

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Dutch Dunkelberger, Karen Kalmar, Ann Grinnell, Debbie Driscoll-Davis,
Mark Alesse, Marissa Day

Members Absent: Robert Harris

Staff Present: Chris Di Matteo

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 11, 2017

Line 66 – take out “the” between hopes and they

Line 99 - add “to the Kittery Community Center” after “the walkway”

Line 141 – reword sentence to state “The Town would like the applicant to move the walkway in front of building to another location. Peer reviewer’s questions on the definition of single-family homes has been satisfied.”

Line 154 -after primary parking area add “within 48 hours of a snow event”

Line 262 263 – change should stat “75 ft. setback of the water and a 25-foot setback to the cemetery.”

Line 34 – “Rogers” not “Rodgers” Road

Vice Chair Kalmar moved to accept the Minutes of May 11, 2017 as amended.

Mr. Dunkelberger seconded the motion.

The motion carried 6-0-0.

APPROVAL OF SITE WALK MINUTES – 17 Island Avenue, May 18, 2017

Line 84 – Reword sentence to “Earldean Wells stated the replanting must be native plants and suggested the applicant work with Jessa Kellogg, Shoreland Resource Officer.”

Add to Minutes – “The previous location and the relocation of the water line to the abutter’s property was discussed during the site walk.”

Mr. Dunkelberger moved to accept the site walk minutes of 17 Island Avenue from May 18, 2017 as amended.

Ms. Driscoll Davis seconded the motion.

The motion carried 6-0-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Shea Robbins, 402 Haley Road, thanked the Board for bringing up for review short-term rentals. She gave a summary of her research regarding the new medical and retail marijuana ordinance. She read the prohibited uses in Item 3 of Code 16.8.22.3. She also reviewed information from California on the detrimental effects of marijuana cultivation and suggested adding medical marijuana cultivation as an exception to the agricultural description. Ms. Robbins also suggested adding medical marijuana cultivation to any area currently excluded by the Town for commercial use.

Ms. Robbins discussed the Maine Real Estate and Developers Association's Spring Conference on Nimbyism. MREDA actively lobbies at the State level she asked who is advocating for Kittery.

Mr. Alesse thanked her for her work.

There being no further comments, the Chair closed the public hearing.

ITEM 1 – Traip Academy iLab: Urban Planning

Action: Facilitate presentation. No formal action. A public informational session to discuss a community vision planning project for the Kittery Outlets area. UNH graduate student, Marissa Day, will present a brief update on the goals of the project and the current status. Students from Traip Academy will present their findings and recommendations for the project based on a 10-day, hands-on exercise.

The students introduced themselves and gave a slide presentation on their project to improve the outlet area in Kittery. They presented four recommendations, which were to add: entertainment – a pier; a grocery store; a trolley and signage.

Ms. Day described the creation of the project and the students described what attracts them to shop at the outlets.

The Board thanked them for their work.

OLD BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARING

ITEM 2 – 17 Island Ave – Shoreland Development Plan Review, Major Modifications to an Approved Plan.

Action: Hold a public hearing. Approve or deny Plan. Owner/Applicant Shelley Wieler requests consideration to modify an approved plan to demolish and reconstruct, in an expanded footprint, a single-family dwelling, located within the 100-foot setback from a protected water body. The site is located at 17 Island Ave (Tax Map 1 Lot 8) in the Residential-Urban (R-U) and s Shoreland Overlay (SH-OZ-250) Zones. Agent is Doug Greene, Port City Designs,

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Tim Stone, 28 Island Avenue, stated he is the abutter. He described the water line relocation and requested the applicant record this on the plan. He added the water line is currently located under fill, which will not be an issue when the fill is removed. Mr. Stone also requested the applicant be careful with their sewer line when work is being done.

Shea Robbins stated her concern that the architect was not certified as stated in Mr. Morse's letter from the MDEP. She stated the Town is trusting this is being done correctly. She welcomed the new owners and added the abutters are good people and hopes they are treated the same way

There being no further comments, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Chair Grinnell stated her concern, as noted in Mr. Morse's letter, that this is an after the fact application. She would like to have a workshop with the Planning Department and the manager. Mr. Di Matteo stated the plan must be certified by a registered architect, surveyor or engineer, which it currently is not. This is a requirement to record the plan.

Mr. Di Matteo stated the condition is for the applicant to incorporate any comments and requirements of what the Board requests.

The following staff comments were addressed:

- The applicant stated the entry pad and roof canopy have been added to the calculation and is included in the plan.
- Comment 8 – the applicant agreed to modify the plan to show the change to the granite steps.
- Comment 11 –the applicant is removing the retaining walls.
- Chair Grinnell requested Comment 5 include the following: “The well construction on the north side the basement foundation of the home and any retaining walls or fill installed after July 14, 2016 must be removed. Mr. Greene stated this has been addressed on the plan. Vice Chair Kalmar requested the previous language be repeated for the south end of the main residence and replace the word “proposed” with “to be removed” on the plan.
- Condition 9 - change to “# 8” instead of “# 7”.
- Notices to Applicant are located at the bottom of the Findings of Fact and will be included on the plan.
- Comment 16 – the plan to remove pavement is satisfactory with Mr. Di Matteo.

Mr. Dunkelberger commented on his frustration along with not having clear guidance from the DEP. He is concerned with certifications being accurate. He thanked Mr. Stone for bringing this issue to the Board's attention. Mr. Di Matteo stated the elevations are certified by the surveyor and the proposed volume in question has been reviewed by Code Enforcement. The applicant will get an affidavit to verify as required.

Chair Grinnell referred to Mr. Morse's letter stating there were violations to the Code. She added the applicant has not been charged with violations only a stop work order. Discussion of

the applicant applying for a new building permit ensued. Mr. Di Matteo pointed it was determined by the Code Enforcement Officer to be unnecessary but may need to be amended.

Vice Chair Kalmar pointed out the base zone requirement needs to state seventy-five feet not zero feet.

The amendment of the water line language will be added to Comment 9 and the sewer and water lines will be added to the plan.

Mr. Dunkelberger moved to approve with conditions the Shoreland Development Plan dated April 17, 2017 from owner and applicant Shelley Wieler for 17 Island Ave (Tax Map 1 Lot 8) in the Residential-Urban and Shoreland Overlay Zones upon the reading and voting, in the affirmative, on the Findings of Fact. Vice Chair Kalmar seconded the motion.

The motion carried 6-0-0.

Kittery Planning Board

APPROVED

Findings of Fact

REVISED

M1 L8

For 17 Island Ave

Shoreland Development Plan Review

WHEREAS: Shelley Wieler requests consideration to modify an approved plan to demolish and reconstruct, in an expanded footprint, a single-family dwelling, located within the 100-foot setback from a protected water body. The site is located at 17 Island Ave (Tax Map 1 Lot 8) in the Residential-Urban (R-U) and Shoreland Overlay (SH-OZ-250') Zones, hereinafter the "Development" and

Pursuant to the Plan Review meetings conducted by the Town Planning Board as noted {in the plan review notes prepared for 7/14/2016 and 5/25/2017}

Shoreland Development Plan Review	6/9/2016; 7/14/2016; 4/27/2017; 5/25/2017	HELD
Site Walk	7/7/2016; 5/18/2017	HELD
Public Hearing	7/14/2016; 5/25/2017	HELD
Shoreland Development Plan Approval	7/14/2016	GRANTED
Modified Shoreland Development Plan Approval	5/25/2017	GRANTED

And pursuant to the application and plan and other documents considered to be a part of a plan review decision by the Planning Board in this Finding of Fact consisting of the following (hereinafter the “Plan”): {as noted in the plan review notes prepared for 7/14/2016 and 5/25/2017}

1. Shoreland Development Plan Application, received 5/19/2016
2. Shoreland Development Plan Application (Modification to an Approved Plan), dated 2/23/2017
3. Shoreland Development Plan, North Easterly Surveying, revised 6/29/2016, received 7/5/2016

4. Amendment #1 Shoreland Development Plan, North Easterly Surveying, dated 4/17/2017

5. Standard Boundary Survey, Great Hill Survey Company, dated 7/15/1999

6. Standard Boundary Survey, North Easterly Surveying, dated 7/7/2016

7. Elevation and Floor Area and Volume Certification, North Easterly Surveying, dated 4/18/2017

8. Cabin Renovation detail, Port City Design, dated 3/23/2017

NOW THEREFORE, based on the entire record before the Planning Board and pursuant to the applicable standards in the Land Use and Development Code, the Planning Board makes the following factual findings and conclusions:

FINDINGS OF FACT

Chapter 16.3 LAND USE ZONE REGULATIONS

16.3.2.17.D Shoreland Overlay Zone

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

Findings: The existing devegetated area is 29.2%. In order to avoid increasing devegetated area, the proposed development proposes to revegetate existing devegetated areas, as depicted on the final plan, dated 4/17/2017. The proposed development does not result in a devegetated area greater than 29.2% of the total lot.

Conclusion: The requirement appears to be met.

Vote: _7_ in favor _0_ against _0_ abstaining (7/14/2016)

Vote: _6_ in favor _0_ against _0_ abstaining (5/25/2017)

Chapter 16.7 GENERAL DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

Article III Nonconformance

16.7.3.1 Prohibitions and Allowances
<p><i>A. Except as otherwise provided in this Article, a nonconforming conditions must not be permitted to become more nonconforming</i></p> <p><u>Finding:</u> The proposed development does not encroach on any front or side yard set backs, nor does it increase the encroachment in the 100-foot setback greater than currently exists. The applicant will revegetate a portion of the asphalt path and/or ramp, in order to avoid an increase to the lot's devegetated area. With consideration of condition of approval #5, the proposed development does not increase the nonconformity of any structure or aspect of the lot.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> The requirement appears to be met.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Vote: <u> 7 </u> in favor <u> 0 </u> against <u> 0 </u> abstaining (7/14/2016)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Vote: <u> 6 </u> in favor <u> 0 </u> against <u> 0 </u> abstaining (5/25/2017)</p>
16.7.3.5.6 Nonconforming structure reconstruction
<p><i>A. In the Shoreland or Resource Protection Overlay Zone(s), any nonconforming structure which is located less than the required setback from a water body, tributary stream, or wetland and which is removed, damaged or destroyed, by any cause, by more than 50% of the market value of the structure before such damage destruction or removal, may be reconstructed or replaced provided that a permit is obtained with in 18 months of the date of said damage, destruction, or removal, and provided that such reconstruction or replacement is in compliance with the water body, tributary stream or wetland setback requirement to the greatest practical extent as determined by the Planning Board.</i></p> <p><u>Finding:</u> The proposed reconstruction does not comply with mandatory waterbody setback requirements, however, there is not a location on the property that would encroach less on the required 100-foot or front/side yard setbacks.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> The requirement appears to be met.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Vote: <u> 7 </u> in favor <u> 0 </u> against <u> 0 </u> abstaining (7/14/2016)</p>
16.7.3.6 Nonconforming Structures in Shoreland and Resource Protection Zones
16.7.3.6.1 Nonconforming Structure Expansion

A nonconforming structure may be added to, or expanded, after obtaining Planning Board approval and a permit from the Code Enforcement Officer. Such addition or expansion must not increase the non-conformity of the structure and must be in accordance with the subparagraphs [A through C] below.

A. After January 1, 1989, if any portion of a structure is less than the required setback from the normal high-water line of a water body or tributary stream or the upland edge of a wetland, that portion of the structure will not be permitted to expand, as measured in floor area or volume, by thirty percent (30%) or more during the lifetime of the structure.

B. If a replacement structure conforms to the requirements of Section 16.7.3.6.1.A and is less than the required setback from a water body, tributary stream or wetland, the replacement structure will not be permitted to expand if the original structure existing on January 1, 1989, has been expanded by 30% in floor area and volume since that date.

C. Whenever a new, enlarged or replacement foundation is constructed under a nonconforming structure, the structure and new foundation must be placed such that the setback requirement is met to the greatest practical extent as determined by the Planning Board, basing its decision on the criteria specified in Section 16.7.3.5.2 – Relocation, below. If the completed foundation does not extend beyond the exterior dimensions of the structure, except for expansion in conformity with Section 16.7.3.5.3, above, and the foundation does not cause the structure to be elevated by more than three (3) additional feet, as measured from the uphill side of the structure (from original ground level to the bottom of the first floor sill), it will not be considered to be an expansion of the structure.

Finding:

A. The proposed development is the first expansion for this structure, therefore, the existing dimensions are equivalent to the recorded dimensions for January 1, 1989.

B. The existing and proposed floor area is 1,000 and 1,216 square feet, respectively. This is an increase of 21.6% and conforms to this standard. The existing volume is 6,799 cubic feet. The proposed volume, less the area exempt from expansion per 16.7.3.6.1.C (detailed below), is 8,306 cubic feet. This is an increase of 22.2% and conforms to this standard.

C. The existing grade located at the uphill side of the cabin is at a NGVD29 elevation of 21.7. The bottom of the proposed first floor sill is at a NGVD29 elevation of 23.7. The proposed development results in the structure to be elevated by an additional 2-feet. The increased volume incurred by the raise in the foundation is not considered to be an expansion of the structure.

Conclusion: This requirement appears to be met.

Vote: 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining (7/14/2016)

Vote: 6 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining (5/25/2017)

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;

Finding: The proposed development as represented in the plans and application does not appear to have an adverse impact.

Conclusion: This requirement appears to be met

Vote: 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining (7/14/2016)

2. Not result in water pollution, erosion or sedimentation to surface waters;

Finding: Maine DEP Best Management practices will be followed for erosion and sedimentation control during site preparation and building construction to avoid impact on adjacent surface waters.

Conclusion: This requirement appears to be met

Vote: 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining (7/14/2016)

3. Adequately provide for the disposal of all wastewater;

Finding: The proposed development does not increase the impact on the existing wastewater disposal system.

Conclusion: This requirement appears to be met.

Vote: 7 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining (7/14/2016)

4. Not have an adverse impact on spawning grounds, fish, aquatic life, bird or other wildlife habitat

<p><u>Finding:</u> The proposed development does not appear to have an adverse impact.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> This requirement appears to be met.</p>
<p>Vote: <u> 7 </u> in favor <u> 0 </u> against <u> 0 </u> abstaining (7/14/2016)</p>
<p><i>5. Conserve shore cover and visual, as well as actual points of access to inland and coastal waters;</i></p> <p><u>Finding:</u> Shore cover is not adversely impacted</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> This requirement appears to be met.</p>
<p>Vote: <u> 7 </u> in favor <u> 0 </u> against <u> 0 </u> abstaining (7/14/2016)</p>
<p><i>6. Protect archaeological and historic resources;</i></p> <p><u>Finding:</u> There does not appear to be any resources impacted.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> This requirement appears to be met.</p>
<p>Vote: <u> 7 </u> in favor <u> 0 </u> against <u> 0 </u> abstaining (7/14/2016)</p>
<p><i>7. Not adversely affect existing commercial fishing or maritime activities in a commercial fisheries/maritime activities district;</i></p> <p><u>Finding:</u> The proposed development does not adversely impact existing commercial fishing or maritime activities.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> This requirement appears to be met.</p>
<p>Vote: <u> 7 </u> in favor <u> 0 </u> against <u> 0 </u> abstaining (7/14/2016)</p>
<p><i>8. Avoid problems associated with floodplain development and use;</i></p> <p><u>Finding:</u> The property is designated Zone C by FEMA Flood Zone standards and is defined as an area of minimal flood hazard. The proposed development does not appear to have an impact on a floodplain or flood-prone area.</p> <p><u>Conclusion:</u> This requirement appears to be met.</p>
<p>Vote: <u> 7 </u> in favor <u> 0 </u> against <u> 0 </u> abstaining (7/14/2016)</p>

9. *Is in conformance with the provisions of this code;*

Finding: With consideration of condition of approval # 8, The proposed development complies with the applicable standards of Title 16.

Conclusion: This requirement appears to be met.

Vote: __6__ in favor __1__ against __0__ abstaining (7/14/2016)

Mr. Harris opposing

Vote: _6__ in favor _0__ against _0__ abstaining (5/25/2017)

10. *Be recorded with the York county Registry of Deeds.*

Finding: With consideration of condition of approval # 8, a plan suitable for recording will be prepared.

Conclusion: As stated in the Notices to Applicant contained herein, shoreland Development plans must be recorded with the York County Registry of Deeds prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Vote: _7__ in favor __0__ against __0__ abstaining (7/14/2016)

Vote: _6__ in favor _0__ against _0__ abstaining (5/25/2017)

Based on the foregoing Findings, the Planning Board finds the applicant has satisfied each of the review standards for approval and, therefore, the Planning Board approves the Shoreland Development Plan Application and subject to any conditions or waivers, as follows:

Waivers: None

Conditions of Approval (to be depicted on final plan to be recorded):

1. No changes, erasures, modifications or revisions may be made to any Planning Board approved final plan. (Title 16.10.9.1.2)
2. Applicant/contractor will follow Maine DEP *Best Management Practices* for all work associated with site and building construction to ensure adequate erosion control and slope stabilization.
3. With the exception of the 2-arborvitae trees located adjacent to the existing building, no trees are to be removed without prior approval by the Code Enforcement Officer or the Shoreland Resource Officer. Efforts to protect existing trees must be in place prior to grading or construction. The applicant will replace the arborvitae with native species.

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

**APPROVED
May 25, 2017**

4. Prior to the restart of construction, a landscape plan must be reviewed and approved by the Shoreland Resource Officer, specifically addressing the regrading of the lot and any proposed replanting, including the slope between the structure and the parking area, to ensure appropriate erosion control measure have been taken.
5. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, any retaining walls and fill installed after 7/14/2016 must be removed and the area returned to its original grade and vegetation.
6. When removing the retaining walls and returning the slope to pre-existing grade, care must be taken to not damage existing trees and tree roots located at the northerly side of the cabin. The Shoreland Resource Officer must be on site during this work.
7. The slope to either side of the door located on the north end of the building that accesses the basement level must be maintained with vegetation only and without the use of any retaining walls, cribs, blocks, stones, etc. A note to this effect must be depicted in the vicinity of the door on the final plan.
8. All Notices to Applicant contained herein (Findings of Fact dated 7/14/2016 and 5/25/2017).

Conditions of Approval (not to be depicted on final plan):

9. Incorporate any plan revisions on the final plan as recommended by Staff, Planning Board or Peer Review Engineer, including depicting the water and sewer lines connecting to 28 Island Ave on the final plan, and submit for Staff review prior to presentation on final Mylar.
10. Applicant will provide proof to staff that the property has been inhabited in the last 5 years.

The Planning Board authorizes the Planning Board Chair, or Vice Chair, to sign the Final Plan and the Findings of Fact upon confirmation of required plan changes.

Vote of 6 in favor 0 against 1 abstaining (7/14/2016)

Mr. Harris abstaining

Vote: 6 in favor 0 against 0 abstaining (5/25/2017)

APPROVED BY THE KITTERY PLANNING BOARD ON July 14, 2016

AND MODIFIED ON May 25, 2017

Ann Grinnell, Planning Board Chair

Notices to Applicant:

- 230 1. Incorporate any plan revisions on the final plan as required by Planning Board and submit for
231 Staff review prior to presentation of final mylar.
- 232 2. Prior to the release of the signed plans, the applicant must pay all outstanding fees associated with the
233 permitting, including, but not limited to, Town Attorney fees, peer review,
234 newspaper advertisements and abutter notification.
- 235 3. One (1) mylar copy of the final plan and any and all related state/federal permits or legal documents
236 that may be required, must be submitted to the Town Planning Department for signing. Date of
237 Planning Board approval shall be included on the final plan in the Signature Block. After the signed
238 plan is recorded with the York County Registry of Deeds, a mylar copy of the signed original must be
239 submitted to the Town Planning Department.
- 240 4. This approval by the Town Planning Board constitutes an agreement between the Town and the
241 Developer, incorporating as elements the Development Plan and supporting documentation, the
242 Findings of Fact, and any Conditions of Approval.
- 243 Per Title 16.6.2.A - An aggrieved party with legal standing may appeal a final decision of the Planning
244 Board to the York County Superior Court in accordance with Maine Rules of Civil Procedures Section
245 80B, within forty-five (45) days from the date the decision by the Planning Board was rendered.

246
247 Chair Grinnell recommended the applicant go to Mr. Di Matteo if there are questions. Mr.
248 Greene agreed.

249
250 **ITEM 3 – Town Code Amendment – 16.3.2.13 Mixed Use Zone**

251 Action: Hold a public hearing. Recommend to Town Council. Applicant, Landmark Hill LLC,
252 requests several amendments to the Mixed Use Zone to reduce the required front yard and
253 landscape planting strip standards.

254
255 The Chair opened the public hearing.

256
257 Ms. Wells reviewed the history of the Code and requested the Board take their time to think
258 before any action is taken. She further added this was voted on by residents and residents should
259 be notified.

260
261 Tom Emerson, member of the Economic Development Committee, stated the intent of the
262 ordinance change was to eliminate mall sprawl. He doesn't think the ordinance is advantageous
263 as it is now and the Economic Development Committee supports the amendment. He believes
264 moving buildings closer to the roadway will help keep developments off the wetlands and
265 picking up light industry is beneficial from an economic aspect. He is not in favor of changing
266 of roof pitch.

Gerry Milroie, retained by the applicant, stated the applicant will move forward with the project regardless of the Board's decision. He added the applicant would like to improve the façade of the building and added he believes the amendment would benefit the area.

Michael Bringham, from Landmark Development, described the project and explained the reason he requested the amendment was to allow him to give the project a new look. He passed out pictures of what the project would look like with and without the amendment change. He added this is time sensitive because of financing. The planting strip will need to be modified if the amendment changes. The façade cannot be changed now because it is against the setback. Ms. Driscoll-Davis stated she appreciates the concerns Ms. Wells brought up and she likes the ideas proposed in the change since it will require developers to pay for the sidewalks. She stated she wishes more people were involved. There have been public hearings.

Discussion of the roof pitch ensued. Mr. Di Matteo suggested adding on Line 54 "not appropriate to the building's design in order to demonstrate to the Board the reason". The Board was in consensus to keep the wording for the roof pitch as is and revisit later, if necessary.

Other changes included:

- Line 340 - change "practical" to "practicable"
- Line 165 – remove "a single row"

**Mr. Dunkelberger moved to recommend to Town Council Town Code Amendment
16.3.2.13 Mixed Use Zone.**

Vice Chair Kalmar seconded the motion.

Mr. Alesse asked why the definitions for Lines 54 and 64 have two different standards. Mr. Di Matteo explained one definition is for a special exception. After further discussion, members agreed to reword Special Exception to "Industry less than or equal to 20,000 sq. ft. would fall under Special Exception." Mr. Alesse suggested adding a cap of 40,000 sq. ft. and made the following motion:

**Mr. Alesse moved to amend the Special Exception to include light industry greater than
20,000 sq. ft. but no more than 40,000 sq. ft.**

Chair Grinnell seconded the motion.

The motion failed 2-4-0.

The Board voted on Mr. Dunkelberger's motion.

The motion carried 6-0-0.

Vice Chair Kalmar requested recommending to Town Council to add this item on the website.

NEW BUSINESS

BOARD MEMBER ITEMS/DISCUSSION

313
314 a. Short-term Rentals

315 This item will be on the agenda for the June 22nd meeting. Ms. Driscoll-Davis stated
316 anyone interested should attend. She suggested the Port Authority, Code Enforcement
317 and short-term rental owners attend. She also would like a count of the number of these
318 rentals doing business in Town.
319

320 **Mr. Alesse moved to adjourn the meeting.**

321 **Mr. Dunkelberger seconded the motion.**
322

323 Mr. Wells asked if the Feasibility Study for the Business Park is completed. Mr. Di Matteo
324 stated a draft will be finalized in June.

325
326 **The motion carried 6-0-0.**
327

328 The Kittery Planning Board meeting of May 25, 2017 adjourned at 8:30 p.m.
329

330 Submitted by Mary Mancini, Minute Recorder, on May 31, 2017.
331

332 Disclaimer: The following minutes constitute the author's understanding of the meeting. Whilst
333 every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information, the minutes are not
334 intended as a verbatim transcript of comments at the meeting, but a summary of the discussion
335 and actions that took place. For complete details, please refer to the video of the meeting on the
336 Town of Kittery website at <http://www.townhallstreams.com/locations/kittery-maine>
337