieleuszko said that he thinks it's a help to the applicant, too.

Mr. Bouchard agreed.

Ms. Bennett said that she would love a blank one so that we could fill it in ourselves.

Mr. Feldman said that part of his concern is that he is holding down the fort; that he has seen what was created for the PB, previously, and he thinks it's very well done but it's very difficult for him to get into that flow and to use that. He added that he will take the checklist that's in the ordinance and make it a little easier to follow and understand so that you can just go right down through the list to make sure things are there or that waivers have been requested for submission information; that he will make sure the PB gets blank copies of that.

Mr. Lentz said that, even if we had it as a template, then we wouldn't need it filled out for each application; that we could do our own and that would help.

Mr. Feldman agreed he could do that.

Mr. Bouchard said that whoever put the packets together for tonight's meeting was perfect, with everything in order and lined up; that that was a big help. He asked someone to get a thank-you to her.

Ms. Bennett said that getting them in advance was very helpful for her.

There was further discussion regarding the transition and how it was improving.

Ms. Bennett asked if the by-laws will be brought up at the next meeting.

Mr. Feldman said that he did get a copy and that the PB should have copies in their packet; that he added comments in red.

Mr. Lentz said that we will try to get them in at the workshop.

Ms. Lemire asked what the PB wanted to do with the Growth Permit Summary letter.

Ms. Bennett said that we were supposed to review the reports no later than June 30th and submit our summarized findings no later than July 30th. She added that we are now in the next cycle and we didn't propose any changes to the permits; that we might want to make a note to get these surveys out earlier this year so that we can review no later than June 30th and make a summary of our findings no later than July 30th.

ITEM 8 – CORRESPONDENCE AND PLANNING ASSISTANT, AS NEEDED

This was not discussed.

ITEM 9 – SET AGENDA AND DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

The next regular Planning Board Meeting is scheduled for January 2, 2018 at 7PM.

ITEM 10 – ADJOURN

There was a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 PM.

S/ Dennis Lentz, Chair

Date approved: 02/06/2018

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary