

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Grinnell called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: Karen Kalmar, Dutch Dunkelberger, Drew Fitch, Mark Alesse, Russell White, Ron Ledgett, Ann Grinnell

Staff: Kathy Connor, Interim Planner

The Board welcomed new Board member Drew Fitch.

MINUTES: February 21, 2018 site walk, 21 Bond Road.

Mr. White moved to accept the Minutes of the site walk on February 8, 2018 for 21 Bond Road.

Mr. Ledgett seconded the motion.

The motion carried 4-0-3. Vice Chair Kalmar, Mr. Dunkelberger and Mr. Fitch abstained.

MINUTES: February 8, 2018

**Vice Chair Kalmar moved to accept the February 8, 2018 Minutes as presented.
Mr. Dunkelberger seconded the motion.**

The motion carried 6-0-1. Mr. Fitch abstained.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Chair opened the public comment section.

Susan Emery, 5 School Street, Kittery Point explained her concern that contract zoning is being considered by the Town and explained why she is against it. She referred to the referendum in 1997 to rescind the approval from the Town Council for contract zoning. She requested the Planning Board not to bring this up again. Ms. Emery commented she will bringing this item to Town Council as well.

There being no further comment, the Chair closed the public comment.

OLD BUSINESS

ITEM 1 – 21 Bond Road – Shoreland Development Plan Review Action: Accept or deny application, Approve or deny plan. Owner/Applicant, Victor Messier requests consideration of the reconstruction of a “bait shed” located on Bond Road (Tax Map 25, Lot 8) in the Residential – Kittery Point Village (RKPV) and the Shoreland Overlay (OZ-SL) Zones. Agent is Brian Rodonets, Coastal Architects.

Mr. Rodonets commented the site walk went well. He requested to have the measurement be changed to 6’x16’ instead of 8”x12” and added the height of the building could be changed to 8 ft. instead of 9 ft. He added the owner is not concerned with blocking his shoreline view. Ms. Connor pointed out the Board will need to see if the application is complete and if there is any additional information they need. She added in the packet were the original permits when it was a bait house. The Board decided to move ahead as complete.

Mr. Ledgett moved to find the application for 21 Bond Road, reconstruction of a bait shed complete.

Mr. Alesse seconded the motion.

The motion carried 5-0-2. Mr. Dunkelberger and Mr. Fitch abstained.

Ms. Connor explained this is not considered a relocation because the shed was destroyed and is not considered water dependent use so it cannot be regarded as a relocation within the shoreland zone. The Board agreed this is a new structure in the shoreland and is not allowed. The Board discussed the possibility of the shed being moved behind the principal structure, which could be permitted through code enforcement. Ms. Connor added most of the property is within the 100 ft. setback.

Vice Chair Kalmar moved to deny the application for 21 Bond Road, (Tax Map 25, Lot 8) located in the Residential-Kittery Point Village and Shoreland Overlay Zone pursuant to the Shoreland Development Plan dated December 7, 2017 with a revised plan dated February 21, 2018 submitted by owner and applicant Victor Messier.

Mr. Ledgett seconded the motion.

Mr. White commented he agrees with the interpretation and complimented Mr. Messier and Mr. Rodonets for coming forward.

The motion carried 5-0-2. Mr. Dunkelberger and Mr. Fitch abstained.

ITEM 2 – 459 Route 1 - Site and Subdivision Preliminary Plan Review Action:

Review letter from Bergen & Parkinson. Letter concerns application by owner, DSS Land Holdings, LLC, and applicant, Michael Brigham of Landmark Hill, LLC, which requests consideration of a mixed-use development for a 20+/- acre site located on U.S. Route 1 (Tax Map 60, Lot 24) in the Mixed-Use (MU) and Rural Residential (R-RL) Zones. Agent is Ken Wood, Attar Engineering.

Chair Grinnell explained the Board will review the letter from the applicant's attorney. Ken Wood informed the Board they agree with the points of the letter and agree to acquiesce and move forward. He explained they have met with Ms. Connor and Ms. Kellogg and came up with a plan two days ago which he believes meets the ordinance.

Mr. Wood explained one issue was the stormwater treatment ponds being 100 ft. from the wetland of special significance on Lot 6. Net density was also an issue and they have removed the road and the parking areas from the net density calculation. He also added there were units and buildings removed from the plan to address the net density issue. He explained two ponds were moved from the 100 ft. setback of the wetland of special significance. He added the Board has not seen the new plan and the formal plan will be submitted next week. The applicant would like to proceed this way and it is not necessary to review their attorney's letter.

A site plan was scheduled for April 3, 2018 at 11:00 a.m. The stakes will be present

A public hearing was scheduled for April 12, 2018.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 3 – 412 Haley Road – Major Amendment to an Approved Subdivision Plan

Action: Accept or deny application, Approve or deny plan. Owner Norwich Investments, LLC, and applicant, Bob Goldman, request consideration of a major modification to a subdivision approved on October 12, 2017 (a modification was also approved on February 8, 2018) and located at 412 Haley Road (Tax Map 34, Lot 3) in the Residential-Rural (R-RL) and Shoreland Overlay (SH-OZ-250') Zones. Agent is Joseph Coronati, Jones and Beach Engineers, Inc.

Joe Coronati explained the applicant has two lots under contract with Bob Goldman and pointed out the lots, which were highlighted on a map. He explained Mr. Goldman would like to modify the shape of Lot 12 by adding to Lot 13 to avoid development next to the shoreland. Mr. Coronati reminded the Board they have approved a portion of Lot 13 to be open space.

Mr. Ledgett asked if the lots are still owned by Norwich Investments. Mr. Coronati replied they are under contract with Mr. Goldman who has 45 days to close. Mr. Ledgett also asked if the subdivision covenants have been reviewed. Ms. Connors informed Mr. Ledgett the documents were reviewed by the Town's attorney and comments and revisions have been made. Mr. Ledgett questioned the possibility of adding more dwelling units since the two lots will total 4 acres. Ms. Connor explained the condominium documents state only one dwelling unit per lot.

Vice Chair Kalmar moved to find the application for a major modification to a subdivision plan dated January 16, 2018 from owner, Norwich Investments, and applicant, Green & Company for a previously approved subdivision located at 412 Haley Road (Tax Map 34 Lot 3) in the Residential-Rural and Shoreland Overlay Zones complete.

Mr. Dunkelberger seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Vice Chair Kalmar moved to approve with conditions the major modification to a subdivision plan dated January 16, 2018 from owner, Norwich Investments, and applicant, Green & Company for a previously approved subdivision located at 412 Haley Road (Tax Map 34 Lot 3) in the Residential-Rural and Shoreland Overlay Zones upon the review and voting, in the affirmative on the Findings of Fact
Mr. Dunkelberger seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0-0.

M34 L6

KITTERY PLANNING BOARD

APPROVED

FINDINGS OF FACT

for

412 Haley Road

Major Modification to an Approved Subdivision Plan

Note: This approval by the Planning Board constitutes an agreement between the Town and the Developer incorporating the Development plan and supporting documentation, the Findings of Fact, and all waivers and/or conditions approved and required by the Planning Board.

WHEREAS: Owner Norwich Investments LLC, and applicant, Bob Goldman, request consideration of a lot line adjustment between Lot 34-3-12 and Lot 34-3-13 to allocate .68 acres from Lot 34-3-12 to Lot 34-3-13 for a subdivision previously approved for 412 Haley Road (Tax Map 34 Lot 3) in the Residential-Rural (R-RL) zone and a portion in the Shoreland Overlay (OZ-SL-250') Zone.

Hereinafter the "Development".

Pursuant to the Plan Review meetings conducted by the Planning Board as duly noted in the Plan Review Notes dated 2/8/2018;

Major Modification Plan Review	Accepted	3/22/2018
Major Modification to Subdivision Plan Approval	Approved	3/22/2018

and pursuant to the Project Application and Plan and other documents considered to be a part of the approval by the Planning Board in this finding consist of the following and as noted in the Plan Review Notes dated 3/22/2018 (Hereinafter the "Plan").

1. Application and associated and subsequent submittal information dated 2/23/2018
2. Site Plan Amendment, Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc. dated 2/27/2018

<p>NOW THEREFORE, based on the entire record before the Planning Board as and pursuant to the applicable standards in the Land Use and Development Code, the Planning Board</p>
--

makes the following factual findings as required by Section 16.10.8.3.4 and as recorded below:

FINDINGS OF FACT

Action by the Board shall be based upon findings of fact which certify or waive compliance with all the required standards of this title, and which certify that the development satisfies the following requirements:

A. Development Conforms to Local Ordinances.

The proposed development conforms to a duly adopted comprehensive plan as per adopted provisions in the Town Code, zoning ordinance, subdivision regulation or ordinance, development plan or land use plan, if any. In making this determination, the municipal reviewing authority may interpret these ordinances and plans.

Finding: The modification pertains to an approved residential development in a residential zone. The modification will increase one lot by .68 acres and decrease another by the same amount. Both lots exceed the minimum lot size requirements of 40,000 sf.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

B. Freshwater Wetlands Identified.

All freshwater wetlands within the project area have been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application, regardless of the size of these wetlands.

Finding: There is an area of wetlands identified within the one of the affected lots.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

C. River, Stream or Brook Identified.

Any river, stream or brook within or abutting the proposed project area has been identified on any maps submitted as part of the application. For purposes of this section, "river, stream or brook" has the same meaning as in 38 M.R.S. §480-B, Subsection 9.

Finding: No rivers, streams, or brooks have been identified on site.

Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

D. Water Supply Sufficient.

The proposed development has sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the development.

Finding: Because this proposed modification is a lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision, there is no impact to water supply.

Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

E. Municipal Water Supply Available.

The proposed development will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply, if one is to be used.

Finding: Because this proposed modification is a lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision, there is no impact to water supply.

Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

F. Sewage Disposal Adequate.

The proposed development will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal and will not cause an unreasonable burden on municipal services if they are utilized.

Finding: Because this modification is a lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision, there is no impact to the sewage waste disposal.

Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

G. Municipal Solid Waste Disposal Available.

The proposed development will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste, if municipal services are to be used.

Finding: Because this modification is a lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision, there is no impact to solid waste.

Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

H. Water Body Quality and Shoreline Protected.

Whenever situated entirely or partially within two hundred fifty (250) feet of any wetland, the proposed development will not adversely affect the quality of that body of water or unreasonably affect the shoreline of that body of water.

Finding: The modification will increase Lot 34-3-13 by .68 acres and decrease Lot 34-3-12 by the same amount of land. Both lots' building envelopes remain the same as previously approved (outside of the required 100-foot setback) and will not adversely affect the water quality or disturb the shoreline.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

I. Groundwater Protected.

The proposed development will not, alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of groundwater.

Finding: The proposed lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision will not affect the use of the individual septic systems designed by a Licensed Professional.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.
Vote of <u>7</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
J. Flood Areas Identified and Development Conditioned.
<i>All flood-prone areas within the project area have been identified on maps submitted as part of the application based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps and Flood Insurance Rate Maps, and information presented by the applicant. If the proposed development, or any part of it, is in such an area, the applicant must determine the one hundred (100) year flood elevation and flood hazard boundaries within the project area. The proposed plan must include a condition of plan approval requiring that principal structures in the development will be constructed with their lowest floor, including the basement, at least one foot above the one hundred (100) year flood elevation.</i>
Finding: There is no construction proposed by this lot line adjustment within a flood prone area. Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.
Vote of <u>7</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
K. Stormwater Managed.
<i>Stormwater Managed. The proposed development will provide for adequate stormwater management</i>
Finding: The proposed lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision will not affect stormwater. Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.
Vote of <u>7</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining
L. Erosion Controlled.
<i>The proposed development will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or a reduction in the land's capacity to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition results.</i>
Finding: The proposed lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision will not affect soil erosion.

Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

M. Traffic Managed.

The proposed development will:

- 1. Not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to the use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed; and*
- 2. Provide adequate traffic circulation, both on-site and off-site.*

Finding: The proposed lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision will have no impact on traffic.

Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

N. Water and Air Pollution Minimized.

The proposed development will not result in undue water or air pollution. In making this determination, the following must be considered:

- 1. Elevation of the land above sea level and its relation to the floodplains;*
- 2. Nature of soils and sub-soils and their ability to adequately support waste disposal;*
- 3. Slope of the land and its effect on effluents;*
- 4. Availability of streams for disposal of effluents;*
- 5. Applicable state and local health and water resource rules and regulations; and*
- 6. Safe transportation, disposal and storage of hazardous materials.*

Finding: Because the modification consists of a lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision, with no additional development involved, there is no impact on the factors listed above.

Conclusion: This standard is not applicable.

Vote of <u>7</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining	
O. Aesthetic, Cultural and Natural Values Protected.	
<i>The proposed development will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites, significant wildlife habitat identified by the department of inland fisheries and wildlife or the municipality, or rare and irreplaceable natural areas or any public rights for physical or visual access to the shoreline.</i>	
Finding: The property does not include any significant aesthetic, cultural or natural values that require protection so the lot line adjustment will have no impact.	
Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.	
Vote of <u>7</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining	
P. Developer Financially and Technically Capable.	
<i>Developer is financially and technically capable to meet the standards of this section.</i>	
Finding: The previous subdivision approval required that the developer provide a performance guarantee and an inspection escrow in an amount suitable to cover the costs of required infrastructure including on-site inspection by the Peer Review Engineer to ensure the proposed development is constructed according to the approved plan. The proposed lot line adjustment will have no effect on these transactions.	
Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.	
Vote of <u>7</u> in favor <u>0</u> against <u>0</u> abstaining	
Chapter 16.3 LAND USE ZONE REGULATIONS	
16.3.2.17.D Shoreland Overlay Zone	
<i>1.d The total footprints of the areas devegetated for structures, parking lots and other impervious surfaces, must not exceed twenty (20) percent of the lot area, including existing development, except in the following zones...</i>	
Finding: Maximum devegetated area in the Shoreland Overlay Zone is 20%. The previously approved development does not exceed the devegetated coverage amounts and this proposed lot line adjustment will have no effect.	

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

Chapter 10 DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPLICATION AND REVIEW

Article 10 Shoreland Development Review

16.10.10.2 Procedure for Administering Permits

D. An application will be approved or approved with conditions if the reviewing authority makes a positive finding based on the information presented. It must be demonstrated the proposed use will:

- 1. Maintain safe and healthful conditions;*
- 2. Not result in water pollution, erosion or sedimentation to surface waters;*
- 3. Adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater;*
- 4. Not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird or other wildlife habitat;*
- 5. Conserve shore cover and visual, as well as actual points of access to inland and coastal waters;*
- 6. Protect archaeological and historic resources;*
- 7. Not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or maritime activities in a commercial fisheries/maritime activities district;*
- 8. Avoid problems associated with floodplain development and use;*
- 9. Is in conformance with the provisions of this code;*
- 10. Be recorded with the York county Registry of Deeds.*

Findings: The proposed modification consisting of a lot line adjustment between two lots in a previously approved subdivision will not have an adverse impact on the factors above.

Conclusion: This standard appears to be met.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

Notices to Applicant: (not to be included on the final plan)

1. Prior to the release of the signed plans, the applicant must pay all outstanding fees associated with review, including, but not limited to, wetland mitigation fee, Town Attorney fees, peer review, newspaper advertisements and abutter notification.
2. State law requires all subdivision and shoreland development plans, and any plans receiving waivers or variances, be recorded at the York County Registry of Deeds within 90 days of the final approval.
3. One (1) mylar copy and one (1) paper copy of the final plan (recorded plan if applicable) and any and all related state/federal permits or legal documents that may be required, must be submitted to the Town Planning Department. Date of Planning Board approval shall be included on the final plan in the Signature Block.
4. Copies of all applicable state and federal permits submitted to the Town prior to the issuance of a building permit.
5. This approval by the Town Planning Board constitutes an agreement between the Town and the Developer, incorporating the Plan and supporting documentation, the Findings of Fact, and any Conditions of Approval.

The Planning Board authorizes the Planning Board Chair, or Vice Chair, to sign the Final Plan and the Findings of Fact upon confirmation of compliance with any conditions of approval.

Vote of 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining

APPROVED BY THE KITTERY PLANNING BOARD ON _____

Ann Grinnell, Planning Board Chair

Per Title 16.6.2.A - An aggrieved party with legal standing may appeal a final decision of the Planning Board to the York County Superior Court in accordance with Maine Rules of Civil Procedures Section 80B, within forty-five (45) days from the date the decision by the Planning Board was rendered.

ITEM 4 – Neighborhood Mixed Use (formerly Business Park) Zoning District

Discussion. Review and discuss proposed changes to the former Business Park Zone, now called the Neighborhood Mixed Use Zone.

Town Manager, Kendra Amaral, gave an overview of the proposal to rezone the former business park. She explained a parcel owner, Bill Cullen, who worked with the Economic Development Committee, proposed the Town add infrastructure. The Town would have needed to utilize \$1.2 million in TIFF to fund for roads, three face power and water. The EDC questioned if that approach was the best investment of TIFF funds. Manager Amaral explained a highest best use type study was conducted through SMPCD and listed the criteria. She added the study results determined the impediment to development in the zone was the wetlands not the infrastructure. Also, zoning was very vague and the developers were not sure what development is allowed. The Town Manager explained they are looking at zoning revisions and worked with KOSAC. The result was given to the Board to provide a zoning based on what we want to see rather than what we want to prevent. It was discovered that two thirds of the area is undevelopable. The upland can handle activity and density. Town Manager Amaral reviewed what she and KOSAC looked at, which included open space to support walkways and paths. She described the methods they used and explained the bonus incentives for developers. They are looking to create a vibrant neighborhood. She added the DEP and Army Corps. of Engineers does not deem this area high on their list of wetlands of interest. Notices were sent out to abutters of the current zone and the Town wants to engage them in conversation. She added they are seeing to move boundaries to Route 236. She thanked all those who participated in the KOSAK process. Chair Grinnell thanked the Town Manager for her excellent overview.

Ms. Connor explained the map in the Board packet is from the highest and best use study and doesn't follow the current zoning boundaries of the park. Town Manager Amaral explained Ms. Connor, a zoning expert, has reviewed this. She added the Town will be looking to recodify Title 16 and the new planning director will be on board on April 17th.

Vice Chair Kalmar reviewed her following comments for changes:

- Why aren't warehousing and wholesale businesses limited for special exceptions?
- Line 86- requested Ms. Connor to reword this to be less ambiguous regarding parking;
- Line 93 – add a definition of liner building;

- Line 110 – verify the Fire Chief has no concerns of no minimum space between buildings;
- Specify the Town's peer review engineer will determine if LIDS and BMPS are adequate as opposed to the developer;
- Line 157- ask at what rate the open space payment in lieu will be;
- Line 246 – add language ensuring a diversity of species of trees and shrubs of more than two species;
- Line 284 – what is intention to take out criteria condition of approval for special exception uses in Title 16.6.4.4.

Mr. Dunkelberger asked to have a type of catchall under special use to cover future uses. Town Manager Amaral would like to see a more manageable description of uses that makes more sense than what the Town has now. Discussion ensued of the appropriate language to include to point out special use will be at the Planning Board's discretion.

Mr. Ledgett asked how the square footage limitations were determined. Ms. Connor explained what she looked at target density of 15 residential units per acre and she also looked at the density requirement for communities that resembled is envisioned for the park. Mr. Ledgett requested this be looked at to see if there is a better way to specify density other than incrementally per square foot.

Mr. Fitch commented he liked the village concept and questioned the mixed-use building requirement to have commercial on the first floor and residential on the upper floors. Ms. Connor replied a mixed use with residential is spelled out because there are different standards, such as more density, and do not have to meet any additional land use requirements. Town Manager Amaral added residential will be allowed as well. Discussion of micro apartments ensued.

Mr. Alesse suggested controlled environment agriculture which allows people to farm vertically. Mr. Alesse described what he learned about this and thinks it should be encouraged. It is environmentally clean and has a high production rate.

The Town Manager explained she has been in conversations with the Water District who are showing an interest in the area as well. Mr. White pointed out to put more into paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 to work towards an energy efficiency bonus. Town Manager Amaral informed him they are not including solar panels as part of the building height. She added the land is 90 acres and estimated a third is developable.

Chair Grinnell asked of the amount of money in the TIFF. The Town Manager informed her that the Town has recently discovered they have been inaccurately funding the TIFFs for the three districts and it is being addressed. She also explained the TIFF process.

Chair Grinnell expressed her concern the 50 ft. height allowance will influence other zones. Town Manager Amaral commented it could be beneficial in other areas.

Ms. Connor will make the adjustments based on the comments and the Board will look at this again at the April 26th meeting. It was noted the Town Council may want to have a workshop with the Planning Board.

ITEM 5 – Affordable Housing/Workforce Housing Discussion. Review and discuss Maine Housing (Maine State Housing Authority) information and next steps following the February 22nd Affordable & Workforce Housing Forum.

Chair Grinnell informed the Board after she attended the affordable and workforce housing meeting, she is keeping this topic as a priority. She explained she has met with Vice Chair Kalmar, Ms. Connor and Mr. Brock. from Town Council, and they decided to set up an ADHOC committee that will be looking into this issue. She added the committee will have eight board members from different Boards, a resident and the new planner. Chair Grinnell requested Planning Board members contact Ms. Connor if they are interested in participating and a tentative meeting is planned for next week. Chair Grinnell explained she also met with Marissa Day who will be sending her information from the Route One project. Representatives from Fair Tide will be included as well. Chair Grinnell wanted residents to know they are working on affordable and workforce housing and the information from the Maine State Housing Authority will be added to the website

ITEM 6 – Board Member Items / Discussion A. Planning Board Action Item List B. Other

Board members reviewed their action list and updated it as follows:

#1 – omit; #2 – omit; #3 – keep but lower priority; #4 – keep; #5 – keep; #6 – keep and remove former planner's name; #7 – keep; #8 – omit; #9 – omit; #10 – keep; #11 – omit; #12 – give to Jessa Kellogg; #13 – Town Planner will work on this; #14 – omit; #15 – omit; #16 – keep; #17 – keep; #18 keep and move up priority.

Ms. Connor will update the list. She will add the Foreside report, air B&Bs; and business park mixed use as items.

Mr. White announced the Comprehensive Plan Committee will hold a public hearing on April 24th at 6:00 p.m.

ITEM 7 – Town Planner Items

A.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Alesse moved to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Fitch seconded the motion.

The motion carried 7-0-0.

The Kittery Planning Board meeting of March 22, 2018 adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Submitted by Mary Mancini, Minute Recorder, on April 3, 2018.

Disclaimer: The following minutes constitute the author's understanding of the meeting. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information, the minutes are not intended as a verbatim transcript of comments at the meeting, but a summary of the discussion and actions that took place. For complete details, please refer to the video of the meeting on the Town of Kittery website at <http://www.townhallstreams.com/locations/kittery-maine>.