

**TOWN OF KITTERY, MAINE
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
Council Chambers**

APPROVED
March 25, 2010

Meeting called to order at 6:11 p.m.

Board Members Present: David Kelly, Michael Luekens, Joseph Carleton, Russell White

Members absent: Scott Lincoln, George Burke, Ernest Evancic

Staff: Gerry Mylroie, Town Planner

Minutes: March 11, 2010 Planning Board Meeting

Mr. Luekens moved to accept the minutes as presented

Mr. Kelly seconded

Motion carries by all members present

Chairman White announced that there will not be a quorum available for review of Item 5 as Mr. Carleton must recuse himself.

PUBLIC COMMENT – There was no public comment. Susan Emery asked if members of the public will be permitted to speak during the Mitchell School item review.

ITEM 1 - Amendments to Title 16 Land Use and Development Code – Shoreland, Resource Protection and Related Zoning Amendments. – Public Hearing/Review/Decision. The mandatory Shoreland Zoning Act, (38 M.R.S. Section 435-449) and guidelines from the Maine Board of Environmental Protection require municipalities to adopt shoreland/resource protection zoning law consistent with, or no less stringent than, the minimum requirements. A proposed amendment to the Code including the Zoning Map incorporates the requirements into Kittery's Municipal Code. The amendment must be reviewed by the Planning Board and recommended to the Town Council for adoption. **Mr. Carleton** commented the Board has reviewed complicated changes to this Title and asked what 2 or 3 proposed changes are the most problematic. **Mr. Mylroie** summarized the mandatory state requirements for code compliance, specifically referencing the state's required changes to zone density that may be more restrictive than the existing code. Discussion followed. **Mr. Carleton** stated he wanted to review items in this amendment that are discretionary, as the Board cannot address changes that are mandated. **Mr. Mylroie** stated there is little discretionary amendment language, except administrative changes, noting the level at which the Board reviews lighting plans.

Mr. Kelly moved to approve the amendments to Title 16 Land Use and Development Code, including those related to the State of Maine shoreland zoning, resource protection, the Town's land use zoning map and other provisions to the Town Council with recommendation to adopt.

Mr. Carleton seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Mr. Carleton noted this item was a public hearing and not opened. **Chairman White** opened the Public Hearing at 6:28 p.m.

Ken Markley, Easterly Surveying, commented on the 1999 conditions of approval from the State noting the increased lot size requirements is not in keeping with the Town's Comprehensive Plan. Discussion followed regarding whether the 1999 conditions can be changed, whether the State's determination was based on a formula or a 'one-size-fits-all' determination, and given the conditions were not adopted in the code, the areas under review have been developed to the less restrictive standards, including municipal sewer and water. **Mr. Carleton** suggested the Council be made aware the State is requiring these 1999 conditions be included in this amendment to the Code.

Mr. Carleton moved to reconsider the previous motion made to recommended the proposed Amendment changes to the Council

Chairman White seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Ken Markley spoke again regarding the density of lot areas on Badgers Island and how the per dwelling unit requirement will restrict future development. Discussion followed regarding why, after 10 years and successful compliance with the local Comprehensive Plan, the 1999 conditions are now being imposed.

Mr. Mylroie responded the Town would have to comply to be eligible for state funded projects. Further discussion continued regarding the restrictive density at Kittery Foreside as required by the State.

The Public Hearing closed at 6:39 p.m.

Mr. Carleton moved the Board approve the Amendments to Title 16 Land Use Development Code including those related to State required shoreland zoning, resource protection, the Town's Land Use Zoning Map, and other provisions, and to forward the proposed amendments to the Town Council with recommendation to adopt, except as to the increased density requirements in the downtown (Foreside Zone) which appear to be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and except as to the per unit density and frontage requirements on Badgers Island.

Mr. Luekens seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

ITEM 2 -Pettigrew Road Right of Way Plan Amendment – Public Hearing/Review/Decision. – Gary E. And Angela E. Hayward, owners of 16 Shade Tree Lane, propose an extension of an existing right-of-way to enable the division of land into two lots. The right-of way is located off Wilson Lane in the Rural Residential Zone and recorded as Map 54.4A. The owner's agent is Ken Markley with Easterly Surveying. **Ken Markley** summarized the amendment request and the work completed to date, and requested a minimum road width for the last 250 feet to minimize impact on the existing stone wall and wetland. A turnaround will be provided for safety equipment. **Mr. Markley** summarized the two waiver requests: street length and reduction of road width on the last segment of road, approximately 250 feet.

The Public Hearing opened at 7:03 p.m.

Niles Pinkham, asked how a road can be built without Board review and approval. As the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Church at Spruce Creek, over whose property the ROW crosses, there is concern about the condition of the existing road and whether the road will be expanded in the areas where overgrowth has reduced its width. **Mark Daniels**, abutter, Map 54 Lot 4B, stated he is in favor of this request, but is not supportive of the process in which the applicant has proceeded because he did not receive the necessary approvals from the Planning Board prior to work on the road in a wetland area. The CEO was advised of the road construction, met with the Planner and applicant, but the construction continued without further review. This will be the third ROW extension granted at this roadway. Were any wetlands filled in and, if so, was there mitigation provided elsewhere on the property? What is the required wetland setback for the road? Had the project started with the necessary review as it should have, had it been stopped when brought to the attention of the Town as it should have, and had the applicant followed the review process as required by ordinance, he would be in favor of the project. However, because he did not, he is against the project 100%. **Mr. Carleton** asked if there was any negative impact on him. **Mr. Daniels** stated there was no impact. He is simply against the way in which the project has proceeded without review or enforcement.

Chairman White stated he felt the Planning Board could not further consider this item until a determination is made by the CEO as to whether this project is in violation of the Land Use Ordinance. The Board cannot review a project with an ongoing violation. If a consent agreement needs to be

developed, this should be pursued. **Mr. Markley** stated the applicant intends to improve the section of the road referenced by Mr. Pinkham. Mr. Markley suggested the applicant misunderstood his right to extend the ROW to his property, and was unaware of the 10 foot setback from a wetland requirement. The winter construction was planned to minimize impact. The applicant can classify the extension as a driveway instead of a ROW. **Mr. White** stated the Board needs to hear in a letter from the CEO as to whether this project is in violation before they can continue review, and the requested waivers can be considered once a determination is made. **Mr. Mylroie** stated Fire and DPW requested the road be built to town standards, with compaction and an 18 foot width, and the flow of water from the site should also be reviewed.

Niles Pinkham noted his support of narrowing the road to 14 feet to decrease the impact on the wetlands, and reemphasized the need for wetland flagging. **Chairman White** stated no further comment can be considered on this item, but will be allowed after the Board receives further information.

ITEM 3 - Marshall's Rental Center – Preliminary Site Plan – Public Hearing/Review/Decision

Richard Marshall, Owner, proposes to occupy the second floor of a renovated building in addition to the first floor with a total of 1440 SF retail/1590 SF warehouse and 3030 SF office space and re-construct an existing building with 1st floor retail 1,200 SF, second floor office 1,200 SF and 1st floor warehouse 3,750 SF. The development is located at 56 State Road in the Business – Local Zone and recorded as Map 8 Lot 43. The owner's agent is Ken Wood, PE with Attar Engineering.

Mr. Mylroie summarized the issues requiring the Board's review on this item, specifically:

1. Stormwater management;
2. Number of entrances to site;
3. Tent location

Ken Wood stated there is no change to the site other than the addition of parking spaces, and Planning Board approval is required when 6 or more parking spaces are created on a site.

1. Stormwater: The site's stormwater plan was installed in 2003, has not experienced any problems, and the owner cleans the catch basins annually. Since 1987, the impervious surface has decreased by 2,819 sf, thereby reducing runoff. A waiver to the stormwater requirement is requested.
2. Curb cuts: Prior to the DOT work on Route 1, the site had one entrance. Following review by the former Planner, DOT and the applicant, two curb cuts were designed to provide better access and egress for all buildings on the site.
3. Sprinkler system: The reduction in volume is less than the requirement for a sprinkler system, and was confirmed in discussions with the Fire Chief.
4. Tent location: The tent will be added to the site plan as it is a semi-permanent display. The tent will not impact the parking calculations.

There was no public comment. The Public Hearing opened and closed at 7:30 p.m. **Mr. Mylroie** provided further comment regarding the curb cuts, emphasizing increased efficiency with fewer curb cuts. **Mr. Wood** provided the history behind the decision to add two curb cuts and explained the landscape changes that will be made by the applicant, stating these curb cuts were reviewed, approved and built by the Town and the DOT, but just because people change, why should property owners change existing infrastructure. **Mr. Marshall** spoke about the changes along Route 1 from the Golden Harvest. The decision for two curb cuts was made with much thought and consideration, and believes it works best for him. Members concurred that, in a sense of fairness, this is not an issue as the applicant worked with Town staff and State officials to reach the existing design. Discussion followed regarding tent location, lighting and landscaping. **Mr. Mylroie** suggested the Board move to grant preliminary approval with conditions. Members discussed lighting on the site, security lighting and ambient lighting. Following further discussion, members concurred that the location of the proposed light fixtures should be included on the plan, and be limited to 60W bulbs. The applicant stated the business sign had not been illuminated

in the past and will not likely be in the future. **Mr. Luekens** noted the Board does not usually waive lighting plans and was concerned the proposed lighting may not be adequate for safety. It is difficult to determine without a plan to review.

Mr. Carleton moved to waive erosion control endorsement by the York County Soil and Water Conservation District.

Mr. Kelly seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Mr. Carleton moved to waive the stormwater plan requirements.

Mr. Kelly seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Mr. Carleton moved to waive a traffic impact analysis.

Mr. Kelly seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Mr. Carleton moved to grant preliminary approval subject to the following conditions: submission of a landscape plan that conforms with design guidelines; the final plan show the location of light fixtures on buildings; the final plan include a note regarding annual maintenance of catch basins; and the final plan include the tent location.

Mr. Kelly seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

10 minute recess

ITEM 4 - Street Design and Construction Standards Amendments to Title 16 Land Use and Development Code – Public Hearing/Review/Decision. Consider amendments recommended by Town Public Safety officials.

This item was deferred in the interest of time

ITEM 5 - Sluiceway Condominiums- Minor Subdivision/Condominium Ownership – Final Plan Review/Decision. Tudor and James Austin, Owners, propose a four (4) unit condominium development on a 6.25 acre parcel located at 37 Pepperrell Road, situated on Map 18 Lot 22 in the Kittery Point Village (KPV) Zoning District. The owner's agent is Thomas Harmon, PE with Civil Consultants.

Mr. Carleton recused himself. As there was not a quorum of Board members present, this item was deferred to a future meeting.

ITEM 6 – Spruce Creek Subdivision - Major Subdivision/Cluster Development - Final Plan Review/Decision. Terry Gagner, Owner, proposes to construct a 10-lot cluster residential development consisting of single-family dwelling units on ±15.2 acres, Tax Map 38 Lots 13 B through 13 F, situated in the Rural Residential (RR) zoning district. The owner's agent is Thomas Harmon, PE with Civil Consultants.

Mr. Harmon noted the conditions attached to the preliminary plan approval have been completed except for the language relating to the easement between the Weathervane and the Mall to the north of the restaurant. **Chairman White** noted he was not present for the preliminary approval and asked for a brief summary. **Mr. Mylroie** summarized the conditions, specifically the easement language as included in the proposed findings of fact.

Mr. Carleton read the Findings of Fact as follows, relative to the Spruce Creek subdivision:

a. Water and Air Pollution Minimized	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
b. Water Supply Sufficient	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
c. Municipal Water Supply Available	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
d. Erosion Controlled	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
e. Traffic Managed	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
f. Sewage Disposal Provided	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
g. Municipal Solid Waste Disposal Available	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
h. Aesthetic, Cultural and Natural Values Protected	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
i. Local Ordinances and Plans Conformance	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
j. Developer Financially and Technically Capable	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
k. Water Body Quality and Shoreline Protected	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
l. Groundwater Protected	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
m. Flood Areas Identified and Development Conditioned	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
n. Freshwater Wetlands Identified	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
o. River, Stream or Brook Identified	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
p. Stormwater Managed	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining

Now therefore the Kittery Planning Board adopts each of the foregoing Findings of Fact and based on these Findings determines the proposed Development will have no significant detrimental impact, and the Kittery Planning Board hereby votes to grant Approval for the Development at the above referenced property, contingent upon the following conditions as set forth in the Plan Review Notes/Findings of Fact, as being Conditions 1-7.

Vote of 4 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

Accordingly, the Planning Board hereby moves to:

1. Approve the Findings of Fact in the Plan Review Notes/Findings of Fact,
2. Acknowledge their reading,
3. Hereby incorporate them into the meeting minutes,
4. Record their unanimous approval by the Planning Board members present unless otherwise noted,
5. Approve the final plan and authorize the Planning Board Chairman to sign the final plan upon confirmation by the Town Planner of final plan compliance with final plan approval requirements and plan note conditions.

Vote of 4 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

ITEM 7 – Mitchell Elementary School Addition – Site Plan Amendment – Plan Review/Decision.

Owners, Town of Kittery School Board propose an approximately 9,800 square feet gross floor area addition to the existing school building. The proposed expansion is located on School Lane in the Residential - Kittery Point Village (R-KPV) Zone, and recorded as Map 27 Lot 20 and Map 36 Lot 5. The owner's agent is Ken Wood, PE, with Attar Engineering and Mike Lassel, AIA, with Lassel Architects.

Mr. Mylroie summarized actions and changes to date. **Mr. Lassel** noted the existing lighting does not meet dark sky compliance, and the School Department has agreed to change the light heads to comply. The fixtures will be reduced from 175W to 150W and the wall mounted gym fixture will be shielded.

Lew Chamberlain, Attar Engineering, reported the following improvements will be made:

1. a stop sign on Haley Road will be relocated to the right side of the road,

2. School Lane centerline will be striped,
3. a white line striping along the edge of the road and stop bars will be added,
4. a small concrete island will house the stop sign, which will include a breakaway pole.

These items have been approved by the Public Works, Fire and Planning departments.

Susan Emery requested the white birches at the telephone building be retained. **Mr. Chamberlain** explained the large clump of birches sits at the proposed entrance and would have to be removed, but they would endeavor to retain others. **Mr. Lassell** explained the existing design provides the best and safest arrangement for traffic and children.

Jay Allen requested continued access to her lot via Mitchell Lane. **Mr. Lassell** stated a 5 foot gravel path could be put in place for her continued use.

Mr. Luekens inquired about the inclusion of the antenna on the site plan. The future location of the public safety antenna is located on the plan.

Mr. Carleton moved to waive Section 16.32.390G and Section 16.32.470C, York County Soil and Water Conservation District endorsement.

Mr. Kelly seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Mr. Carleton asked if the Board is required by ordinance to grant preliminary plan approval prior to final plan approval. **Mr. Mylroie** stated the Board could consolidate the Preliminary and Final plan approval, and provide the Findings of Fact.

Mr. Kelly moved to consolidate preliminary plan approval with final plan approval at this time

Mr. Carleton seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Mr. Carleton read the Findings of Fact as follows:

The Findings of Fact for the Mitchell School addition, as set forth in the Plan Review Notes/Findings of Fact dated March 15, 2010, based on the entire record before the Planning Board and as pursuant to the applicable standards in the Land Use and Development Code, the Planning Board makes the following factual findings as required by Section 16.36.070.C.1:

(i) Plan Confirms with Local Ordinances and Plans	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(n) Freshwater Wetlands	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(o) River, Stream or Brook	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(b) Sufficient Water	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(c) Municipal Water Supply	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(f) Sewage Disposal Adequate	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(g) Municipal Solid Waste Disposal	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(k) Surface Waters-Outstanding River Segments	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(l) Groundwater Protected	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(m) Flood Areas Identified and Development Conditioned	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(p) Stormwater Managed	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(d) Erosion Controlled	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(e) Traffic	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(a) Pollution	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(h) Aesthetic, Cultural and Natural Values Preserved	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(j) Applicant Financially and Technically Capable	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
(q) No Spaghetti-Lots	Vote of <u>4</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining

Now therefore the Kittery Planning Board adopts each of the foregoing Findings of Fact and based on these Findings determines the proposed Development will have no significant detrimental impact, and the Kittery Planning Board hereby votes to grant Approval for the Development at the above referenced property with waivers granted as noted and contingent upon conditions 1-5 as set forth in the Plan Review Notes/Findings of Fact for the Mitchell School addition dated March 15, 2010.

Vote of 4 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

Accordingly, the Planning Board hereby moves to approve the Findings of Fact in the Plan Review Notes/Findings of Fact, acknowledge their reading, hereby incorporate them in to the meeting minutes, record their unanimous approval by the Planning Board members present unless otherwise noted, approve the preliminary plan with the following conditions and authorize the Planning Board Chairman to sign the final plan upon confirmation by the Town Planner of final plan compliance with final plan approval requirements and plan note conditions.

Vote of 4 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

ITEM 8 - Shapleigh Middle School Addition – Site Plan Amendment – Plan Review/Decision.

Owners, Town of Kittery School Board propose an approximately 10,200 square feet gross floor area addition to the existing school building. The proposed expansion is located on Stevenson Road and Manson Road in the Residential – Rural (R-R) and Residential – Suburban (R-S) Zones, and recorded as Map 37 Lot 3. The owner’s agent is Ken Wood, PE with Attar Engineering and Mike Lassel, AIA with Lassel Associates.

Mr. Mylroie summarized the project status to date, including parking, landscaping, lighting and pedestrian access. A list of activities held at the school was prepared by the School Department, including six large scale activities (ie. the Special Olympics) that would overflow available parking on-site. Possible solutions include:

1. Event sponsors would be required to arrange police detail, off-site parking solutions, and shuttle service.
2. Relocation of the event.
3. Purchase of additional property for overflow parking through bonding.

Mike Lassel spoke to the cost of improvements off site, excluding parking, and the Building Committee’s idea to require a permit for large school events, and test some of the proposed parking solutions for a one year period.

George Dow, Council representative, further supported the permit process, noting the abutters concerns have been addressed for the project before the Board. **Ken Wood** reported a shuttle service has been successfully used in his community. Board members concurred the proposed process needs to be reviewed after a one year period. **Mr. Dow** reminded the Board that there are few events that will exceed the 171 parking spaces, and parking enforcement is through ticketing and towing of violators. Discussion continued regarding parking at different events, typical school days, for voting, etc. Members concurred the amendment, with the proposed parking policy in its draft format, is not ready for final approval. **Mr. Lassel** reminded the Board the project does meet the ordinance parking requirements. The Committee would like to regulate what is in place and enforce the regulations that have not been enforced previously. **Mr. Luekens** asked if there had been serious consideration of purchasing adjoining property. **Mr. Mylroie** explained there was discussion regarding the Linscott property, with an estimated cost of \$400,000 to purchase and build-out. Other possibilities have been discussed as well. The Board discussed remaining items:

1. Lighting: Mr. Mylroie stated lighting was in conformance.
2. Snow removal: Mr. Chamberlain stated snow storage has been provided on site.

Chairman White reminded the applicant the Board is absent three members and final approval would require a unanimous vote of all four members present. **Mr. Lassel** stated they can provide a final policy on school letterhead at the next meeting. **Mr. Luekens** noted this project was advertised as a preliminary

plan review, not as final plan approval, and should be continued to the next meeting in order to provide the abutters with an opportunity to see this project at the final review stage. Members concurred there was substantial progress since the last review and voiced their appreciation of the efforts of the Committee and consultants. This item will be continued at the next scheduled Planning Board meeting.

ITEM 9 – Zoning Map Amendment – BJP Corp. - Application Completeness/Acceptance/Schedule Public Hearing. Bill Conda, owner, proposes a zone boundary change on Tax Map 61 Lot 28 by moving the Mixed Use/Rural Residential boundary currently 1,500 feet from the centerline of US Route One north to 1,250 feet near the southwest corner of US Route 1 and Lewis Road thereby enabling the development of residential units north of Zakayla Lane.

Mr. Mylroie presented the request to the Board. **Chairman White** wondered if this could be considered spot zoning. **Mr. Carleton** suggested each case should be reviewed individually, but zoning is typically not altered unless there is public benefit. **Chairman White** concurred. **Mr. Conda** explained the intent is to protect the abutters by allowing for a single family dwelling rather than a commercial use. New single family dwellings are not permitted in the MU district after April 1, 2004.

Chairman White moved to extend the meeting to 10:15 p.m.

Mr. Luekens seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

Mr. Luekens moved to find the application substantially complete and schedule a public hearing

Mr. Carleton seconded

Motion carries unanimously by all members present

ITEM 10 – York Hospital – Final Site Plan – Stephen Pelletier, Owner, proposes to construct a 28,571 square foot building for York Hospital consisting of 8 medical offices and 4 dwellings units at 35 Walker Street, located on Map 4 Lot 168, situated in the Local Business 1 (**LBI**) and Kittery Foreside (**KF**) Zones, parcel area is ±2.5 acres. The owner's agent is Joseph Cheever, EIT, with Attar Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Mylroie explained the project is ready for final action and approval except for landscaping plan revisions. The traffic study has been satisfactorily reviewed by CMA.

Chairman White requested the Findings of Fact be placed in the format the Board is comfortable with using, and return to the next meeting for final approval. There is too much to review and absorb at this late hour. Future agendas need to be limited to 8 items in the interest of fair review.

No action taken.

ITEM 11 - 100 Dennett Road Subdivision Plan - Major Subdivision - Sketch Plan Review. Owners, Sarah Dennett & Alan H. Miller propose to develop a 13 lot subdivision in an open space conservation design for single family residential dwelling units on a 30.36 acre parcel recorded as Map 12 Lot 3-2 located at Street 100 Dennett Road in the Suburban Residential (SR) Zone. The owner's agent is Ken Wood, PE, with Attar Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Wood summarized the proposed subdivision. A site walk will be scheduled via email with the members, applicant, and agent. No action taken.

ITEM 12 - Planning Board Business Plan 2010 - Discussion about Goals and Implementation.
This item was not discussed.

The Planning Board meeting of March 25, 2010 adjourned at 10:20 p.m.
Submitted by Jan Fisk, Recorder – March 30, 2010