

**Town of Kennebunk  
Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, October 10, 2016**

**Present:** Chris MacClinchy – Chair; Richard Smith – Vice-Chair; David Smith – Secretary; Robert Metcalf; Janice Vance – Alternate

**Not Present:** Matthew Randall

**Also Attending:** Judy Bernstein – Town Planner

**1. Open Meeting**

C. MacClinchy opened the meeting at 7:05 pm. Today is Monday October 10, 2016.

**2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings**

Approval of Meeting Minutes was held till the end of this meeting.

**3. Public Hearing on Proposed Revision to Cedarwood Farm Subdivision by Lord and Harrington, LLC**

J. Bernstein provided a summary of this application. The applicant is Lord & Harrington, LLC. The property owner is Heyland Village Properties, LLC. The Location is 85 York St; tax map 58, lot 21. They are requesting revision of the proposed apartment building location and revision of the parking plan to have parking underneath the building. Included in the Board's packet is some other information including the previous approval for the phase plan. Also included is a letter from Chris Osterreider, Town Engineer, regard his thoughts on this project.

Steve Doe, of Sebago Technics, presented for the applicant. This is a proposed 24 unit apartment complex, which was approved for the site in 2013. There is a new person looking to buy this property and they are reevaluating how this project should be done. The proposed road will be very similar to the original plan. The building is in the same location. Instead of looping the road around the area, they will be adding parking under

the building as well as parking on the West side of the building. There will be an area in the back where Fire vehicles can turn around. Also, they have opened up the back of the building to make it more pleasant for residents. The storm water retention area has been moved closer to the complex.

Mr. Doe also showed elevations for the 2 levels of the apartments; which includes 12 units on each floor. Most of the parking will be underground, so this will not look like a 3 story building. They were able to make the parking under the building drive-through. Also, they made changes to the fire lane in the back of the building, per the Fire Chief's suggestions. There will some maintenance there, due to it being grass paved.

The Landscape plan is now included in the packets. They have added two catch basins at the stream crossing, and backtracked the outlet so that water is buffered before it gets to the stream. Also, they have corrected the legends in the plan, per Town Planner's comments. The fore bay that leads into the basin will now be paved, to make it easier to keep clear and also to help with plowing. They have also added an ADA crosswalk to the plan.

Mr. Doe explained that they have now addressed everything in the Town Engineer's comments, except where he was looking for narrative from an engineer. They are asking to go through DEP before doing this step. There is an engineering analysis which will be needed for the storm water system. From the Planner's review, they have corrected concerns on the cover sheet and updated some of the notes within the plan, though they were not able to turn around the updates regarding the Sycamore Lane comment prior to this meeting.

J. Bernstein stated that the note is not clear. First, it doesn't include the information from the original plan approval. Does the Phase 3 overall parcel include the portion of Sycamore Lane? Or is that separate?

Eric Heyland, the original developer, answered. Phase 3 is about 14 acres and includes all the land included for Sycamore Lane. Phase 3 will be responsible for maintaining Sycamore Lane.

J. Bernstein reiterated that this is not clear in the plan and they will need to revisit those notes.

Mr. Heyland stated that he will do that. This detail will also likely be drafted in the form of a covenant.

R. Smith asked, who is responsible for maintaining Sycamore. Is this responsibility being split up?

Mr. Heyland responded that currently it is being controlled by Phase 1 residents as Phase 3 isn't completed.

R. Smith asked who is going to be in charge of making sure that the maintenance is happening.

Mr. Heyland answered there is a Home Owners Document for all of Cedarwood, which will call for the maintenance. The document will be a legal document to spell out the details of responsibility.

R. Smith noted that he is not worried about the financial aspect of this. He wants to know who is responsible for making the determination when something will happen.

Mr. Heyland answered Phase 1 has hired a maintenance company which managed the maintenance schedule.

J. Bernstein asked who is responsible for keeping the road open.

Mr. Heyland responded ultimately the Home Owners Association (HOA) will be responsible.

J. Bernstein asked who was responsible for speed bumps.

Mr. Heyland stated that he didn't install them. Probably it was the HOA. However, he added, speed bumps are not illegal.

J. Bernstein stated that they were not part of the approval.

R. Smith stated that he wants to make sure that there is a single entity who will make sure that necessary work gets done. He doesn't want to wait on a committee.

J. Vance asked if there is a Board of Directors for the HOA.

Mr. Heyland answered yes.

J. Vance asked if they are present in the room.

Several hands from the public were raised.

J. Vance asked how they decide which management company to hire.

Mr. Heyland responded that his understanding is that the Board of Directors for the HOA hired the management firm. The management firm has a copy of the HOA documents.

J. Vance asked if there are copies of the HOA documents for Phase 3.

Mr. Heyland answered not yet, but soon.

D. Smith asked, if two separate management companies are hired by different phases, who will coordinate to make sure that everything is taken care of?

Mr. Heyland explained that they have created a reciprocal easement agreement. If one Phase doesn't meet their obligations, the next Phase has the right and responsibility to do the maintenance.

R. Metcalf noted that we are talking about apartments not condos. The applicants are holding ownership of this Phase, and they will be responsible and participating as part of the HOA.

Mr. Heyland answered this is correct.

Mr. Doe continued presenting. They have added a note about the Shoreland Overlay Zone to the plan. They had inadvertently left off the sidewalk connection previously. There was a walking trail proposed which will be added back into the plan.

J. Bernstein stated that the walking trail was completed along with Phase 1.

Mr. Heyland responded that he does not know the status.

C. MacClinchy asked if there is a trail in Phase 1.

Members of the audience answered no, there is not a trail.

C. MacClinchy asked wasn't the trail designed to be there in lieu of a sidewalk.

J. Bernstein answered yes. They were able to remove the sidewalk from Phase 1 because of this proposed trail.

Mr. Heyland stated that the trail was never supposed to be installed. The plans referred to an existing trail.

J. Bernstein noted that she doesn't recall it being an existing trail.

Mr. Heyland stated that they never did construction work as the trail is up against the wetland. They had several meetings on this, including a site walk.

J. Bernstein noted that the approved plan said "proposed walking trail".

Mr. Heyland asked if they were referring to the trail proposed along the detention basin. What Mr. Doe is referring to, is along the top berm. They did construct the berm, and

did install the top piece there. Beyond that, there is an existing trail. There was never an intention to build a walking trail along the wetlands as it already existed.

R. Metcalf noted that the walk way which wasn't being constructed should have been maintained. What was put into the HOA documents regarding the maintenance of the trail?

Mr. Heyland stated that he never understood that the trail would need to be maintained.

J. Bernstein noted that according to the approved plan, there is a proposed walking trail which goes around the berm but then goes all the way through Phase 1.

C. MacClinchy stated that the Board will have to look at the previous approvals and minutes and notes in order to get clarity about this issue.

Mr. Doe continued. He suggested that he, J. Bernstein, and Mr. Heyland need to go through all the plan sets to make sure that all the notes being asked for are included within the plan. The last bullet item in the Town Planner's notes was the landscape plan. For apartment buildings, they need a 50' buffer around the building.

J. Bernstein asked if it would be a landscape buffer, as this is part of the performance standards.

Mr. Doe noted that the 50' area was intended to be lawn. There is a precedence for lawn as the 50' buffer. The area behind this building is part of the Maine state forest and will not be developed. The proposed lawn would be adequate as a buffer in this case.

J. Bernstein suggested that the Board should make a finding on this. She doesn't want to have the Board stated that a lawn is OK as a landscape buffer.

Mr. Doe stated that he believes there is enough vegetation to adequately buffer, even with the lawn area.

R. Metcalf asked what the widest section of lawn is.

Mr. Doe answered about 30'. He added that while the front edge of this will possibly be maintained the back slope will likely be naturalized.

R. Smith asked what is the viewscape of the first houses in terms of looking back up towards the apartment building.

Mr. Doe answered that the area is wooded. It's unlikely there is much of a view. There is probably 500-600' between the building and the nearest houses.

R. Smith asked if the natural landscaping will be an adequate buffer for those houses. What is the makeup of those woods?

Mr. Doe answered that it is a mix of hardwood and evergreens.

R. Metcalf asked if it is all state-owned land which borders this property.

Mr. Doe answered yes.

R. Smith asked if this means it can't be cleared.

Mr. Doe responded that he doesn't know what the forest service can do with the state-owned land. But, there is also a good sized wetland in there too. He stated that he doesn't believe they would go into the wetland and do cutting.

C. MacClinchy asked if this will be entertained as a waiver. Or, will the Board entertain this as being adequate for a buffer?

R. Metcalf stated it sounds like they would be entertaining this as being adequate as a buffer.

C. MacClinchy stated he wants to avoid declaring a lawn as a buffer.

J. Bernstein noted that as long as the Board feels comfortable including the forest around there as a part of the buffer.

J. Vance stated that in essence, the applicant is asking for a waiver of the regulations.

Mr. Doe responded not necessarily. The buffer is meeting its purpose, due to the forested area between the apartment building and the houses.

J. Vance stated that she understands his argument, but that grass does not provide any visual buffer.

Mr. Doe noted that there is still plenty of wooded area within the buffer area. There will be 30' of woodland at the narrowest with only 20' disturbed area.

R. Smith asked in regards to the opening in the back of the building for exiting the parking, where does that exit come out?

Mr. Doe answered it is part of the road way.

R. Smith asked if this is part of the buffer.

Mr. Doe responded no. There is no pavement within the buffer.

D. Smith stated that the Board can assume some of the vehicles will be exiting in the evening. Does it make sense, in terms of light trespass, to vegetate some portion of the 500' between apartment and houses to protect the neighboring homes when the forest is not leafed out?

Mr. Doe stated that there is not going to be any light trespass at 600'. That is quite a bit of distance.

D. Smith asked if the wetland on the state land is forested.

Mr. Doe answered yes.

C. MacClinchy asked if there were any additional notes that needed to be addressed.

J. Vance asked if there is a plant list for the rest of the landscaping.

C. MacClinchy answered that there is a note on the landscaping plan.

R. Metcalf noted that there is a plant in the plan which is not part of the plant schedule. It is keyed as AM, which is not in the legend. Is that a typo?

Mr. Doe answered that it was not listed, but that he will correct that.

R. Metcalf suggested that he also add quantities in the plant list.

Mr. Doe stated he will do that. He had left it off the plan so that landscapers read the plan and not just the number.

C. MacClinchy noted that Mr. Doe had skipped the note regarding cleared access through Sycamore Lane.

Mr. Doe answered that is a question for Mr. Heyland.

C. MacClinchy asked Mr. Doe to finish his portion before they brought Mr. Heyland back to the podium.

Mr. Doe asked that they be allowed to work with DEP prior to addressing the final note from the Town Engineer.

R. Metcalf asked if this is site location or NRPA.

Mr. Doe answered it is a site location [permit].

Mr. Heyland came back up to the podium to discuss Sycamore Lane. This came up at the last meeting. The area being discussed is between the end of the paved road and Sycamore Lane. There was a lot of discussion regarding paving all the way rather than leaving it as gravel. There were a number of meetings about this back in 2013, and it was decided that there would be a paved portion as part of Phase 2a. There is proposed to be pavement for an additional 300' before returning to gravel for a length of 400', and then go back to pavement at the end of Phase 1. The discussion was that there is concern about speeding traffic through there. There was a plan which allowed for it to be gravel and 18' wide. The Board is now concerned, as is the Fire Department, that the road was blocked. Do we want this to be paved all the way through or continue to allow the gravel section?

J. Bernstein noted that Mr. Heyland was saying "keep as gravel", but that it has not yet been graveled.

Mr. Heyland agreed as this section of the road hasn't been built yet.

C. MacClinchy noted that the concern is that this road hasn't been built as approved yet. Because this is a major subdivision, it needs to have 2 means of access. They cannot count the current situation as a means of access as it isn't accessible for emergency equipment.

Mr. Heyland stated he is willing to commit to having the road built in the next 6 months.

C. MacClinchy noted that the Board will need to see that this road is built as approved prior to issuing any occupancy for the new apartment building.

D. Smith stated that he needed to change gears. In terms of the sidewalk, that will be critical because this is a private road. It is likely that they won't have a school bus enter the subdivision. He stated that he knows Mr. Heyland has said he will put in the sidewalks, but it will be critical for kids to safely access the school bus.

J. Bernstein pointed out the note which stated that this is going to be a private road and that it won't be proposed for Town acceptance.

Mr. Heyland responded that the sidewalk is already installed for a good portion of this section.

R. Smith noted that the Board had approved gravel only for the portion of the road which goes through the wetland. What was pointed out on the map reaches beyond that.

J. Bernstein agreed, the gravel was approved for a limited area.

Mr. Heyland stated that it is on the grading plan. The gravel section is identified by station. What he showed was the stations on the plan.

R. Smith responded that it makes more sense on the grading plan. He added that it could go a long way toward stopping traffic if they put up more adequate signage stating that this is a private road with no through traffic.

Mr. Heyland agreed.

R. Smith asked for clarity regarding occupancy in the apartment building. Before occupancy is granted, the road will be built to standards the Board considers adequate.

Mr. Heyland answered yes. The road will be built per plan approval.

C. MacClinchy asked if there were more questions from the Board.

D. Smith asked about sprinklers in the underground parking. He understands you can't build the structure without it, but he doesn't see any notes.

J. Bernstein noted that sprinklers will be part of the building permit.

D. Smith stated he would just like the Board to have the assurance that the sprinklers will be there.

Mr. Doe stated he will add the note that the building will be sprinkled.

D. Smith noted the two lagoons in the detention. The rest of the water will be expressed into the buffer before going into the wetland? Where will those be again?

Mr. Doe answered that water coming from the pavement in the back of the building will go into a swale. Anything white on the plan is upland.

D. Smith questioned if the water will go in a South Westerly direction.

Mr. Doe answered yes. It will flow across the parking lot, which is graded so that all the water will flow to the catch basin area.

C. MacClinchy noted that the landscape plan shows loam and seed, but it looks like different shading in areas.

Mr. Doe stated that they had added some ferns. It won't be mowed grass, but rather it will be a more naturalized area.

D. Smith noted that on the last couple of sheets, the building elevations. The first floor plan show more balconies on the east side than are called for in the plan.

Mr. Doe answered yes, there is something amiss with the elevations.

D. Smith noted that it will need to be clear that you will only be putting 12 balconies on that side of the building.

J. Vance asked about the lighting plan. Is there a list of fixtures? What are the heights?

Mr. Doe answered that it looks like varying heights. Some 12' and some 16' heights. In the parking lot will use the 16'. Others are 12'. Also, there are some building mounted lights with a 12' height.

J. Vance asked if there will be a sign on Sycamore Lane. If so, will it be lighted?

Mr. Doe answered that he assumes there will be a sign. He will need to get clarification regarding any light.

C. MacClinchy noted that he doesn't see lighting fixtures indicated on the driveway except at the corner.

Mr. Doe noted that he will make sure the light plan matches the site plan set.

C. MacClinchy stated that he expects there will be a sign at the entrance to Juniper Way. Is there a name for the building?

Mr. Doe responded that it is not named yet.

C. MacClinchy asked if there will be a small lit sign.

Mr. Doe answered yes. It will be to indicate the complex so people won't drive past into the residential area.

Both R. Smith and R. Metcalf stated they would wait on any further comments until after the public hearing.

C. MacClinchy stated he wanted to go back to the landscape plan. They have indicated snow storage in the turnaround parking area. It looks like this is encroaching into the Shoreland Zone setback. Is that the best place to put snow?

Mr. Doe answered that it's a practicality. That this is where they are likely to push the snow. They plowers won't be looking at this drawing. This isn't a town road with a lot of salt and sand.

R. Metcalf asked how long the area for turning around fire equipment is. How far will they be plowing?

Mr. Doe answered they will need the whole area plowed for turn around.

C. MacClinchy noted that on sheet 1C there is a field, or rectangle, indicated off the entrance to Juniper Way. What is that?

Mr. Doe answered that it is a level spreader. This should be part of the Sycamore Lane's two catch basins on either side of the road.

J. Bernstein asked if this is be added to the legend or labeled on the plan.

D. Smith noted that in the August 22, 2016 minutes, it was asked what the Town's Shoreland Zone is extended in this revision. It was suggested that only named streams are part of the Shoreland Zone.

Mr. Doe added that this is not Fernald Brook.

J. Bernstein answered that Fernald Brook splits and goes in two directions. She asked if because this isn't labeled they are suggesting it isn't a brook.

Mr. Doe responded not. But his understanding is that because it isn't labeled it doesn't fall under the need for a 250' wetland setback.

J. Bernstein stated she will need to research that again.

Mr. Doe noted that his understanding is that the fork east of Route 1 needs the 250' setback, but the fork that goes west of Route 1 doesn't need that.

J. Bernstein stated that she will check.

C. MacClinchy opened up the Public Hearing at 8:22 pm.

Wayne Sargent introduced himself. He is the president of the Phase 1 condo association and was representing those units. While Phase 1 residents were made aware of plans for Phase 3, what is being proposed now is significantly different than what was represented at the time they purchased their homes. He continued that the Gravel section of the road was supposed to be maintained by Mr. Heyland. Due to the fact that it wasn't appropriately maintained, there were 3 incidents when 911 was unable to access Phase 1. The residents of Phase 1 received notice from the Town that they needed to do repair work, which was because the road was not graded as it was supposed to be. They want to make sure that it will not be the residents' responsibility to repair damage caused by construction.

Also, he added they were told that Phase 2 would be condos and not apartments. Because this building will be rental apartments, they won't be taking over the costs of

maintenance that Phase 1 has had to handle so far. Phase 1 residents are concerned that this apartment building will become weekly rentals or even a hotel. They are concerned because there is history of changing projects in the middle, sometimes without appropriate approvals.

In addition, there is concern about the safety of the mailboxes, which are right at the intersection. They would like to have the Phase 1 mailboxes moved to a safer location.

Finally, Mr. Sargent asked if the property is 84 York St., why is the entrance off Sycamore Lane. If the property had access from Route 1, many of the problems with the HOA will go away. Why can't they access the lot from Route 1?

J. Bernstein and R. Metcalf responded. If they were to access from Route 1, they would have to cross a lot of wetlands.

R. Metcalf added that this was discussed during the original approval.

Mr. Sargent stated that the requirements of the Board for Phase development is that prior phases need to be completed prior to obtaining approval for subsequent phases. He would strongly encourage the Board to require all prior phases be completed.

He added that the reciprocal easement, which was discussed by Mr. Heyland, was not agreed to by the Phase 1 residents.

Mr. Heyland stepped up to the podium. He noted that there is some confusion about the access through the area. He has received emails from the Town Planner regarding boulders and speed bumps in the road and concerns that plowing stopped, so the road was not passable. Regarding the upgrade of the 2a portion of the road, that is a completely independent phase. He has already committed to doing this as quickly as possible; starting within 6 months. However, he notes that making this happen is contradictory to addressing the concern about people speeding through. He reiterated his commitment to make the road conform to the approved plan. As for the statement about his not doing his piece of the work, he finds that accusation disrespectful.

Mr. Heyland continued that the reciprocal easement agreement means that all phases of the subdivision are responsible for maintaining the road.

Mr. Sargent noted that his concern is not the people speeding through. His concern are the three 911 calls that couldn't get through.

J. Bernstein noted, in regards to the concern of having a hotel put in place of the apartment building, that this Board doesn't regulate condos v apartments. However, a hotel would be a different use and would need to come back through for change-of-use.

George Colt stepped up to the podium next. He stated that whatever reciprocal agreement is created with Phase 3 will obligate the other Phases financially. All the phases will need to be brought into the loop as part of this agreement.

Mr. Heyland stated that the Cedarwood HOA Master Association will have this as a layer in that agreement.

J. Bernstein asked if the Board can see a copy of this master agreement.

D. Smith asked if they could have more forceful signage declaring Sycamore Lane is a private way with access only for residents.

Mr. Heyland stated that there is signage which says "Private" and "Residents Only".

Members of public in the audience agreed that a sign exists, but that it is small and inadequate.

Mr. Heyland also noted that some of the confusion is in the GPS system. Currently GPS will send travelers down the road.

D. Smith asked what can be done to improve signage. How can it be made clearer that this is not a through-way, even if GPS says that it is? He understand that a sign will be taken care of, but it needs to be adequate.

Mr. Heyland also stated that he will add signage to the gravel sections of the road.

D. Smith noted that will also need to have this at the Phase 3 section as well. Need a disclaimer that it is a private way.

The Public hearing closed at 8:41 pm.

C. MacClinchy asked for any additional questions or comments from the Board.

R. Smith stated that they just need to do what they said they will do.

R. Metcalf noted that the need to make sure that everything is done in conformance with what has been discussed tonight. He added that the covenants need to be looked at by the Town Attorney. Also, he questioned does the Board feel comfortable taking action on this application tonight. Or, do they need to see that everything is happening as discussed? He added that he would like to see some of the loose ends tied up before taking action.

J. Vance, R. Smith, and D. Smith agreed that they were uncomfortable taking action tonight.

C. MacClinchy stated yes, the Board will need to see those loose ends tied up.

J. Bernstein asked if they wanted to run the documents past Natalie Burns, Town Attorney.

R. Metcalf said they should always run these sorts of agreements past an attorney. As this project has been an ongoing issue, they want to make sure that everyone is covered.

J. Bernstein added that she will need to have the Phasing plan updated. Also, there needs to be clarity about the gravel upgrades. She knows that the letter of credit has run out. The applicant will want to figure out when things will be completed and who will be responsible.

R. Metcalf recommended that the applicant sit down with Judy in order to make sure that all the notes are straightened out.

J. Vance revisited the mailbox comment. She wants to make sure that this is not going to be in conflict with the entrance to the apartment building.

Mr. Doe agreed. He thinks that the mailboxes should be moved to the north of the entrance to make sure that everyone is safe.

J. Bernstein suggested contacting the Post Office to make sure there is no issue with that move.

J. Vance asked what the final upshot on the sidewalks is.

C. MacClinchy answered that the sidewalk exists up Juniper Way.

Mr. Doe responded that is correct. The question could be about the walking trail.

C. MacClinchy noted that will need to be researched.

Mr. Doe said that is his understanding.

D. Smith asked if that will need to be maintained during the winter as well.

Mr. Doe replied he had no idea.

J. Vance stated that if it is being used by kids it will need to be maintained.

C. MacClinchy asked if there was anything else from the Board.

D. Smith asked if they needed to act on the landscape buffer issue.

C. MacClinchy answered that it will be part of the Findings of Fact.

#### **4. Discussion regarding Planning Board Priorities for Continued Zoning Amendment Work**

J. Bernstein stated that she had intended to have a list of amendment work for the Board to discuss, but as both the Planning Board and the Site Review Board have had applications filed every day or two, she has not had a chance to put that together.

She did hand out a letter which was received from the chair of the Lower Village Committee. They want to be put on the Board's agenda to discuss working on an amendment for design review standards. She stated that she doesn't think they have an idea yet what they want. However, they can certainly set up a workshop meeting to hear what they have to say. The Board can then give them some feedback. Town Planner has already provided a copy of standard.

R. Metcalf noted that what is existing for an infrastructure is very limited. The other issue here is that it's a larger area that most people realize. Lower Village includes land along Western Ave. There is a greater encompassing area that needs to be looked at as a whole.

R. Smith noted that there are also wetlands which need to be taken into account.

J. Vance asked if there is a delineation where the Lower Village ends.

J. Bernstein answered that there is the zoning delineation. She then asked if the Board would like to give them a couple options for a policy meeting.

C. MacClinchy suggested either 11/14/16 or 12/12/16.

J. Bernstein asked if they wanted to offer both dates.

C. MacClinchy answered yes.

J. Bernstein noted that at some point she will pull together a list of zoning amendments that need to be reviewed. She also stated she may add subdivision standards for review.

## 5. Other Old/ New Business

### Upcoming Agendas:

- Kevin Reilly Shoreland Zone application
- Erinmore project.
  - Jim Logan said he is not quite ready. He has filed plans, but wants to get DEP signoff before he comes back to this Board.
- LEB Subdivision on Ross Rd.
  - J. Bernstein has asked for Natalie Burns to attend the next meeting. Ms. Burns will not be available for 11/24/16 meeting. Does the Board want to try for 11/14/16?
    - R. Metcalf answered yes. They would prefer Ms. Burns attend as they know that LEB's attorney will be there.
  - J. Bernstein added that currently, LEB is working on the follow-up data requested by the Board.
- Cedarwood will likely want to get back onto agenda ASAP.
- There is a new Shoreland Zone application for a Mr. Kahn from Fletcher St.
- There is a new Shoreland Zone application for Gabriel Gordon for a wetland crossing on Turner Lane.

### Minutes reviewed:

Meeting minutes for 7/25/16 were reviewed and corrected.

D. Smith moved to approve minutes as corrected.

R. Smith second the motion.

Vote was 4 approve/1 abstain (R. Metcalf abstained as was absent from the meeting)

Meeting Minutes for 8/22/16 were reviewed and corrected.

D. Smith moved to approve minutes as corrected.

J. Vance seconded the motion.

Vote 5/0 in approval.

J. Bernstein asked when the Board wants to have Biddeford Savings Bank (Mr. Single) come back.

C. MacClinchy suggested 10/24/16.

R. Metcalf provided some update on the Comp. Plan. The committee is still updating section of the Comp Plan. They had a meeting last week, and another meeting scheduled for this Wednesday to update the Public Hearing process. They didn't get much success rate to the surveys that went out, and will be discussing that situation. He will keep the Board updated as there is more news.

C. MacClinchy thanked everything who went to the workshop meeting with the Board of Selectmen. He also added that it looks like there may be a new Board member by the next meeting. They have 2 good applicants for the alternate position, including a former Board member.

## **6. Adjournment**

D. Smith moved to adjourn the meeting.

R. Metcalf seconded the motion.

Vote was 5/0 in approval.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:45 pm.

*Respectfully submitted by Lynne Capitan.*

**Signature Page**

---

---

---

---

---

**Signature**

**Date**